

The copyright of this thesis vests in the author. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Published by the University of Cape Town (UCT) in terms of the non-exclusive license granted to UCT by the author.

# **Narrative Strategies in the Gospel according to Luke:**

**A Bakhtinian Exploration**

A thesis submitted to the  
University of Cape Town  
in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy

by

**Bettina Irene Fischer**

Supervisors: **Prof. Richard Whitaker, University of Cape Town**  
**Prof. Charles Wanamaker, University of Cape Town**

Department of Classics  
University of Cape Town  
Rondebosch  
South Africa

April 2004

UT 880 FISC  
765383

## Acknowledgements

I am grateful to many for the help and support I have received in writing this thesis: To my supervisors, Prof Richard Whitaker and Prof Charles Wanamaker, who have always made themselves available and have given me advice at crucial stages of my work; to Dr Carli Coetzee, who as my first supervisor gave me the courage to embark on this project; to Hermann Boeddinghaus for helping me with the proof reading; to my friend, Guenevere Burke, for assisting me with the final format; to Veronica Belling, librarian in the Department of Jewish Studies at the University of Cape Town; to my friends, Christa Schönfeld, Uschi Swaine and Gina Niederhumer, for their sustained support; to my sister, Carin Stuart, and her husband, Michael, for their encouragement over a number of years.

I would also like to state my indebtedness to Richard Burrige's book *What are the Gospels*, which has formed much of the basis of the fourth chapter of this thesis.

My thanks go to the Kaplan Centre at the University of Cape Town for allowing me to work in one of their carols.

The financial assistance of the former South African Centre for Science Development (CSD, now the NRF) towards this project is gratefully acknowledged. The views expressed in this thesis are not necessarily those of the CSD (or of the NRF).

Bettina Fischer,  
April 2004,  
Cape Town, South Africa.

This thesis is dedicated to  
my children

Carina, Alice, Carl and Maria  
Also to Holly, my granddaughter

And to the memory of my son, Paul.

University of Cape Town

## ABSTRACT

Using the theory of the twentieth century Russian literary scholar and linguist, Mikhail Bakhtin, this thesis has set out to explore narrative strategy in the Gospel of Luke, the aim being to consider how this would affect a generic reading, and what implications this would have in assessing the discourse of this text. Bakhtin classifies early Christian writings as part of the Menippea, a collective name for a body of parodying-travestying literature of the Graeco-Roman period. In contrast to the classical genres of the mainstream, epic, love-poetry and tragedy, Bakhtin rates Menippean texts as being essentially dialogic, engaged in exploring ideas of life and death from the perspective of a carnivalistic view of the world. He uses the genre of the Greek Romance, seen by him as a forerunner of the European novel, to demonstrate some of his theory. Having selected the Romance, *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, by Chariton, as a comparative text to the Gospel of Luke, both texts are explored in terms of the Bakhtinian concepts of chronotope, carnival, and intertextuality.

Regarding the organization of time and space, both texts were found to function according to a combination of *biographical time* and *adventure time* in *abstract alien space*, which Bakhtin identifies as the chronotope of the *adventure novel of ordeal*. The heroes in both texts were found to be unchanging, in line with Bakhtin's theory that the protagonist of this type of text embodies the viability of the idea being tested, the integrity of the character signifying the integrity of the idea. Furthermore it was found that both texts share a number of motifs that are characteristic of this genre. Concerning the discursive function of the chronotope, it was found that the location of the episodes recounted supported the discourse of the Gospel as a whole. Having rooted itself in the established religion as represented by the Hebrew Bible and the Temple, the discourse then diverges from it for the greater part of the narrative, to finally challenge the practice of that religion on its own ground before setting off to disseminate itself as a new religion throughout the world.

Both the Gospel of Luke and *Chaereas and Callirhoe* were found to be shot through with the carnival element in the Bakhtinian sense, presenting parodying and utopian doubles of what may be surmised to have been the world of the intended reader. The protagonist of the Gospel embodies the carnival movement of life, death and rebirth,

as well as the image of the crowning and de-crowning of the carnival king. This points to the Gospel's free use of invention in order to test the concept of the coming Kingdom of God. The carnival element reinforces the idea of the latter as the movement of life (as opposed to stasis) that Jesus propagates in inverting the status quo. The dialogically engaged parodic and utopian doubles of the world represent the battle of good and evil that underlies this text, responsible for its dramatic tension. Parables in the Gospel also display the use of carnivalistic inversions.

An intertextual exploration of the Gospel and *Chaereas and Callirhoe* has found that the former is heavily engaged with the books of the Hebrew Bible, while the latter is engaged with the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, both making use of the primary canon of the culture in which they are set. Using the older texts as sources, they also engage dialogically with them. A closer reading of the relations between the Gospel of Luke and the Book of Zechariah has found an extensive use by the Gospel of the older text as a source for characters, scenes and discourse. At the same time, the new text diverges from the older text, carnivalistically inverting scenes and concepts of power, in this way presenting the utopian Kingdom of God as an alternative. The Book of Zechariah acts as a sub-text to the Gospel, creating the awareness of the underlying battle and of the divine council. Both the Gospel and *Chaereas and Callirhoe* are shown on a far less grand scale than the canonical texts that they interact with.

In comparing the findings of this thesis with views held by biblical scholars concerning the genre of the Gospels it was found that a Bakhtinian reading of the Gospel of Luke has brought to light aspects in this text that are not accounted for in readings informed by form criticism and redaction criticism. In regarding the Gospels as *Kleinliteratur*, the deliberate intricate intertextual use of the discourses of books from the Hebrew Bible by the Gospel of Luke are missed. Further, if the Gospels are identified as kerygma, the carnivalistic dimension of the Gospel of Luke, and therefore the presentation of its complex dialogic relations between the parodic and utopian versions of the world are also lost. Thirdly, in isolating the Gospels from other Graeco Roman texts, no account is taken of the fundamental generic affinity between the Gospel of Luke and the Greek Romance that has been demonstrated in this thesis.

The Bakhtinian exploration of the Gospel has furthermore demonstrated that the model that has been used to identify the Gospels as ancient biographies or *bioi* does not make an adequate distinction between the genre of biography and that of the Greek Romance. As ancient biography is seen as a flexible genre, the aspects in the Gospel of Luke that do not fit into model, such as the happy ending, have not been seen as a reason to exclude it from the genre as such. The investigation along Bakhtinian lines has shown these differences to be significant insofar as they can be seen to be consistent with the results of the investigation concerning the chronotope, the carnivalesque and intertextuality, which points to the Gospel being generically closer to the Greek Romance than to ancient biography. In showing this affinity new possible ways of reading the Gospel open up. First, the release from the constraints of historicity and verisimilitude allows for an unimpeded testing of the central idea under scrutiny, namely the coming Kingdom of God as embodied by Jesus. The high incidence of the supernatural with its sensational excitement would therefore not be seen as anything unusual. Secondly, the Romance genre is believed to have been popular in the Graeco-Roman era, which would imply a large and varied intended readership. Thirdly, it is less dangerous to propagate a radical discourse in the form of fiction. Any historical elements in terms of character, time and space can be incorporated by a text of this type as a literary device, which would make the story feel more 'real' to the reader.

This thesis does not claim to have exhausted all the possibilities of exploring the Gospel of Luke along Bakhtinian lines. It is only a beginning. What it has shown is that the Gospel of Luke shares a number of generic features with Romance literature of the Graeco-Roman period. This means that the longstanding tendency to read it as bios or as an historical account misses what the writer of this text has done as a self-conscious author. It misses the complex and highly dialogic nature of this text.

## Contents

<b>Introduction</b> .....	1
<b>Chapter 1</b>	
The Chronotope in the Gospel of Luke and in <i>Chaereas and Callirhoe</i> .....	14
<b>Chapter 2</b>	
Bakhtin's Carnival and the Gospel of Luke.....	49
<b>Chapter 3</b>	
Intertextual Relations between the Gospel of Luke and the Book of Zechariah .....	94
<b>Chapter 4</b>	
The Gospel of Luke as a Menippean Text .....	144
<b>Chapter 5</b>	
Conclusion .....	199
<b>Bibliography</b> .....	215



## Introduction

While *The Oxford Companion to the Bible* (1993: 258) refers to the genre of the Gospels, canonical and apocryphal, as *sui generis*, this classification is being challenged by modern critical scholars. The *sui generis* theory is part of the form-critical view, a movement that had challenged the long-held opinion of the Gospels as biographies of Jesus. Form critics pointed to what they saw as differences between the Gospels and other biographies, like the description of only a short period of the protagonist's life, and the absence of a direct description of character. Followed by redaction criticism, which also adheres to the *sui generis* hypothesis, form criticism has dominated NT studies for the greater part of the twentieth century.<sup>1</sup> A new interest in favour of biography began to emerge in the second half of that century, the argument being that ancient biography of the Graeco-Roman period differed in form from modern biography, and that the Gospels should be read within the literary environment of the period of their production (Aune 1987: 22-3, Burridge 1992: 206, Stanton 2002: 14-18).

What some of these classifications have in common is that, in line with traditional thinking, evidenced by their position in the canon and their status within church practice, the Gospels are often discussed in their collective form, with an assumption that what holds for one, also holds for the others.<sup>2</sup> Theology, biblical scholarship and church worship have contributed towards this stance.<sup>3</sup> Individual Gospels have been fragmented by a focus on small sections for purposes of analysis and liturgical practice. Often these small sections are discussed in relation to sections in other biblical texts, either in one of the other three Gospels, or in books of the Hebrew Bible. Paradoxically, the effect has been to invoke an amalgamation of the four Gospels in the imagination, suggesting the existence of one master narrative behind

---

<sup>1</sup> For convenience I shall refer to the Hebrew Bible as HB and to the New Testament as NT in this thesis.

<sup>2</sup> A distinction is made between the Gospels of Mark, Matthew and Luke (the Synoptics) on the one hand, and on the Gospel of John on the other, by form criticism. See *The Synoptic Tradition* (Bultmann 1968) and *From Tradition to Gospel* (Dibelius 1971).

<sup>3</sup> Stein, criticizing redaction criticism in this regard, believes that the searching out of the individual contribution of each evangelist results in a breaking up of the four Gospels as a whole, thus losing the greater theological message (Stein 1992: 649).

these texts, toward which each individual text contributes.<sup>4</sup> This imagined master narrative, sometimes simply referred to as The Gospel, represents what many worshippers believe to be a set of events that have taken place in historical time and space.<sup>5</sup>

The second half of the twentieth century has shown a rising interest in narrative studies of the Gospels, a direction that, in looking at the narrative of each text as a whole, can be seen to challenge the holistic view of the Gospels as a group. Swinging away from the fragmentation introduced by early theological and liturgical practice, and then, by the practice of form criticism with its methods of source, tradition, redaction and composition criticism, the move is towards a stance that views each Gospel as a whole narrative text in its own right. The New Testament scholar, Robert Tannehill, going a step further, has broken the constraint of the Gospel enclosure in the canon by asserting that the Gospel of Luke should be seen as the first part of a larger narrative, the second part of which is the Book of Acts. The implication is that two texts, having been regarded as belonging to two different genres, are seen by this scholar as part of one product, the second one being the sequel to the first.<sup>6</sup> Tannehill makes this assertion by virtue of what he perceives to be one overarching authorial purpose. His argument is that the author of Luke has used narrative to convey a theological message, namely, a gradual disclosure of God's purpose (Tannehill 1986: xiii).<sup>7</sup>

<sup>4</sup> It is of interest to note that the *Diatesseron* believed to be the oldest Syriac version of the Gospel story was created by Tatian ca. 160 CE, consisting of an amalgamation of the four separate Gospels. It was superseded by a translation of the four Gospels (late second – early third century CE), and finally suppressed in the early fifth century (Oxford Companion to the Bible 1993: 104, 753).

<sup>5</sup> Mel Gibson's recently released film, *The Passion of the Christ*, shows a section of the Gospel story. Based on the passion story in the Synoptic Gospels, it incorporates sections from the Gospel of John and other texts from the Gospel tradition, giving the impression of one whole narrative. Sections of the pre-passion Gospel story are included by means of analepsis.

<sup>6</sup> Talbert discusses Luke-Acts as a unity in his *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts* (1974) He also states that in a search for Luke the theologian, redaction criticism is used to analyze the Gospel of Luke, while style criticism is used to analyze the Book of Acts (Talbert 1989: 311).

<sup>7</sup> See also Staley, who, using Aristotle's understanding of narrative unity and plot, divides the plot of the Gospel of Luke into four major sequences: the introductory sequence, made up of non-Markan material, focusing on events surrounding the births of John and Jesus in Judea, and their initial public appearances; the second sequence, largely following Mark's structure, that focuses upon Jesus' Galilean ministry, especially on the miracles; the third sequence, a travel section, where Jesus is on the way to Jerusalem, dominated by non-Markan teaching traditions, growing opposition to Jesus, and Jesus' resoluteness in living out his purpose; the final sequence, which parallels Mark, focusing upon Jesus' prophetic activities in Jerusalem, his martyrdom, and God's vindication of him. Focusing on the second sequence, Staley demonstrates deliberate plot developments that he sees paralleled by Paul's ministry in Acts (Staley 1993: 281-302). See also S G Wilson, who in examining the aspect of law in the Lucan narrative, opts for examining the finished product (synchronically), rather than considering traditional historical or source questions in detail (Wilson 1983: 12-13).

Although there is a wide-spread consensus amongst scholars that Luke and Acts should be seen in this sequential relationship, there are also voices that challenge this.<sup>8</sup>

Stephen D. Moore in his book, *Literary Criticism and the Gospels: The Theoretical Challenge*, has made a survey of works by biblical scholars who have applied models developed by literary theorists, works that have ventured beyond the traditional methods of biblical scholarship. Moore traces the movement of this new critical activity from a narrow focus on story (Moore 1989: 3-24) to a wider focus on narrative rhetoric (Moore 1989: 25-68) to the role of the reader (Moore 1989: 71-197). He concludes that while the different models of interpretation could be seen as competing with one another, they do not lead to a 'supermethod' of interpretation. Collectively, they come up with paradoxical results, resulting in further problems of interpretation. Moore, however, sees this as a challenge that should be entered into by biblical scholarship (Moore 1989: 171).<sup>9</sup>

Following the line taken by narrative criticism in approaching each Gospel as an individual text, my aim is to discover more about the genre of the Gospel of Luke and how this affects a reading of it. My approach will be two-pronged. I shall use the theories of Mikhail M. Bakhtin as the tool in exploring narrative strategies in this text. Secondly, using the same theoretical framework, I shall examine the narrative strategies of a Greek Romance text, and compare the findings with that of the Gospel of Luke. I have chosen the Greek Romance as a comparative genre, as the texts are also narratives, which scholars, on the whole, place in the same Graeco-Roman environment as the Gospels.<sup>10</sup> Bakhtin describes particular genres in

<sup>8</sup> Stephen Moore (1987: 443-458), Martin Dibelius in *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (1956). See also Parsons and Pervo's discussion on this issue (1993: 115-126).

<sup>9</sup> See also Kolasny (1990: 76), who in the context of applying rhetorical criticism to Luke 4: 16-30, emphasizes that the texts of individual pericopae must be looked at within the context of the entire work, suggesting that the methodology of historical and form criticism fails to do this.

<sup>10</sup> While it is widely held that the Gospel of Luke was composed ca. 80-85 CE (Fitzmyer 1993: 472), scholars are less certain about the dating of the extant Greek Romances. See Tatum, "Modern estimates of both the chronology and the characteristics of antiquity's fiction change regularly, and often fundamentally, because of new fragments of ancient fiction" (Tatum 1994: 2). Reardon, while stating that precise dating is impossible, and that there is not agreement about when the genre first appeared or how long it lasted, suggests that it is commonly held that "the first, shadowy proto-novels appeared in late Hellenistic times, and that the genre grew in confidence during the first century of our era" (Reardon 1989: 5). Schwartz cites recent opinion as placing Chariton in the first or even second century CE. She refers to Hernández Lara (1990), Ruiz Montero

demonstrating his theory of dialogism, linking genre to the capacity of dialogic interaction possible in a text (Bakhtin 1981: 8-28). One of the genres he describes is that of the Greek Romance.

As in the case of the Gospels, the Greek Romance consists of a number of narrative texts, unconnected in terms of authorship, date and place of production. Scholars have grouped them together by what they perceive as similarities in form, plot and language. Sharing a central story with a similar beginning and end, the content consists of similar episodes that are, however, of varying sequence, length and detail. Classicists view this genre as having reached its peak in the second century CE, although some examples of the extant texts are tentatively placed in the first century BCE. Early versions of the *Alexander Romance* are dated to the third century BCE (Reardon 1989: 5). There is little evidence of how ancient scholars regarded these romances.<sup>11</sup>

The specific text I have chosen to compare to the Gospel of Luke is *Chaereas and Callirhoe* by Chariton. Although there is no absolute consensus on the dating, this text has been placed into the first century CE or earlier. Its Hellenistic Greek is relatively free of the ‘atticisms’ associated with examples of the genre produced from the late first century onwards, suggesting that it was produced before that period. On the other hand, the description of the geographical and social background of Miletus in the story has been seen to fit in with what is known of that area during the time of the early Roman Empire, suggesting that it would not have been produced before that era (Reardon 1989: 17).

If modern literary theory has contributed towards an interest in investigating the Gospels from a new perspective in the twentieth century, it has done the same for the Greek Romance. Modern literary scholars see features that were formerly regarded as a sign of

---

(1991), Baslez (1992), and Cueva (2000) (Schwartz 2003: 375, n. 2). Egger opines that Chariton’s novel is the earliest of the full, extant Greek novels, calling it “our first European novel” (Egger 1994: 310). She cites Hägg as suggesting that Chariton is also the author of *Parthenope* and *Chione*, two other pre-Atticist novels preserved only in papyrus fragments (1994: 43, n. 3).

<sup>11</sup> See Egger, who cites the first century Latin satirist, who mocks readers of a certain *Callirhoe*, which may refer to Chariton’s novel or a popular mime of the same title. She also refers to Weinreich (1962: 130), Schmeling (1974: 18), Plepelits (1976: 29 ff). Furthermore, Egger refers to Philostratus (early third century), who pours scorn on a certain Chariton (1994:43 n. 3).

inferiority and a lack of organization (the repetitiveness of themes, disjunctions and inconsistencies in the narrative, the mixture of disparate genres within the larger text) in a different light.<sup>12</sup> Furthermore, there has been a move towards looking beyond the boundaries drawn around what was considered to be the canon in an attempt to relate these narratives to other texts.<sup>13</sup> A generic link with early Christian literature has been made by the New Testament scholar, Richard I Pervo, as he relates the genre of the Book of Acts as well as that of the Apocryphal Acts to the Greek Romance (Pervo 1987, 1989). In his book, *Profit with Delight* (Pervo 1987), he bases his opinion on the fact that both the Greek Romance and the Book of Acts mix instruction with entertainment, a practice commonly found in popular literature but frowned upon by ancient arbiters of 'good' literary taste. The classicist B P Reardon relates the Greek Romance to what he calls Christian and para-Christian romance texts such as some Apocryphal Acts by virtue of the element of travel and adventure (Reardon 1991: 5).

The classicist, John Morgan, perceives the relationship between ancient fiction and religion to be a significant one, considering them as catering to the same human needs, "(to) reassure the individual of his personal worth and discover meaning in the tangled web of his daily experience". He points out that some classicists have made connections between the romances and the mystery cults of the Roman Empire, the romances functioning as coded texts, their meaning only available to initiated members.<sup>14</sup> Referring to Christianity as the most successful of the eastern mystery cults, he is of the opinion that early Christian texts made use of the repertory of the Romances, although they propagated a different fundamental message. Thus he points to the artificiality of the barrier erected by academic disciplines between early Christian and other Hellenistic literature (Morgan 1994: 8).

---

<sup>12</sup> Morgan cites the nineteenth century German scholar, E Rohde, in his book, *Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer* (1876), as arguing that the ancient novel began as an amalgam of Hellenistic narrative erotic poetry with paradoxographical narratives of travel and adventure. This theory was undermined by the discovery of papyrus fragments of the *Ninus* romance, which showed that a fully developed love romance (*cont. p. 5*) existed too early to fit in with Rohde's evolutionary chronology (Morgan & Stoneman 1994: 2).

<sup>13</sup> The five extant romances by Chariton, Xenophon, Longus, Achilles Tatius and Heliodoros, have been referred to as the canon (Reardon 1989: 2).

<sup>14</sup> Morgan cites R Merkelbach's *Roman und Mysterium in der Antike* in this regard (Morgan & Stoneman 1994: 8).

Similar to Morgan's opinion concerning the function of the Greek Romance within Graeco-Roman society is that of Reardon. The latter perceives the emergence of the Greek Romance in the light of a response to the need of the individual to find personal meaning within a bigger world within the Empire, in which the intense political interest characterizing the city-state could no longer operate (Reardon 1989: 7). In his book, *The Form of the Greek Romance*, Reardon puts forward a scheme of interpretation that traces a pattern recurring in most of the romances. Following the direction taken by the classicist, B.E. Perry (1967), he identifies his interpretation as the social parallel of the psychological pattern put forward by Northrop Frye (1976), and the religious one put forward by K. Kerényi (1927) and R. Merkelbach (1962), which runs as follows. The *individual within a big world* is in a state of *isolation*, causing him to *travel*, which leads to *trials* through which he is *sustained by love*, ending in *salvation* (Reardon 1991: 174).

It has been mentioned above that the Greek Romance also features in Bakhtin's writings. He wrote his essay "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope" in the late 1930s, adding "Concluding Remarks" in 1973. Seeing the romances as precursors of the European novel, he discusses this genre in terms of his theory of the chronotope. Reardon refers to this work in a footnote, only to acknowledge that it was written, that it is of interest in terms of the work of a great thinker, but that it is dated (Reardon 1991:177n). It is true that Bakhtin's actual dating of some of the individual romances has been superseded by later scholarship, but that does not mean that the essay as such is necessarily dated. Bakhtin does not claim to make a conclusive study of the Greek Romance in this one essay. His chief interest lies in what he terms novelistic writing, and in demonstrating an aspect of it, namely, the chronotope. Reardon, Frye and Merkelbach interpret the shared plot of the romances as a unifying pattern, giving it a symbolic function on either a psychological, societal or religious level. Bakhtin's primary interest lies in the extent of dialogism permitted in a particular genre. He views the genre of the Greek Romance within the wider context of ancient genres outside the established mainstream of literary classics, those that he sees as low culture, parodying-travesty genres, such as the satyr play, Menippean satire and carnival.

In Bakhtin's view, then, the texts of the Greek Romance feature as forerunners of the European novel, the genre that is at the centre of his work. His theory on the novel, much of which can be applied to narrative prose as such, is inseparable from his understanding of language. Underlying this is a basic assumption of a Manichaeic-like struggle at the heart of existence; a struggle between centrifugal forces to keep things apart, and centripetal forces to make things cohere. Not confined to physical existence, this struggle is also the force that underlies culture. As such it is reflected in human language. Bakhtin stresses the fragility and historical nature of language; the coming and dying of meaning, something it shares with human existence itself. Language moves forward in historical time while constantly engaged in the struggle between centrifugal forces that diversify meaning and centripetal forces that unify meaning (Bakhtin 1981: 270-2).<sup>15</sup>

Language, according to Bakhtin, cannot be regarded outside its social context. The language act is in itself a social act. As such it is essentially dialogic. While every utterance can be seen to be in response to another utterance, it is also structured in expectation of a future response. Thus every utterance is intertextual as it responds to one or more past utterances, as well as being affected by the context within which it is made. Extending the utterance to discourse, one can say that all discourse is in dialogue with other discourses, the single voice only being heard in relation to the presence of already existing voices. Voluntarily or involuntarily, discourse takes a position in relation to other discourses, thus expressing a particular world-view. Bakhtin refers to these world-views as languages or voices, a number of which can be present in a single utterance (Todorov 1984:50-51).

Should there be several, diverse voices in dialogue with each other in a more or less un-hierarchical relationship within a given text, then Bakhtin would refer to this text as being polyphonic and dialogic. However, should a text come across as unitary on account of one controlling, authoritative voice that silences every other voice, then he would label the utterance as monologic. Given his view on the dialogic nature of all utterances, however, one

---

<sup>15</sup> Bakhtin frequently either repeats or re-articulates much of his theory in his various texts. My text-references for his statements are representative of statements that appear in other texts as well.

must assume that he is speaking in terms of degree when he refers to a text as being either polyphonic and dialogic on the one hand, or monologic on the other.

Bakhtin expresses a strong opinion concerning the role of genre in terms of the extent of dialogic possibilities within a given text. Thus he sees the established, highly regarded, mainstream genres of antiquity, such as the epic, drama and lyrical poetry as essentially monologic; dialogic activity having been curtailed by their verse form, their language, their conventions and their subject matter. In his view texts produced within these generic conventions represent the finished product of one organizing consciousness, as opposed to presenting a dialogic interaction. He describes his favourite genre, the novel, in terms of how it differs from epic, drama and lyric poetry. Eschewing any definition of the novel genre in terms of a set of conventions, he puts forward the opinion that the very lack of a set of these constitutes the difference between it and other genres. Moving with time, the novel is seen by him to be in a constant state of evolution and renewal, appropriating any number of genres as the need arises, but never allowing itself to be contained by any of them. Its subject matter concerns current issues as opposed to the valorized past portrayed in the epic, or the expression of the feelings of a single consciousness in the case of lyric poetry. By virtue of the novel's constant state of flux, its essential open-endedness, its freedom from any set of conventions, Bakhtin makes the claim that the novelistic genre is the *only* literary genre that can do justice to the full potential of the polyphonic nature of language. This is not to say that every novel is polyphonic. Some are more so than others. It seems that when Bakhtin refers to the 'novelistic word', however, that he means prose narrative that is dialogic to a high degree (Bakhtin 1981: 5-25).

Although this description of novelistic writing is qualitative, suggesting timelessness, Bakhtin does connect manifestations of it to certain historical periods. In his view, the novels of Fyodor Dostoevsky, produced in Russia during the nineteenth century, constitute the highest achievement in terms of polyphonic writing. However, he also sees the novelistic word as having flourished during earlier periods in history, such as the Hellenistic period and the Renaissance, considering social processes as having been responsible for this. In his book on Rabelais he gives a great deal of attention to the Renaissance, describing it as a period in

which society existed in heteroglossic<sup>16</sup> circumstances, thus providing optimal conditions for the production of the novelistic word. A diversity of cultures and national languages were engaged in a struggle, asserting themselves against each other with the inevitable result of a high degree of hybridization in artistic production. One can say the same about the Graeco-Roman period of the Ancient Near East, during which the Greek Romance flourished and during which the Gospel of Luke was produced.

In his survey of the work done in applying literary theories to the Gospels, Moore does not mention Bakhtin (Moore 1989). There are, however, scholars who have considered it as being suitable as a tool for investigating biblical texts. In 1996 Carol A. Newsom, in the context of Old Testament studies, advocates the Bakhtinian model as the one discourse that can address the impasse between biblical theology and biblical scholarship; the impasse in terms of regarding the Bible as a unified whole, in order to discover a central concept or system, as opposed to concentrating on its heterogeneity. Her opinion is based on Bakhtin's distinction of a sense of monologic truth and a sense of dialogic truth as he describes this in *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Her concern regarding theological studies is that although there is a claim that the Bible is viewed in its entirety, which would include all the texts, actual practice has shown that texts that do not fit into a particular theological system (a system based on a monologic sense of truth, in her view) are marginalized or even disqualified. Turning to biblical scholarship on the other hand, which uses contradiction, disjunction and multiple perception within the Bible to make a case for the Bible's heterogeneity, Newsom claims that these studies, too, are driven by a monologic sense of truth. While an attempt is made to disentangle and identify the various monologic voices, no theoretical framework that would enable an understanding of how these voices interact within the whole seems to be made use of (Newsom 1996: 290-306). In a later article Newsom discusses the Book of Job as an example of a polyphonic text in the Bakhtinian sense, demonstrating how the concerns of biblical theology and biblical criticism can both be accommodated when biblical texts are regarded in terms of a dialogic as opposed to monologic sense of truth (Newsom 2000: 87-108).<sup>17</sup>

<sup>16</sup> The co-existence of a number of different speech types.

<sup>17</sup> See also Gitay (1996), who published an article using Bakhtin in the context of a rhetorical approach to the Hebrew Bible. His argument runs along the same lines as Newsom's in terms of reconciling the approach of

Another article that applies Bakhtinian theory to a biblical text is that of Seth Sykes (1997), "Time and Space in Haggai-Zechariah 1-8: A Bakhtinian Analysis of a Prophetic Chronicle." Sykes comes to the conclusion that Haggai-Zechariah 1-8 is a single text and, as such, is a prophetic parody of the chronicles in the Hebrew Bible. Identifying the different styles, which distinguish the prophecies from the chronistic narrative in Haggai-Zechariah 1-8, as different voices, he relates this text to the earlier chronicles. Using Bakhtin's theory of the conceptualization of time and space (the chronotope), which the latter uses to gauge the genre of a text, Sykes compares that of Haggai-Zechariah 1-8 with that of the chronicles. He thus demonstrates dialogic interaction between these texts. As a result he takes the view that Haggai-Zechariah 1-8 subverts the world-view of the chronicles that preserve and legitimate the political authority of the monarchy, in order to urge obedience to the prophetic word of the divine king and warrior, Yahweh (Sykes 1997: 97-124).

More recently, Barbara Green has published a book, *Mikhail Bakhtin and Biblical Scholarship: An Introduction*, which advocates the use of Bakhtinian thought in biblical studies. Having introduced Bakhtin and his theories (Green 2000: 11-57), Green presents a Bakhtinian reading of 1 Samuel 17: 55 - 20: 42. She focuses specifically on the dialogue within the (sub)consciousness of the character, Saul. Green goes on to point to other Hebrew Bible scholars that have used Bakhtin's theories, focusing on a discussion of the works of Kenneth Craig Jr., Carol Newsom, Ilana Pardes, and Rober Polzin.<sup>18</sup> Green also mentions the New Testament scholars, Paul Anderson and David McCracken, who allude to Bakhtin in discussing the Gospels.

---

biblical studies with theological studies towards the different books of the Hebrew Bible by using the Bakhtinian model. Gitay also makes use of the Book of Job to demonstrate his theory, seeing the frame narrative (representing a conservative view) in dialogic interaction with the dialogues (representing a more radical view) within the story. Furthermore, he sees the Book of Job in dialogue with the Book of Proverbs (Gitay 1996: 61-8).

<sup>18</sup> Other Old Testament scholars who work explicitly with Bakhtin are Judith Fentress-Williams (1 Samuel), Karen Gale (Genesis), Francisco Garcia-Treto (1 Kings, Amos), Harold Fisch, Herbert Levine, and Carleen Mandolfo (Psalms), Nanette Stahl (Law), Seth Sykes (Haggai and Zechariah), Hugh White (Genesis), and Patricia Tull Willey (Isaiah).

There are a number of factors that would justify the use of Bakhtin's theories in an exploration of the narrative of the Gospel of Luke. First, one can consider that Bakhtin has actually described and made use of the texts of the Greek Romance, a genre that is a product of the same, multicultural Graeco-Roman environment that has produced the Gospel of Luke. Secondly, although the Gospel of Luke was to play a central role in what was to become the dominant culture of Christianity, it emanated from the margin of society at the time of its production. A third consideration is that the subject matter of this text deals with what was a burning contemporary issue, namely, the birth of a new religious movement. Fourthly, the prologue mentions the existence of other texts that concern the same issue, implying an intertextual response to these by promising to give its own, new account of the events described. A fifth point is that the text cannot be said to follow the conventions of any one classical literary genre, although it contains elements of a number of them. In contrast to what classical convention stipulated, according to Erich Auerbach, the characters that feature centrally in the Gospel are simple, ordinary people in terms of the hierarchy of a worldly establishment. They are shown, here, in a serious light rather than as comic figures, which would have been the norm.<sup>19</sup> Furthermore, as has been observed in the texts of the Greek Romance, there are disjunctions within the text of the Gospel of Luke. While this could be seen to be the result of a piecing together of parts of various sources, it could also be a manifestation of what Bakhtin would call the presenting of an image of another's discourse (Bakhtin 1990: 43-48). Lastly, one could speak of this text as presenting a mixture of cultures. Written in Greek, it relates a Jewish story. The possibility of a mediating function, which may involve strategies over and above the translation of national languages, comes to mind.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> In the second chapter of his book, *Mimesis*, Erich Auerbach notes the mingling of styles in the scene of Peter's denial of Jesus in the Gospel of Mark, stating that this also is the case in the other two Synoptics. Describing the depiction of Peter, an ordinary, everyday character, as the "image of man in the highest and deepest and most tragic sense," he sees this phenomenon as incompatible with the "sublime style of classical antique literature (Auerbach 1953: 35-37).

<sup>20</sup> See Phillips, who in the context of an analysis of *The Good Samaritan* (Lk 10: 30-37) puts forward the opinion that Bakhtin's theory of dialogism, that is, that all writing is rewriting (a response) (Bakhtin 1981: 92), and thus intertextual, illustrates that a scriptural text should be read as already constituting a multiplicity of readings (Phillips 1992: 291).

Can Bakhtin's theoretical writings be described as a clear theoretical system that can be applied to a given work? Critics and commentators point out the difficulty in apprehending his work as a whole; the unsystematic way in which he presents his ideas, the way he repeats himself but not in exactly the same way, and how he contradicts some of his ideas in the different essays. The problem is seen to be further complicated by the unchronological way in which the works were first made available to Western scholars, not to speak of the further complication of the true authorship of the texts published under the names of Bakhtin's two friends, V N Voloshinov and P N Medvedev. Simon Dentith, discussing Bakhtin and contemporary criticism, describes him as a "wide-ranging, imaginative and suggestive writer" whose "value is not that of a ready-made interpretative system." Nevertheless, he sees the work of Bakhtin and his circle as "press(ing) upon the diverse intellectual currents of Europe and North America...dialogizing in turn New Critical formalism, structuralism, Marxism, deconstruction and some versions of historicism" (Dentith 1995: 88).

A great deal of work is being done at present on Bakhtin, an indication that his work continues to challenge modern critical thinking.<sup>21</sup> While it may not be possible to apply his work as a complete, systematic theoretical framework (anything complete and rigid, in any case, runs against Bakhtin's theory of becoming), there is nothing to stop one from using the ideas, based on an underlying understanding of the essentially dialogic nature of human existence, to explore a text. My approach is to apply experimentally various aspects of his theory to the narrative of the Gospel of Luke. My first chapter explores the chronotope of both the Gospel of Luke and the Greek Romance, *Chaereas and Callirhoe*. My second chapter applies Bakhtin's theory of the carnivalesque to both these texts. My third chapter examines the aspect of intertextuality. Narrowing down the focus on the intertextual relations between the Gospel of Luke and the books of the Hebrew Bible, the relationship between the Gospel of Luke and the Book of Zechariah is explored as a case study. This is then compared to the relations between *Chaereas and Callirhoe* and Homeric texts. My fourth and last chapter focuses on issues of genre. Looking briefly at some of the theories propagated by biblical scholars in identifying the genre of the Gospels, the currently popular view of the

---

<sup>21</sup> See, for example, Bauer, Bezeczky, Bocharov, Coates, Danow, Emerson, Falconer, Morson & Emerson, Nielson, Clark, Holquist, and others.

Gospels as ancient biographies is looked into in more detail. The model of *bios* that is carefully set up and explained by Richard Burridge in his *What are the Gospels* is applied experimentally to the romance text, *Chaereas and Callirhoe*. As this does not show up a definitive distinction between the two genres, and as Burridge's model does not satisfactorily address the aspects the supernatural, the intertextual engagement, and the carnivalistic inversions in the Gospel of Luke, there is reason, in terms of the findings in Chapters 1, 2, and 3, to reassess the genre of the Gospel of Luke.

## Chapter 1

### The Chronotope<sup>1</sup> in the Gospel of Luke and in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*

I shall begin this investigation into the chronotope of the Gospel of Luke by giving an outline of Bakhtin's theory of the chronotope.<sup>2</sup> Next, I shall examine an example of the Greek Romance, *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, by Chariton, in terms of this theory to see whether it applies to this particular text. I shall then apply the same theoretical model to the Gospel of Luke. From there it will emerge whether there is any common ground that can be taken as a basis for a generic comparison between these two texts.

#### *The Chronotope*

In his discussion of the chronotope Bakhtin traces the way the problem of representing historical time and space in literature has been met at various stages in the history of the novel. In 1937-8 he wrote the following:

We will give the name *chronotope* (literally, "time space") to the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed in literature (Bakhtin 1981: 84).

While time and space can be thought of separately in the abstract, they cannot be separated in the concrete instance, be it a real life occurrence or a represented one.

---

<sup>1</sup> Bakhtin uses this term to refer to the time-space arrangement in a text, which he discusses in his essay, 'Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel' (Bakhtin 1981: 84-258).

<sup>2</sup> Most of my outline is taken from the essay, 'Forms of Time and of the Chronotope,' written in 1937-8, and 'Concluding Remarks,' written in 1973 (Bakhtin 1981: 84-258).

The chronotope is far more than a technical device. It is a major constituent of the text as a whole. As such Bakhtin sees it as a formally constitutive category of literature, determining the genre of a text and the way in which the human image is presented in it.

The chronotope in literature has an intrinsic *generic* significance. It can even be said that it is precisely the chronotope that defines genre and generic distinctions, for in literature the primary category in the chronotope is time. The chronotope as a formally constitutive category determines to a significant degree the image of man as well. The image of man is always intrinsically chronotopic (Bakhtin 1981: 84-5) (Bakhtin's italics).

In his concluding remarks, written in 1973, Bakhtin spells out the implication of evaluation that the generic determination of the chronotope carries:

A literary work's artistic unity in relationship to an actual reality is defined by its chronotope. Therefore the chronotope in a work always contains within it an evaluating aspect that can be isolated from the whole artistic chronotope only in abstract analysis. In literature and art itself, temporal and spatial determinations are inseparable from one another, and always colored by emotion and values. Abstract thought can, of course, think time and space as separate entities and conceive them as things apart from emotions and values that attach to them. But *living* artistic perception (which also of course involves thought, but not abstract thought) makes no such divisions and permits no such segmentation. It seizes on the chronotope in all its wholeness and fullness. Art and literature are shot through with *chronotopic values* of varying degree and scope. Each motif, each separate aspect of artistic work bears value (Bakhtin 1981: 243) (Bakhtin's italics).

Bakhtin suggests here that the chronotope of a given text is never neutral. It is inextricably bound to an evaluating voice. It is discursive. Each motif carries an evaluative factor as it is linked to the chronotope.

Bakhtin distinguishes between three different types of chronotopes in ancient narrative prose; chronotopes that he perceives as manifesting themselves in later novelistic writings. He traces the first type, which operates according to *adventure time*, in what he calls the *adventure novel of ordeal*, referring to the five extant texts that have been regarded as the canon of the “love-and-adventure romances” (Reardon 1989: 2).<sup>3</sup> Bakhtin calls them “Greek” or “Sophist” novels, placing them between the second and sixth century CE. Regarding *Chaereas and Callirhoe* as an early example of this kind of novel, he places it at “no later than the second century AD ... perhaps the earliest of the Greek Romances” (Bakhtin 1981: 86). As has been indicated in the introduction of this thesis, classicists have subsequently placed this romance text at an even earlier date (first century BCE or first century CE).<sup>4</sup> This would make it a suitable choice for the purpose of comparison, as it may have been in existence by the time the Gospel of Luke appeared, or its appearance may have been contemporaneous with it. Tihanov cites one of Bakhtin’s Russian predecessors, Alexandr Veselovskii (1899), who associated the appearance of the genre of the Greek Romance with the era of Alexander the Great (Tihanov 1998: 32-3).<sup>5</sup> Modern classicists, like Reardon and Morgan, link the appearance of this kind of text to the changing position of the individual within a larger empire as result of the political changes wrought during that era.<sup>6</sup> One could surmise that either the Romance texts themselves, or romance-like texts would have been in circulation for some time in the Graeco-Roman world by the first century CE. The focus in this chapter is on this kind of Romance.

Mention must be made of the other two chronotopes that Bakhtin associates with ancient narrative prose, so that a distinction may be made between them and that of the *adventure novel of ordeal*, even though they will hardly feature in this chapter. The first one is what he

<sup>3</sup> The five ancient novels that classicists refer to as the canon: Chariton, *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, Xenophon, *An Ephesian Story*, Achilles Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, Longus, *Daphnis and Chloe*, Heliodorus, *An Ethiopian Story*

<sup>4</sup> See Reardon (1991: 17, n. 3), Brigitte Eggerman (1994: 43, n. 3), and Haegg (1983: 5-6).

<sup>5</sup> Stoneman expresses the opinion that the *Alexander Romance*, dated c. second or third century CE, had probably already existed as early as the third or second century BCE (Stoneman 1994: 118). He identifies the protagonist of the *Alexander Romance* as a hero of the Greek Romance, seen as portraying the situation of the individual in the newly expanded world of the Hellenistic kingdoms (Stoneman 1994: 126). See also Reardon 1989: 3-5 on a literary history of the form of the Greek Romance.

<sup>6</sup> Reardon 1991: 172; Morgan 1994: 3.

terms the chronotope of the *adventure novel of everyday life*. Here he describes a time that is a mixture of *adventure time* and *everyday time*, each type “changing their essential forms in this combination” (Bakhtin 1981: 111). The texts that he identifies as functioning according to this type of time include the works of Apuleius and Petronius as well as Christian hagiography. The third type of chronotope identified by Bakhtin is operative in what he terms the *biographical novel*, functioning according to *biographical time*. He identifies this type of time in various prose writings spanning a number of centuries, beginning with works by Plato. A distinction is made here between what he calls the time of *Platonic autobiography*, taking the *Apology of Socrates* as an example, and what he calls *rhetorical autobiography*, which he associates with the Greek encomium and Roman autobiography. He cites the autobiography of Isocrates as an early example (Bakhtin 1981: 136-7).

#### *The adventure novel of ordeal*

In describing the chronotope of the *adventure novel of ordeal* Bakhtin focuses on four aspects. He begins with his conception of time, to then move on to space. After that he discusses how the human image is represented in this particular chronotopic arrangement, and how a set of motifs and images function within it.

The concept of the chronotope being abstract on its own, Bakhtin describes its various types by means of the kind of plot that embodies them, associating a particular plot pattern (made up of a recognizable set of motifs) with each type. In agreement with what has been observed by other scholars of the Greek Romance, he states that the plot of the *adventure novel of ordeal* is basically always the same.<sup>7</sup> It would have been generally recognizable. One could observe here that in the light of Bakhtin’s view on intertextuality each version could be seen

---

<sup>7</sup> Morgan suggests that authors of romances used the similar plots because they knew that they had a winning formula that satisfied the needs of their readers (Morgan 1994:3). Anderson sees the various authors handling of what he calls a typical plot-situation in their respective individual way, some better than others. He sees this basic plot as having been appropriated from older oriental texts (Anderson 1984: 25, 33). See also Reardon who sees the subject matter of these novels as a mixture of love and adventure, with love being treated with more sophistication as the novel developed, adventure declining proportionally. He then gives a description of the basic, common plot, which is similar to that described by Bakhtin (Reardon 1989:2).

as a response to other already existing versions.<sup>8</sup> The story line goes more or less like this: Two young people, exceptionally beautiful, chaste, noble, often with something mysterious about their birth, fall fatefully and inextricably in love. Their initial meeting often takes place during a religious festival. So intense is their love that it presents itself as an illness and even threatens the protagonists' lives. However, the consummation of this love, and thus the happiness of the lovers, is threatened by a number of what seem to be insurmountable obstacles and ordeals. They are forcibly separated, to meet up again by an unexpected turn of events, only to be separated again. The life and chastity of the lovers comes under threat on a number of occasions. Finally, however, the story ends happily, either in marriage, or in a re-affirmation of the original marriage.<sup>9</sup> Throughout the story the protagonists are in touch with a particular deity to whom they pray and sacrifice. They believe that this deity, at least in part, controls their life and is, on the whole, benevolent. On the other hand they see Tyche, that is, Fate, also sometimes addressed as Fortune, as a force that brings them disaster.

Bakhtin identifies two different types of time as operating in the representation of this basic plot. The first type consists of two moments of *biographical time* in the life of the protagonists: the falling in love, and the final consummation of that love in marriage. Different from this is the representation of the *time of the adventures* that occur between these two moments, in the gap, as it were. Bakhtin describes this gap as an extra-temporal hiatus that occurs when a non-human force interrupts the normal course of events in the lives of the protagonists. The time of the adventures that occur in this hiatus is arranged technically from the outside to suit the purposes of each adventure, each functioning within its own time logic. It leaves no trace on the biographical time that has been interrupted. In fact, there is no reason why there should not be any number of adventures occurring within this hiatus. These could occur in any order, but they would never have any effect on the

---

<sup>8</sup> Morgan, in questioning the premise that literary similarities can be explained in terms of causal derivation, suggests that resemblances to other genres should be seen as a deliberate self-location of individual authors within the pre-existing framework of Greek literature (Morgan and Stoneman 1994:2). This could be seen as a step towards the Bakhtinian view of an author responding dialogically with other texts and genres. The Gospel of Luke also shares a basic plot with a number of other Gospel texts. Instead of seeing this only in the light of one text serving as a source for others, it can also be seen as a dialogic response.

<sup>9</sup> According to Reardon, the happy ending of this type of love story is what distinguishes the Romance from older forms, such as tragedy and Old Comedy. The latter two reflect civic experience, according to him, while the Romance reflects personal experience (Reardon 1989:7).

outcome of the basic story. Each incident works according to its own clock, but were they all to be added up in the sense of the amount of time spent, the sum would not coincide with that of the biographical life of the protagonists. When the latter get married they are at the same age and in the same physical state that they were at the time of their meeting. Neither the adventures, some of which are simply horrific, nor the passing of time leave any visible traces on their looks or character.

A number of varying time segments representing the different adventures function mostly on the basis of random contingency. The individual adventures are usually introduced by a link word or phrase, like 'suddenly' or 'just at that time' or 'unexpectedly', giving the signal that the premeditated course of events is about to be interrupted by something that is beyond human control, such as chance or some deity. Thus people meet or do not meet at a crucial moment. Words like 'earlier' and 'later' carry great weight in terms of plot development (Bakhtin: 1981:92).<sup>10</sup>

Because these incidents seem to happen at random, beyond the control of the protagonists, they cannot be foreseen or forestalled by reasonable, logical analysis and planning. Not surprisingly, other means of gaining knowledge about individual destinies and the future are resorted to, adding to the already strong supernatural element of the story. Fortune telling, omens, legends, oracular predictions and prophetic dreams feature as frequent motifs in the *adventure novel of ordeal*. This is tied up with the random and disjointed movement of adventure time.

#### *Chaereas and Callirhoe in the light of Bakhtin's adventure time*

---

<sup>10</sup> Praeder, in an article that argues for the Greek Romance as the genre for the Gospel of Luke, reacts to and describes the phenomenon that Bakhtin calls the hiatus that accommodates adventure time. She views the ancient novel as ordered biographically, the sequence of birth and death narrative-world element being the same as in ancient biographies. However, she distinguishes between the ancient novel and ancient biography in terms of the time arrangement within the basic sequence of birth to death (what Bakhtin describes as the hiatus filled with adventure time) insofar as she sees the sequences in biographies as anecdotal or topical while the novel gives the impression of chronological order by making use of clearly marked backward references (in the form of summary citations of other texts) and forward references, such as "then", "on the next day", "immediately thereafter" (Praeder 1981:280).

Looking at *Chaereas and Callirhoe* in the light of this description of plot and time organization one finds that it fits Bakhtin's general description of what happens in the Greek Romance. The young protagonists are both nobly born, and endowed with exceptionally good looks. In their case, though, there is nothing mysterious about their birth.<sup>11</sup> They meet by chance on the way to the temple during a religious festival and are struck by an irresistible passion for one another. The two sets of parents, although hostile towards each other, feeling under pressure lest they endanger their children's lives, as well as pressure from the crowd, consent to their immediate marriage, which takes place amidst general public rejoicing. As the lovers are set to live a life of conjugal happiness, a plot to destroy the marriage is successfully hatched by Callirhoe's former suitors. Chaereas, having been tricked into believing that his new bride was unfaithful to him, strikes her and ostensibly kills her. Callirhoe is laid in a vault. An account of many ordeals for both lovers follows. The ordeals take place against the background of a number of foreign countries. The story ends happily, in spite of overwhelming odds (such as Callirhoe entering into a second marriage), with a restoration of the original marriage in the protagonists' homeland. At the end of the story both Chaereas and Callirhoe appear to be completely unscathed by their ordeals and by the ravages of time. They are set to simply continue their life of conjugal bliss for ever after.<sup>12</sup>

One could say that the individual ordeals between the beginning and the end of this story happen in Bakhtin's extra-temporal hiatus in *adventure time*. Often they occur unexpectedly and depend on random contingencies. It is by chance that robbers save Callirhoe from death in the tomb. It so happens that Dionysius of Miletus has been recently widowed, making him free to marry Callirhoe. Chaereas is unexpectedly saved from death at the point of crucifixion. Egypt happens to rebel against Persia just at a crucial moment in the trial that is

---

<sup>11</sup> This feature does appear in other *adventure novels of ordeal*, such as Longus' *Daphne and Chloe* and Heliodorus' *An Aethiopian Story*.

<sup>12</sup> The fact that Callirhoe leaves her child with Dionysius at the end has been interpreted by Anderson as part of the humorous treatment of the relationship between Callirhoe and Dionysius, the latter being left with the child he believes to be his own, and yet abandoned by Callirhoe whom he loves (Anderson 1982:14-15). However, seen in the Bakhtinian sense, the leaving of Callirhoe's son with Dionysius would fit in with the concept of *adventure time* leaving no traces on the protagonists' biographical time. Chaereas and Callirhoe commence their life of everlasting bliss in the same state that they were in before the interruption, unencumbered by anything that has happened during the phase that operated according to *adventure time*.

to determine which of the two men is Callirhoe's true husband. Furthermore, each adventure functions according to its own time logic. Scenes seem to follow immediately upon one another, not taking into account any maturational processes. For example, Callirhoe's child, new-born in one scene, is suddenly a bigger child in the scene in Babylon, accompanied by a pedagogue. The story does not give the impression of years having passed between the scenes (Cf. *Chaereas and Callirhoe* III. 8 and V. 10).

In line with Bakhtin's perception of the link between *adventure time* and the supernatural element, the latter is heavily represented in this story. There is interaction between the supernatural and the life of mortals throughout. During her ordeals Callirhoe is in constant communication with Aphrodite, the goddess she depends on to save her. She prays to her and reproaches her, while sending bitter accusations to Fortune as the cause of her troubles. She responds to a dream, acting in obedience to a vision of Chaereas at a particularly decisive moment in her life (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* II. 9). On the other hand we see gods, and evil forces in the form of suitors and robbers, initiating most of the action. It is Eros who sets the plot in motion. Aphrodite and Fortune play their part. The third person narrator acknowledges their existence and their power, making it clear that these gods do not exist only in the minds of the characters.

But Fortune was minded to do something as cruel as it was paradoxical: Chaereas was to have Callirhoe in his possession and fail to recognize her; while taking others' wives on board ships to carry them off, he was to leave his own behind ... as spoils of war for his own enemies. But Aphrodite thought this too harsh ... having harassed by land and sea the handsome couple she had originally brought together, she decided now to re-unite them (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* VIII. 1)

#### *Abstract-alien space in the adventure novel of ordeal*

Bakhtin's description of the type of space that is needed for the events that function according to *adventure time* is as follows. As the events are initiated either by Chance or some other deity, happening either through random contingency or by the whim of a deity, a

large expanse of space is needed in which the ordeals can take place. Thus one finds a number of countries and various seas featuring in this kind of novel.<sup>13</sup> Even though the names of the countries are familiar, Bakhtin describes the space that features in this type of story as *abstract* space. What is of importance for events such as abduction, pursuit and escape, is not the particular country in which they occur, but, rather, the question of distance and proximity. A shipwreck needs a sea, which can be any sea. An escape needs another country, from which country to which country being unimportant. The adventures have no essential tie to the country in which they take place. Their occurrence is not dependent on that country's social structure, culture or history (Bakhtin 1981: 99-102).

Bakhtin terms the space of the Adventure Novel of Ordeal *abstract alien* space. Its link with *adventure time* is technical and mechanical. It is presented as it is needed for each adventure. The hero has no connection with it, even when it is his own homeland. It is of no importance which specific country that homeland happens to be. The alien quality of this type of space is necessary for chance or other outside forces to take their free run. Any closer connection between the hero and the space in which he finds himself, or any organic link between time and space, would bring with it its own laws and thus limit the random movement of non-human forces as the initiators of the adventures (Bakhtin 1981: 101-102).

#### *Abstract-alien space in Chaereas and Callirhoe*

The action in *Chaereas and Callirhoe* takes place over a vast expanse of space, stretching from Syracuse to Babylon and back. The three principal locations, excluding the homeland, Syracuse, are a country estate near Miletus, the Persian King's palace in Babylon and the whole battle area in the war between Egypt and Persia, both on land and sea. On a smaller scale there are Callirhoe's quarters, the tomb, on board ship, the shrine of Aphrodite, the Queen of Persia's private quarters and others. Bakhtin's notion of distance and proximity plays a great part in this story as the protagonists move across these spaces. Callirhoe is

---

<sup>13</sup> The expanse of the ancient Mediterranean world is the backdrop for a number of genres in antiquity, beginning with Homer. Burridge notes it in ancient biographies, even expanding it as far as Scotland (Mons Graupius) in the *Agricola* by Tacitus. The geographical settings are determined by the movements of the subject of the biography (Burridge 1992:145, 177).

taken out of the vault (which had separated her from Chaereas) and abducted across the sea to a distant land, taking her far away from the grieving Chaereas, who is ignorant of the turn of events. She enters into a second marriage, which makes it impossible for her to return home. She is transported across the Euphrates to the Persian King where she is at the centre of a trial. Here she is unexpectedly brought face to face with Chaereas (unexpected for her, not for the reader), but is unable to communicate with him. When the Egyptians rebel and wage war against Persia, she is taken along to the battle area, and is kept on the island of Aradus. Again, she is taken far away from Chaereas. When things end happily, the distance across the sea to Syracuse seems short, as there is no distance between her and her lover. Chaereas covers more or less the same expanse of space as he tries to overcome the distance between them throughout the story.

One could say that the spaces featuring in this Romance correspond with Bakhtin's description of the *abstract-alien space* that is linked to adventure time. The space for each adventure is presented as the adventure demands it. Callirhoe's tomb could be anywhere. She could have been abducted across any sea, as long as it took her to a foreign country. Her quarters could be anywhere, as could be the quarters of the Persian Queen. What is important about Persia, as a country, is that it is much, much further from home and is even more foreign than Miletus. Also, it opens up the possibility for further obstacles, such as presenting the Persian King himself as another threat to Callirhoe's chastity. However, as it suited this adventure that there should be ordinary communication, there seems to have been no language problem, or any disparity of religion. The Persian Queen is also a worshipper of Aphrodite. The war zone is halfway back towards home. One could say that the war episode, which like other adventures comes about unexpectedly, is brought in for two reasons. First it interrupts the trial in which the true husband of Callirhoe is to be determined, enhancing the suspense of the story. Secondly, it provides a scheme within which Chaereas (who cannot live unless Callirhoe is restored to him) can prove himself a worthy soldier and leader, someone in whom the Egyptian King puts his trust, and to whom even the Persian King finally owes gratitude. He claims Callirhoe from this new position of strength, the latter having been placed in the right location for him to find her. The protagonists cannot be said to be in touch in any deeper way with the countries they find themselves in. Rather, one

could say that whoever and whatever features in the adventure is there for the sake of the adventure itself.

*The representation of the image of man in the adventure novel of ordeal*

Bakhtin views the representation of the human being in the chronotope of *adventure time* and *abstract alien space* in a particular way. The hero of the *adventure novel of ordeal*, according to him, is a private individual rather than a public figure. This is in line with observations made by Veselovskii, as well as Reardon and Morgan,<sup>14</sup> who see the fact that the Greek Romance stories are about the individual with domestic and private concerns as one of the fundamental factors that distinguishes this genre from other ancient genres, such as epic and tragedy.

Bakhtin, however, does not leave it there. While he emphasizes the essentially private nature of the individual in this kind of narrative, an isolated person, tied up with the most private of concerns, that of love, which is the pivot of the whole story, he sees this man as behaving like a public figure on the surface at certain crucial times. Like the public man of the rhetorical and historical genres, he delivers speeches in the manner of a public account of the private details of his love life, of his exploits and adventures. Finally, legal procedures sum up all these exploits and provide a judicial affirmation of the hero's identity, as well as the lovers' chastity and fidelity to one another. It is this rhetorical and judicial procedure, according to Bakhtin, which defines the unity of the human image in the Greek Romance.<sup>15</sup> This image, however, stands in contradiction to the purely private content of the story, and manifests itself as external, formalistic and conventional (Bakhtin 1981:109). One could see this to be in line with the abstract nature of *adventure time* and *alien space* in this type of chronotope.

---

<sup>14</sup> See Tihanov 1998: 32-33 (for Veselovskii); Reardon 1989; Morgan 1994: 3.

<sup>15</sup> Cf Anderson, who comments on the skilled rhetoric displayed at the trial scenes in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, but does not make the connection that Bakhtin makes in terms of character depiction. Rather, he concentrates on the comic effect of the mixing of love and fourth century politics. He sees the comic element in the way the characters are presented, seeing this as functioning like in New Comedy (Anderson 1982: 17-20). One could conjecture that Bakhtin's view of the discrepancy between the private nature of the heroes and their public appearance and confirmation of their rhetorical skills could have a comic effect.

The distinguishing feature of the hero who moves within the chronotope of this genre is that he is *unchanging*. Bakhtin calls him passive in the sense that things happen to him, rather than that he takes the initiative. His actions are in response to the ordeals that befall him, ordeals that have been brought about by an outside force. All he can do is to endure and try to survive the ordeal, to endure and not to change his basic identity under the pressure. In short, Bakhtin sees the ‘distinctive correspondence of an identity with a particular self’ as the ‘organizing centre of the human image in the Greek Romance’ In his view this displays a link with a “folklore that predates class distinction, assimilating one of the essential elements in the folkloric concept of a man ... ‘a faith in the indestructible power of man in his struggle with nature and with all inhuman forces’ (Bakhtin 1981:105).<sup>16</sup>

There are a number of motifs that surround a human image of this kind, motifs that act as devices to enhance a sense of suspense in terms of an identity remaining true to itself. These include recognition, disguise, presumed death, subsequent resurrection, presumed betrayal and a formal test of the hero’s integrity, often in the form of a trial. The theme of the trial features prominently in the Greek Romance.<sup>17</sup> While the trial is usually about chastity and fidelity, other attributes such as nobility, courage, strength, and sometimes, even intelligence, are also tested throughout the novel. The novel as a whole can be seen to be conceived as a test of its heroes, each individual ordeal in turn having the test as its organizing centre (Bakhtin 1981: 105-6).

---

<sup>16</sup> Anderson notes that the major characters in the ancient novels tend to be lacking everything except perfection, but that individual authors were abler than others in portraying their characters. The plots are responsible for this type of characterization, in his view, as the heroes are first, lovers, then intriguers, and lastly, characters (Anderson 1984: 62-72). He sees Chaereas as a character that owes much to New Comedy (Anderson 1982: 14). Reardon, in commenting on the characters in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, describes the characters in the ancient novel as “romance types.” The heroine, hapless and beautiful, and the hero, handsome and rather passive, are the idealized. The other characters are often more realistic, such as the rascally brigand, the resourceful slave, the faithful friend and the anxious parents (Reardon 1991: 26).

<sup>17</sup> Schwartz, like Bakhtin, notes the trial as a recurrent type-scene in the Greek Romance, noting that all five extant Greek novels, as well as the two Latin novels, contain such scenes. Referring also to Anderson (1989), she sees these scenes as highlighting the ability to speak a highly rhetorical form of Greek. Schwartz views the depiction of Persia in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, especially in its trial scene, as resonating with the Greek elite’s experience of some aspects of Roman rule, in spite of the fact that Rome, as such, does not feature in this novel (Schwartz 2003: 377-8).

I shall digress for a moment to show how this conception of the individual in a romance with this kind of chronotope is different to what Bakhtin sees in the other two types of chronotopes in ancient, novelistic literature. In the *adventure novel of everyday life*, the hero, who is also a private individual, goes through a metamorphosis from which he emerges as a better and more developed person. Metamorphosis is seen as a mythological sheath for the idea of development. There is development of character in the hero throughout this kind of novel (Bakhtin 1981: 111-113). This is evident in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses*, Bakhtin describing the hero's experience leading up to this change as the sequence of *guilt, retribution, redemption, and blessedness* (Bakhtin 1981:121). The hero of the third type of chronotope, that of ancient biography, is a public, exterior person portrayed in the space of the public square in biographical time. The portrayal is in the form of praise for civic or political acts (Bakhtin 1981: 131).<sup>18</sup>

In contrast to these, the hero in the *adventure novel of ordeal* is a private individual who does not change throughout the novel. The ordeals that have been experienced leave no trace on him or her. As circumstances return to their initial state, life is resumed at the point where it had been interrupted by outside, mostly supernatural, forces. The achievement of the individual does not lie in development, but in the successful survival in terms of an initial, ideal identity. It is publicly judged and acknowledged at the end of the story.

#### *The image of man in Chaereas and Callirhoe*

How do the protagonists in *Chaereas and Callirhoe* feature in terms of Bakhtin's perception of the human image in this kind of chronotope? One could be a little puzzled by the fact that Bakhtin uses the expression *image of man* and talks in terms of a hero. There are, after all, always two protagonists in this type of romance, and usually the author gives more attention to the heroine than to the hero. This is certainly the case here. Callirhoe features as the

---

<sup>18</sup> Cf Burridge, who, in describing ancient biography, sees the subject (protagonist) and plot as generic features that play their part in identifying the genre of a text (Burridge 1992: 113). Seeing the overwhelming number of verbs that refer to the protagonist of the text as one of the criteria of ancient biography, he notes the tendency to stereotype on account of the encomiastic nature of some of the texts in characterization (1992:148).

central character, more resilient, resourceful and attractive than her lover.<sup>19</sup> While Chaereas is introduced by comparing him to ancient heroes, Callirhoe is compared to the goddess Aphrodite herself. If Chaereas had not proven himself in the war episode at the end, one would have been left with the impression of a weak, untrusting, not very clever, suicidal character. One could also argue here that Chaereas changes during the course of the ordeals, the section that operates according to adventure time. From being a weak, suicidal character, he suddenly becomes a resourceful and courageous general. However, if one looks at him at the beginning of the story one finds that his suicidal tendency is not a part of his usual character. It is the overwhelming force of love, a love that was brought about by a supernatural force, the god Eros that is responsible for the temporary state that could be mistaken for his character. At the end of the novel, that is, when *biographical time* sets in again, he is the same as he is before the interruption that marks the beginning of the events that operate according to adventure time.<sup>20</sup>

There was a young man called Chaereas, surpassingly handsome, like Achilles and Nireus and Hippolytus and Alcibiades as sculptors and painters portray them...(Chaereas and Callirhoe I: 1)

One could say that Chariton pulls out all the stops here. The mythical figures Achilles and Nireus are warriors, known also for their handsome looks while Hippolytus' beauty was so seductive that it attracted his stepmother. Alcibiades, a historical figure, was known as a handsome aristocrat and public figure. The suggestion here is that in Chaereas are combined the attributes of nobility, overwhelmingly good looks, the prowess of a warrior and the

---

<sup>19</sup> See Reardon (1989: 18), and Egger (1994: 31ff, 43 n. 1), who suggest that the original title of this Romance may well have been *Callirhoe*. Egger notes the centrality of Callirhoe to this novel, seeing the plot built around her (Egger 1994:36). Haegg, on the other hand, points out that, according to the only complete manuscript of this novel, the title is *Erotic Tales about Chaereas and Callirhoe* (Haegg 1983:6). He also refers to the heroine as the main character in these novels, taking the view that Chaereas is a pale and insignificant person next to Callirhoe (Haegg 1983: 96).

<sup>20</sup> Egger suggests that Chaereas redeems himself at the end of the novel to prove himself worthy of Callirhoe (Egger 1994: 35). The word *redeem* suggests that there was a loss of what Chaereas was to begin with, which would support the idea that the character is essentially unchanging, even though he manifests himself in a different mode during the period operating according to Bakhtin's adventure time. If one were to compare this to Apuleius' *The Golden Ass*, an example of the *adventure novel of everyday life*, according to Bakhtin, the protagonist of the latter undergoes major changes throughout the novel, ending as a different, maturer character to what he was at the beginning.

capability of a public figure. A paragraph later, Chaereas, the idol of the young folk, walking home from the gymnasium meets Callirhoe on her way to the temple.

Chaereas, so stricken, could barely make his way home; he was like a hero mortally wounded in battle, too proud to fall but too weak to stand ... but when [he] began to waste away bodily, he found courage ... to tell his parents that he was in love and would die if he did not marry Callirhoe (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* I:1).

We see Chaereas for the greater part of the story in this miserable mode. However, this is solely the result of his love for Callirhoe without whom there is no life for him. Even his misguided jealousy at the beginning can be explained by this. The suicidal state is a sign of constancy, a sign of being true to himself and his 'promise'. Even his participation in the war, which then brings his true character to the fore, is motivated by a suicidal wish, which can only be put aside once Callirhoe is restored to him. There is a great deal of suspense in terms of Chaereas remaining true to his identity as one wonders whether he will recover in time. Although there are a couple of formal trials in this story, Chaereas' real trial is the long run of events that give him no hope of being re-united with his love. The novel ends with his initial identity intact, now visible as the blanket of his suicidal misery has been lifted.

Turning to Callirhoe:

The Syracusan general Hermocrates, the man who defeated the Athenians, had a daughter called Callirhoe. She was a wonderful girl, the pride of all Sicily; her beauty was more than human, it was divine, and it was not the beauty of a Nereid or mountain nymph at that, but of the maiden Aphrodite herself. Report of the astonishing vision spread everywhere ... (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* I:1).

Chariton takes pains to emphasize that Callirhoe's beauty is divine. This is confirmed again and again as people's first impulse is to worship her, mistaking her for Aphrodite. As the latter sometimes appeals to her father Zeus, for help, so does Callirhoe appeal to her powerful father, Hermocrates, in her dire moments, be it only in thought. A further

comparison could be seen in the fact that a statue is made of Callirhoe in the temple of Aphrodite.<sup>21</sup> For all her smittenness on account of Chaereas, Callirhoe always retains some sort of independence. Unlike Chaereas, she is too proud to draw her parents into her confidence when she falls in love. Furthermore, she is prudent enough to know that it is not wise to always reveal the whole truth to a man. She does not tell Dionysius that she is carrying Chaereas' child. Not even with Chaereas at the happy reunion at the end is she completely open as she slips a note for Dionysius to the Persian Queen.

This was the only thing she did independently of Chaereas; knowing his jealous nature, she was anxious to prevent him learning of it (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* VIII. 3)

This kind of deceit could seriously call into question Callirhoe's character in terms of the ideally chaste and upright nature of the heroine of the Greek Romance. One might argue that she has not withstood the test. Nor would she seem to pass the test of chastity and fidelity to Chaereas when she marries Dionysius. In fact, Chaereas reproaches her bitterly when he hears about it ("Faithless Callirhoe! Wickedest of all women!" (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* IV: 3)). Yet the novel ends with her character, her beauty and her reputation completely intact. Her second marriage and her deceit towards Dionysius is explained and justified by the fact that she does this in obedience to a vision of Chaereas in a dream to save the life of his unborn son. Her note to Dionysius can be seen to be justified by a good motive out of a sense of gratitude to the man who had been her benefactor.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Egger views the frequent comparison of Callirhoe with Aphrodite specifically in the light of eroticism, in line with the beginning of the novel where a love story (preparing the reader for a particular kind of story) is announced. She also associates the bathhouse scene, in which Callirhoe is gazed at by various female slaves, with the statue of Aphrodite of Cnidus (citing Hunter 1994), seeing this scene as deliberately setting the atmosphere for a new sexual encounter (Egger 1994: 38). Haegg is of the opinion that the author evokes a mental image in the reader by comparing Callirhoe to statues of Aphrodite that everybody has seen in the sanctuaries and public places. He sees it as a technique to obviate the need for book illustrations (Haegg 1983: 7).

<sup>22</sup> Anderson, commenting on the Chariton's technique of dramatic irony, sees the character, Dionysius, duped by Callirhoe into a bigamous marriage, in the light of the father in New Comedy who finds himself in competition with his son (Anderson 1982: 15). One could see the fact that Callirhoe emerges with her virtue intact at the end of the story as an extension of the irony, supporting Anderson's claim of the comic nature of this romance.

It seems that in the case of Callirhoe, beauty is linked to goodness and intelligence. Seen in this sense, her identity remains intact throughout. She is worshipped as a goddess who is above human law on account of her beauty. Her beauty never falters and never fails to attract love from both men and women. Conversely, she is generous and kind to everyone. Even though she is twice married and has borne a son, she is always presented as someone who has been untouched. She is even associated with Artemis, the virgin goddess, at the beginning and near the end of the story (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* VI: 4). Having left her son behind with Dionysius, she resumes her marriage with Chaereas at the end, to all intents and purposes in the same state as she was at the beginning. The novel ends with her kneeling at the feet of the statue of her patron goddess, Aphrodite.

In terms of Bakhtin's perception of the essentially individual hero acting like a public figure at crucial moments, one need only look at the various trials and public meetings in this novel, which are witnessed by huge crowds. Many people again and again witness Callirhoe's beauty wherever she goes. All of this culminates in Chaereas' final, public account to the people in his homeland. Everything is approved of by the crowd of their home country, the lovers' private integrity being publicly affirmed in a scene that is characteristic of the love of spectacle in the Greek Romance as a whole.

#### *Motifs in the adventure novel of ordeal*

Bakhtin calls the different elements that make up the plot "motifs" (Bakhtin 1981:87). Noting that, like the plots, the motifs of the different romances are essentially the same, he stresses that none of them is new. All of them appear in one or other ancient genre. So, for example, one would find the motif of first meetings with the flare-up of passion that results in intense despair in Hellenistic love poetry. Storms, shipwrecks, wars, and abductions are to be found in ancient epic, recognition or non-recognition is part of ancient tragedy, public speeches and religious and philosophical discussions are part of rhetorical genres, while descriptive motifs had already been developed by Herodotus in his *Histories*.<sup>23</sup> What is new

<sup>23</sup> Classicists would add New Comedy to the list of genres in which many of the motifs of the Greek Romance can be found (Anderson 1982:2-6; Reardon 1989:7).

about them is that they are all combined in the Greek Romance in a syncretism of genres resulting in a genre that has, amongst other things, an encyclopaedic quality about it. As the motifs enter the chronotope of *adventure time* and *alien space*, they are subsumed by it and assume a new character and function (Bakhtin 1981:89, 97).

The most chronotopic of all motifs, according to Bakhtin, is that of *meeting*. The temporal marker “at the same time” is inseparable from the spatial marker “in the same place”. Meeting being at the core of all human interaction, there are also more formalized meetings in social, civic and religious life, such as diplomatic encounters, trials and religious rituals. There are a host of other motifs that are connected to the motif of *meeting*, such as parting, escape, acquisition, loss, marriage, recognition. As is the case with the concept of the chronotope, the concept of meeting is abstract and cannot exist in isolation. In the *adventure novel of ordeal* it enters, like the other motifs, as a constituent element of the plot into the concrete unity of the work as a whole, and becomes part of the chronotope of *adventure time* and *abstract alien space*, taking on the emotional evaluation of the context of which it is a part (Bakhtin 1981:97-8). The motif of *meeting* often performs architectonic functions in a plot. It can serve as an opening, as a culmination or as a *denouement*. It can also take on symbolic functions, the place where the meeting takes place often reflecting the power relation within that particular meeting. A meeting on the road, for example, is free of social and governmental hierarchical constraints and allows anyone to enter or exit.

#### *The motif of meeting in Chaereas and Callirhoe*

It is not difficult to trace the motif of *meeting* in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*. One could say that the whole plot hinges on meeting, non-meeting and almost-meeting. All the above-mentioned motifs can be found in this story. The following places of meeting serve to demonstrate how they reflect power relations. Chaereas and Callirhoe meet for the first time in the street, which puts them on an equal footing, outside parental arrangements. The fact that it happens during a festival for Aphrodite serves to underline the strength of their passion. Furthermore the meeting on the street is a signal for the state of constant travel that awaits the lovers. The tomb as the place of encountering the robbers shows Callirhoe

stripped of her social status as no one counts her among the living. She is thus completely at the mercy of the robbers. Dionysius first meets Callirhoe at the shrine of Aphrodite, which not only enhances his passion, but also prevents him from taking advantage of her. On the other hand, once she meets him in his own establishment, he is in command and her chastity is under threat. Apart from the Persian court providing a sense of excitement, it also serves to emphasize the importance of the love story and the superlative extent of Callirhoe's beauty, important enough for the Persian King to hold a trial and fall a victim to love. Here the lovers are at the mercy of a mighty foreign power. When Chaereas finally finds Callirhoe on the island, Aradus, she is his prisoner and completely at his mercy. The final great meeting of all the people at home, as they witness the lovers, provides safety and sanity, the lovers being restored to each other on equal footing.

#### *The chronotope in the Gospel according to Luke*

On the face of it, there are several objections one might make to a comparison of the chronotope of the Gospel of Luke to that of the Romance text in the light of what has been discussed above. First, instead of a plot line describing the movements of a romantic love story showing a particular section of the life of two protagonists, the Gospel is a story about the movements of a single protagonist stretching from before his conception beyond his exit from this world. Secondly, the narrator of Luke does not give the impression that things happen by chance, or that the individual incidents are based on random contingency. Thirdly, one could say that that the limited space of the Roman Provinces in Palestine can hardly be compared to the vast expanse of the space utilized in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*.<sup>24</sup> I shall begin by addressing these objections.

In using the plot and the motifs to describe the chronotope of the Romance, Bakhtin makes the point that a particular kind of plot, namely one that consists of a number of adventures that are linked up in a particular way, the adventures themselves consisting of a set of motifs that are shared by the various examples of the *adventure novel of ordeal*, is typical of the chronotope of *adventure time* and *abstract alien space*. If one is to look at the plot of the

Gospel of Luke and set aside the romantic love story for a moment, one still finds an extraordinary number of elements that correspond with Bakhtin's description of the *adventure novel of ordeal*, elements that can also be found in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*. As in the case of the Romance, the Gospel shares its basic plot with that of stories by other writers. As in the Romance, the protagonist is in constant movement from one place to another in response to an outer force. In the Romance the mission is to be re-united to the loved one, while Jesus fulfils the will of his heavenly father in the Gospel, moving to reach the people to whom he must proclaim the kingdom of God. Motifs that appear in both the Gospel and the Romance include mysterious circumstances of birth and tokens to verify identity,<sup>25</sup> the empty tomb, crucifixion, restoration from the tomb, non-recognition, legends, shipwreck, miraculous escape, public speeches, prophecy, the crowd as witness, loss, betrayal, the trial, wrongful accusations, and meeting. While the protagonists of the Romance have to survive one adventure after another in their effort to be re-united, the protagonist of the Gospel has to contend with evil forces that conspire against him in the completion of his mission.

As is the case in the Romance, the Gospel plot is made up of many varying episodes and incidents. If one is to see the individual ordeals in the Romance as organized to test the integrity of the character of the protagonists, one could venture to say that the question of Jesus' identity, whether he performs miracles, casts out demons, answers the Pharisees, or appears to his disciples after resurrection, is also at the core of the individual incidents in the Gospel. Bakhtin draws attention to the way many of the different ordeals in the Romance are introduced by the linking words, like "suddenly", "unexpectedly" and "just at that time". One could compare this to the linking words that connect the episodes in the Gospel, like "after this"(Lk 10: 1, 8: 1, 5:27), "once" (Lk 9: 18), "just then" (Lk 8: 41), "as he was praying" (Lk 9: 29), "as they were walking along the road" (Lk 9: 57), "while he was still speaking" (Lk 22: 47), "at that time" (Lk 13: 1, 13: 31), and others. In both cases these words signal either an interruption or a gap between incidents, incidents that function according to Bakhtin's *adventure time*, each in its own time logic. A major gap in the Gospel

---

<sup>24</sup> However, there is a Greek Romance that is also set in a smaller space: *Daphne and Chloe* by Longus, which is set on the island of Lesbos.

<sup>25</sup> The angel says to the shepherds, "This will be a sign to you: you will find the a child wrapped in bands of cloth and lying in a manger." (Lk 2: 12).

could be seen between the end of Luke 2 and the beginning of Luke 3, at which point the story is connected in a pastiche-like manner. Jesus' deeds as a man begin here, in a sense constituting the beginning of the plot in terms of the mission he fulfils, while the content of Luke 1 and 2 can be seen as an elaborated, lengthy parallel to the beginning of *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, where the heroes' origin is given in a much shorter form. *Biographical time* can be said to function briefly in Luke 1: 5-10, *adventure time* setting in at the point when the angel Gabriel appears to Zechariah (signaling the beginning of the divine intervention), to function until Luke 24:36, when *biographical time* is resumed. Like the heroes in the Romance, Jesus appears unscathed by all the suffering that he has been through at this point. He does have the marks on his hands and on his feet (Lk 24:39-41), but these are there for the purpose of verification. There seem to be no other signs of the physical maltreatment he has received from the soldiers. He then goes home to his father in Heaven.

The difference between the linking words 'suddenly', 'just at that time' and so forth in the Romance<sup>26</sup> and the linking words, 'after this' and 'at that time' in the Gospel, is that the former are characteristic of the role that chance and random contingency play in the ordeals of the Romance, while the latter do not, as a whole, have that connotation. This brings me to the second possible objection, namely that the Gospel narrator does not give the impression that the incidents in this story come about by chance, on which Bakhtin places such importance in his description of *adventure time*. However, what matters in the Romance is not so much whether it is chance, Eros, Aphrodite or Fortune that direct the adventures of the heroes. What matters is that super-human forces intervene in the lives of the heroes and control the events; that the initiative does not belong to the human protagonists. In the Gospel this is also the case. The supernatural element is enormous. Each incident in Luke 1 and 2 is initiated by heavenly intervention setting the story in motion. The introduction to the adult Jesus functions in accordance with a deliberate time logic that is needed to link up supernatural incidents, occurring in different places, to each other, emphasizing the overall supernatural intervention. The same kind of time logic takes place in the passion narrative where, as for example, a particular number of hours are of great importance. Many other incidents are presented one after another, introduced by the linking phrases discussed above.

---

<sup>26</sup> They do occur in the Gospel as well but to a lesser extent.

All this, however, happens within the overall movement of the journey, a geographical journey as well as a journey through time, which Jesus follows in response to his heavenly father's will. The story ends with his ascension to Heaven by supernatural means. The journey can be compared to the journey of the lovers in the romance, also controlled by a deity, also returning the protagonists to their homeland in the end.

Apart from the Lord God of Israel, who is never directly presented but who is shown to be the instigator of the action as a whole (e.g. Lk 1: 19, 1: 28-38, 3: 22, 9: 35), there is the angel Gabriel (Lk 1: 11-19, 26-38), a host of angels (Lk 2: 13-5), and the "two men in dazzling white" at the empty tomb (Lk 24: 4). Furthermore, there is the Holy Spirit (invisible), which enters people (Lk 1: 41, 67), rests on them (Lk 2: 25), and leads Jesus to the wilderness (Lk 4: 1). In opposition to the heavenly forces are the many demons that Jesus casts out, as well as the devil that presents Jesus with the first temptations, placing him on the pinnacle of the temple in Jerusalem by supernatural means (Lk 4: 3-13). As the suitors in the Romance function as an evil force in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, so are the Pharisees, Sadducees, and the people who bear false witness against Jesus presented as an evil force that opposes his mission. The supernatural element in the Gospel is not confined to beings. There are also occurrences that come about by supernatural means, occurrences that cannot be explained by human logic. Apart from the healings, casting out of devils and the performance of the miracles by Jesus himself, there is the conception of John the Baptist, the conception of Jesus, the voice from heaven at Jesus' baptism, the Transfiguration, and Jesus' resurrection from death and his ascension to heaven.<sup>27</sup>

Looking at the non-human forces that intervene in the lives of the heroes in the Romance in the light of the supernatural element in the Gospel, I would like to suggest that the two are not as different as they seem to be at first. What Bakhtin refers to as chance and random contingency, could be interpreted to be what things looked like from the view of the protagonists, the stress being on their lack of control over the turn of events. In fact it becomes clear near the end of *Chaereas and Callirhoe* that the patron goddess, Aphrodite,

---

<sup>27</sup> The supernatural element is more extreme in the Gospel than in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*. However, later Greek Romances, like *Leucippe and Clitophon* by Achilles Tatius, show an increasing amount of this element.

exercises the main control. Her opponent is Fortune or chance.<sup>28</sup> The difference between the two stories is that the protagonist in the Gospel is consciously aware of the divine control to which he responds willingly and which is spelt out, while the lovers in the romance worship Aphrodite as the one who is in control, but are afraid that she withdraws her protection and abandons them to Fortune, which she does for some of the time.<sup>29</sup> However, this difference does not affect the way *adventure time* functions. In this sense it functions similarly in the Gospel to the way it functions in the Romance. Each incident works according to its own time logic that is technically imposed on it, lacking an overall organic, maturational development.

Similarly, one could say that space in the Gospel is technically arranged to suit whatever is needed for a particular episode, bringing me to the third objection. Can there be a comparison between the vast expanse of space that reaches across the sea and various countries in the romance with the relatively small area that the Gospel is confined to? I would like to suggest that the difference is one of scale only. In essence many of the same movements occur within the two spaces. Like the protagonists in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, Jesus is constantly on the move. While Chaereas moves to lessen the distance between himself and Callirhoe, Jesus moves to reach the people to whom he must proclaim his message. He crosses provincial borders as opposed to national ones. Although he does not cross a sea as vast as the Mediterranean, he crosses the Sea of Galilee on several occasions (not in a ship, but in a small boat) and effects a miraculous escape from a potential shipwreck (Lk 8: 22-5). While Callirhoe crosses the Euphrates, entering a foreign land where her chastity will be put under threat by the Persian King, Jesus crosses the Jordan, going into the wilderness where his integrity is threatened by the devil. At a certain point he moves towards Jerusalem in order to complete his mission. Although Jerusalem is not Bethlehem where he was born or Nazareth where he was raised, it can, nevertheless, be seen as the

---

<sup>28</sup> See Robbins, who, in the context of comparing the element of self-praise in Luke with that in Plutarch's *Alexander*, writes "...self-praise is acceptable if the one praising himself does not claim all the credit but gives credit to God or "Chance." (Robbins 1981: 303). Robbins, placing this aspect of the Gospel somewhere between Hellenistic biographical Jewish writing (Josephus), and Graeco-Roman historical biography (Plutarch), thus equates the function of God in the Gospel to Chance in the Graeco-Roman biography.

<sup>29</sup> Interestingly, although this sense of abandonment does not appear in this particular Gospel (Luke) it does actually feature in Mark 15:34, as well as in Matthew 27:46.

closest to what is possible as a homeland in this world. It is the central place where his heavenly father is worshipped. The first heavenly intervention takes place here at the beginning of the story when the birth of Jesus' forerunner, John the Baptist, is announced. Furthermore, Jesus is brought to the temple where Simeon and Anna prophesy his future, and he refers to the temple as 'my Father's house' as a twelve year old (Lk 2:49).

The difference in scale is thus not a stumbling block in a comparison of the space presented in *Chaereas and Callirhoe* and that of the Gospel. Rather, the scale of the space in each case is linked to the supernatural dimension. While the space of the Romance is vast, it is confined to areas where Aphrodite, the principal goddess in this story is worshipped. This is the common factor that links up the characters in the story, regardless of which country they find themselves in. The Persian King sacrifices to Eros, and calls to Aphrodite for help (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* VI. 2). Whatever other gods were worshipped in these places in historical reality, there is no mention of them in terms of actual worship in this story. Similarly, one can say that Jesus moves within a geographical space where the God of Israel is worshipped as the one supreme god. There is mention of only one Lord. The story begins in the temple during a religious festival and ends in the temple with the disciples "blessing God" (Lk 24: 53). Similarly, the story of *Chaereas and Callirhoe* is set in motion during a festival of Aphrodite and ends in the latter's temple with Callirhoe in a posture of worship thanking the goddess (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* VIII. 8).

While Bakhtin maintains that the large expanse of space in the Greek Romance is necessary for chance to have its free run, one can say that the space of the Gospel is large enough for the God of Israel to effect his plan through the protagonist, Jesus.<sup>30</sup> However, here, too, as in the Romance, one sees space presented technically as it suits each episode, such as, the sanctuary, at Bethlehem, in the synagogue, in the river Jordan, on a mountain, in a house, at table, and on the road. In effect space in the Gospel functions according to Bakhtin's concept of *abstract-alien* space.

---

<sup>30</sup> Here, too, one could compare it with *Daphnis and Chloe* by Longus, where the island of Lesbos is large enough for the deities that ruled over that story (Eros, Pan, the Nymphs).

In responding to the three possible objections to a chronotopic comparison between the Greek Romance and the Gospel of Luke I have covered the aspects of plot, time and space arrangement in the latter in terms of Bakhtin's theory, as well as in comparison with *Chaereas and Callirhoe*. I shall move on now to discuss how the protagonist is presented in the Gospel in terms of Bakhtin's theory and compare this to how it is presented in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*. Following on from there I shall discuss and analyze some of the motifs, especially the motif of meeting, to see how these affect the discourse of the Gospel text.

### *The image of man in the Gospel*

The identity of the protagonist, Jesus, can be seen as the central theme in the Gospel. Any suspense that is to be found in this story is tied up with this aspect.<sup>31</sup> Bakhtin maintains that the hero of the Greek Romance does not change throughout the novel, and one can certainly say the same for Jesus. Whatever he does, and whatever is done to him, there is no change to be found in his character as a result of it. While the question of identity and the hero's achievement in maintaining it is also of central importance in the Romance, in the case of Jesus there is more emphasis on *who* he is than on what he is. The test as it is presented in the episodes concerns proof of that identity. One could say that this is also the case in the Romance, but here the suspense is about whether the hero manages to keep certain character traits intact throughout all the ordeals. In the Gospel, the suspense centres on the identity of the character itself. Both texts present the protagonists as characters that are extraordinary by virtue of certain qualities that they possess from the very beginning. In the Romance the qualities are unusual beauty, nobility, courage, chastity and faithfulness. The Gospel shows Jesus as being extraordinary by virtue of the events surrounding his birth, the prophecies that are uttered about him and the display of childhood wisdom beyond his years. But it is the way he projects the ideal of goodness, which could be seen to be god-like, and his performance of miracles that inspire admiration, fear, awe and love in the crowds. Every episode in the Gospel goes towards proving this identity, heavily supported by the angels,

---

<sup>31</sup> In Chapter 2 of this thesis, I give an account of Bakhtin's description of the Menippean hero, who is the embodiment of an idea. This type of character is faced with many ordeals against which he struggles to survive in terms of his personal identity. The test of the character constitutes the test of the idea he embodies (Bakhtin 1984:135).

supernatural occurrences, like the Transfiguration, his resurrection and his ascension, and by what he does and says about himself. Even the narrator, who for most of the story keeps a narratorial distance, referring to him as *Jesus*, leaving it to the characters to utter who he is, refers to him as *the Lord* at a particular stage (Lk 22: 61).<sup>32</sup>

Bakhtin sees the hero of the Greek Romance as a private person who at certain times behaves like a public person, this combination giving a quality of abstractness. This is played out in *Chaereas and Callirhoe* where we see the protagonists in their personal love story and agony as private persons while appearing in public and giving a public account of their personal life, so that their identity can be publicly authenticated. Jesus, too, is a private person. He is not born or elected into a public position in the establishment of the country within which he moves. Nor does he ever enter that establishment. His struggles are essentially private. Like Callirhoe, he is in constant communication with the deity that controls his life. Occasionally he goes off to pray by himself, even withdrawing from the disciples (Lk 22: 41-4).<sup>33</sup>

Like the heroes in the Romance, Jesus behaves like a public person at crucial moments. He does not give an account of his private life, but he displays some of the contents of his mission when he preaches to crowds, heals the sick and teaches his disciples. At the formal trial, however, he does not behave like the heroes of the Romance at their final trial. In fact, his trial could be compared to an intermediary trial, like the one at the Persian court, in which Callirhoe and Chaereas have to appear in front of a foreign authority, to whom they owe no allegiance, but at whose mercy they are. Jesus appears at his trial as a private person but gives no account of his life, which makes for a great deal of suspense. In fact, he passes this test in terms of identity. He does not recognize the authority of this court, his allegiance belonging to the authority of his heavenly father. Furthermore, to be condemned by this court is part of his mission in terms of the heavenly plan (Lk 9: 21-2, 18:31-3). At this point,

<sup>32</sup> See, for example Soards who, in the context of *thought and content* in the Lucan passion narrative, using a combination of literary and source criticism notes that Jesus is absolutely *steadfast* during his passion (Soards 1990: 92) (author's italics).

<sup>33</sup> One could see the disciples in a parallel role to that of Polycharmus in the *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, except that Jesus is a more powerful personality than Chaereas, and Polycharmus does not display any character traits of his own other than being Chaereas' constant supporter.

however, his supporters are plunged into despair in terms of his identity, in terms of him being who he has been to them throughout the story thus far. In a dramatic turn of events he passes this test as well by his resurrection and ascension. We are thus left with a happy ending, the protagonist having returned to his home, reunited with his heavenly father. There cannot be a public authorization in worldly terms at the end, as is the case in the Romance, because Jesus is not in his true homeland until he has returned to heaven.

*Discursive function in the motif of meeting in the Gospel*

It has been mentioned earlier that the Gospel story is set in a space that covers the geographical area in which the God of Israel is worshipped. In terms of time it is set in a historical period when the people in this area were in subjugation to a foreign power that did not worship this god, the implication being that this worship may have come under threat. Before examining some of the individual examples of the motifs of *meeting* to show how they are a constitutive element of the discourse that underlies this story, a preliminary observation may be made.

In the prologue of the Gospel the narrator conveys that there are other versions of the story, that he has made thorough investigations, and that he is confident that this account is a truthful one of how the set of events took place. In other words, in Bakhtinian terms, his story will be a response to other versions and will have in mind possible future responses, responses that may question his version, or simply be divergent accounts. This may be the reason for the strong discourse of legitimization that runs throughout this Gospel. The legitimizing element can also be seen to reinforce the presentation of the start of a religious movement. Embodied by Jesus, this movement diverges from mainstream Judaism while making the claim that it is legitimately grounded in it. The motif of *meeting* is constitutive of this discourse.

While the historical-geographical context of the story is that of a Roman province, the story shows Jesus, who is called the Son of God by the angel Gabriel, come into this world as a

---

result of divine intervention. He comes to meet with God's people<sup>34</sup> to proclaim the good news of the coming kingdom of God. Although God himself does not appear, sending his emissaries, Gabriel, the Holy Spirit, the voice from heaven, and Jesus, his presence is felt by virtue of the frequent supernatural interventions that take place. The initial divine intervention signals a major change for the people involved, just as the intervention by Eros and Aphrodite signals an impending crisis for the protagonists in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*.

In the chronotopic arrangement in the Gospel, the individual motifs of meeting constitute what could be seen as a mainstream or traditional line and a divergent, new line. Thus, when the first divine intervention takes place between the angel Gabriel and Zechariah to announce the birth of John the Baptist who is to herald in Jesus (Lk 3: 16), there is no question that this meeting is firmly rooted in mainstream Judaism in adherence to the Hebrew Bible. The time is during a religious festival at the offering of incense. The place is the sanctuary in the Jerusalem Temple. Multiple intertextual associations legitimize this incident in terms of the patriarchs and prophets of the Hebrew Bible.<sup>35</sup> Zechariah is a righteous priest performing a sacred duty. The sign that is witnessed by the crowd outside to show that divine intervention has taken place is Zechariah's temporary loss of speech. Thus there is a heavily legitimized anchor into the mainstream religion at the announcement of the impending birth of John the Baptist, who is the forerunner of Jesus.

The first divergence in terms of the chronotope of *meeting* is when the conception and birth of Jesus is announced. The angel Gabriel meets with Mary privately in Galilee, not in the Temple or even in a synagogue, and at no significant time in terms of religious festivals. In this case he announces something even more amazing (directly to the mother) than on the previous occasion. Mary, a virgin, will conceive as a result of the Holy Spirit coming upon her, and bear a son who will be called the son of the most high (Luke 1:31-5). There are no

---

<sup>34</sup> As they are represented in the Hebrew Bible.

<sup>35</sup> Chapter 3 of this thesis, which explores the intertextual relations between the Gospel of Luke and books of the Hebrew Bible, discusses the annunciations of John and Jesus in detail in this regard. Suffice it here to say that this intertextual engagement with the books of the Hebrew Bible maps out the spiritual space, in the context of which the geographical-political space of the Gospel of Luke functions.

witnesses, either during the meeting or afterwards. If it were not for the angel Gabriel, whom the reader has seen in operation before, linking up Mary with Elizabeth, whose pregnancy has been so carefully legitimized, there could be doubt about which supernatural power this announcement has come from.

Any possible remaining uncertainty as to the divine origin of the conception of Jesus is dispelled when Mary meets with Elizabeth as a private individual in the latter's house. The time is when Elizabeth is in her sixth month of pregnancy while Mary has only recently conceived Jesus. Elizabeth, filled with the Holy Spirit by virtue of the unborn John responding to the unborn Jesus, recognizes that Mary is the mother of *my Lord* (1:41-3). This is the sign that divine intervention has taken place, and Elizabeth, a descendent of Aaron, witnesses it. Thus we have a linking up of the divergent chronotopes that contain the announcement of the two births, with the legitimization of John being extended to Jesus.

The birth of Jesus takes place outside any location tied to the religious establishment, and at a time that is not bound to a specific religious festival. An angel and the heavenly host authenticate it to the shepherds. The shepherds witness it and the sign is a child wrapped in bands of cloth lying in a manger (Luke 2:12). However, Bethlehem as the city of David, the greatly revered progenitor of the kingly line, implicitly legitimizes the event in terms of scripture. This effect is strengthened by the fact that the angels appear to the shepherds in the field, reminding us of David's origin as a shepherd. Earlier we have been told that Joseph, Mary's husband, is of the line of David (Lk 1: 27). The effect of this chronotope is that while Jesus is born outside the religious establishment of his time, the place and timing of his birth is, nevertheless, not outside the great tradition of King David, which the current priestly establishment adheres to. Other authentications of Jesus as the Messiah in Luke 1 and 2 are the reactions of Simeon (Lk 2:28-32), the prophetess, Anna (Lk 2:36-38). The boyhood incident (Lk 2:43-49), when Jesus shows unusual wisdom for his age, and refers to the temple as his father's house, supports the notion of his special identity and purpose. All three incidents take place in the Temple, the latter serving as a legitimization in terms of traditional Judaism.

The first open, divine authentication of the adult Jesus takes place at his baptism when the voice from above acknowledges him as its son. The sign is the dove. John the Baptist and people who are also being baptized would be the witnesses, although the Gospel mentions no reaction from them. The time is the period during which John is preaching. Like a prophet in the Hebrew Bible he calls the people to repentance. John, who had been so carefully legitimized within the most sacred place in Judaism, has now moved to the outside to herald in a new religious leader. Jesus is authenticated by the heavenly voice within this context in the river Jordan, outside the locations of the religious establishment. But as in the case of Bethlehem, the river Jordan has connotations that link up with a story from the Hebrew Bible. It is the river that Naaman is healed in by the prophet Elisha (2 Kings 5:1-14). Not only is there an association with the biblical tradition, but one could also see it as a forecasting of Jesus' role as a healer. Furthermore this association foreshadows Jesus' words in the synagogue, which mark the change that will result in the disappointment of some expectations concerning the Messiah (Lk 4: 16-21).

Jesus first reveals himself in terms of his mission as a bringer of good news of prophet-like dimensions in the synagogue in Nazareth during a religious service. Although he has moved further away from the official centre of Judaism out of Judea into Galilee, this meeting takes place in the context of official religious practice, showing his own involvement with the mainstream. Within the normal course of the service, he spells out his link to the prophecy of Isaiah (Luke 4:16-21) and to other prophets who were critical of the people of Israel in their time. Chased out of the synagogue, he embarks on his work as someone who casts out demons, as a healer and as a teacher. This takes place mostly outside buildings of religion, although he does preach in synagogues from time to time, evidencing a continued link with the establishment. The Transfiguration takes place on a mountain where three of his disciples witness two characters out of the Hebrew Bible, Moses and Elijah, talking to him about his coming departure (from this world), to be effected in Jerusalem, and they hear the voice from the cloud acknowledging him as its son, its chosen one (Luke 9:32-6). Again, Jesus' identity and mission is legitimized outside the establishment, not through a priest, but by the voice and the open link with Hebrew Scripture, the legitimization being strengthened by the place

where the meeting takes place, reminiscent of the mountain where Moses received the Ten Commandments.

Whilst the constraints of this chapter prevent a discussion of all the significant legitimizing incidents of meeting in the Gospel in terms of their chronotopic arrangement, I shall discuss what I see to be a major chronotope running through the whole story, namely the chronotope of the *road*. Not only is it a constituent of the plot itself, as it is in the Romance, inseparable from the traveling element, but it also embodies a major part of the underlying discourse in the Gospel. Its function concerning the legitimizing element could be seen to be one of opposing the chronotope of *temple* although it is anchored in it.

While the chronotope of the *road* suggests movement, the chronotope of the *temple* suggests stasis. As regards the latter, an analogy can be drawn with Bakhtin's description of the chronotope of the *castle*, a building that symbolizes power and hierarchy (Bakhtin 1981:246). Furthermore, it is saturated with time that has passed, containing evidence of previous centuries in its architecture, its contents and in its traditional religious practice. Not everybody is allowed into the Temple, most people are barred from the sacred area, and whoever enters, does so on the terms of the laws that have been put in place over a long period. In the setting of the Gospel it is the stronghold of Judaism. Worshippers (including Jesus' family (Luke 2:41)), come to it from many places in order to perform sacrificial duties on religious occasions, especially at the festival of the Passover.<sup>36</sup> The priesthood performs religious ceremonies in this stationary place, adhering to strict rules.

This may be contrasted with the chronotope of the *road*. The road is open. There are no laws that prescribe what sort of meeting can take place. It has no protecting or exclusionary walls, and it leads to many places, the focus being on the future instead of the past. There is no hierarchy. Thus anyone can come to a meeting there, the meeting can be a chance meeting, and people can meet on equal terms.

---

<sup>36</sup> See the Books of Haggai and Zechariah in the Hebrew Bible for the significant role of the reconstructed temple for the children of Israel in terms of Yahweh coming to save and dwell among his people.

Much of Jesus' healing and preaching takes place on the road, *going to cities and villages* at any given time (Luke 8: 1). This means he goes out to meet people from all spheres of life, healing and teaching all alike. When the Pharisees, for instance, meet him there to ask him questions, they move out of their own space of power in the establishment to face him on equal ground. He moves towards the future, to Jerusalem, where he will complete his mission. People can, and do, follow him on the road. He sends his disciples out on the road to many places to proclaim the good news and to heal (Luke 9: 1-6). Finally, after his resurrection, having explained the full meaning of his mission to his disciples, and having identified himself as the Messiah, he urges them to proclaim "repentance and forgiveness of sins in his name to all nations, beginning with Jerusalem." (Lk 24: 47). One could say that the road represents the element of the religious movement that diverges from the mainstream, not only to renew current religious practice, but to include all nations, moving beyond the borders of the Jewish nation, beyond the borders of the geographical space in which this story takes place, thus expanding the dominion of the kingdom of God to the whole world.

On the other hand, it is Jerusalem and the Temple that Jesus is heading for with his large following, and it is the Temple where the disciples wait to be clothed with power from on high at the end, claiming their rightful place in it. Jesus' driving out of "those who were selling things," his teaching, and proclaiming the good news in the Temple on a daily basis (Luke 19:45-8), all emphasize that he is not an outsider proclaiming a new religion, but that he is grounded in the traditional Jewish religion, his mission being to renew current practice from within and to proclaim new life, although he moves outside the establishment to effect this.

### *The Word as the chronotope of meeting*

While the Temple has been presented in the Gospel as the central place of worship in Judaism where people meet and communicate with God by means of sacrificial ritual, this narrative also evidences synagogue practice. This is significant in that it is here that Jesus first reveals himself and his mission to his people. He does this while reading out of

*Scripture* (Lk 4:16-27), whereas the birth of John the Baptist had been announced during the *sacrifice* of incense in the Temple. Whilst in no way replacing worship in the Temple, in which the communication between the people and God takes place during sacrifice, worship in the synagogue uses the space of Scripture for this communication. It is at the site of the Word that worship takes place and that messages are received. As the word *synagogue* (meeting) implies, the actual building is not of importance. Scripture as the meeting place with God is free from geographical constraints. In this sense one can speak of a chronotope of the *word*. Although the Gospel is deeply entrenched in Hebrew Scripture (which I shall for the purposes of this discussion call the 'old Word') from the very beginning and links itself to it throughout, we are, nevertheless, left with a 'new Word' (the Gospel) at the end. I would like to suggest that the way in which the new Word is anchored in the old Word, but diverges from it, is comparable to the phenomenon that has been described above in terms of the movement between mainstream Judaism and the divergence from it as evidenced in the motifs of meeting.

In the prologue the narrator of the Gospel tells us that the account he is about to present is based on what is handed down by "eyewitnesses and servants of the word" (Luke 1:2). Which word? Is it the Scriptures as read in established practice, or the word proclaimed by Jesus, including himself as an embodiment of the realization of the prophecies of the old Word?<sup>37</sup> This is not clear at this point. At the end of Luke 4 Jesus says: "I must proclaim the good news of the kingdom of God to the other cities also" (Luke 4: 43). This is a prophecy that has been already legitimized by the prophecy of Isaiah, with which he identified himself earlier. We have thus a new Word anchored in the old Word. It is the point where the divergence begins. At the beginning of Luke 5 we see the "crowd pressing in on him to hear the word of God" (Lk 5:1). This must be the new Word. All his teaching is based on the old Word, although he adds new elements into it: his interpretation, his role as the embodiment of the kingdom of God, and the many parables. The result is the new Word that is constantly

---

<sup>37</sup> See Staley who, in discussing Lk 4: 14-9, points out the many incidences of the word, *logos*, in opening scenes in that section (referring to Jesus' words) as projecting the authoritative voice of Jesus above the buzzing conversations of ordinary folk. He points out that only in Luke's Gospel does Jesus "rebuke" the fever that Simon's *mother-in-law* had. Unlike the prophetic utterances even of Mary, Zechariah, Simeon and John, Jesus' words will be the very means through which the liberating power of God is activated in human experience (Staley 1995: 189).

justified by the old Word. As the story develops, Jesus himself becomes part of that new Word to an increasing degree. He mentions several times that his suffering and death will be part of the fulfillment of the prophecy of the old Word. This is spelt out after his resurrection again and again. First, the two men in dazzling white remind the women of what Jesus had told them (Lk 24: 6-8). Then, Jesus himself appears to the two disciples going to Emmaus, reminding them of the words of the prophets. He does this first as a stranger, verifying it dramatically as he reveals his identity to them by the sign of the gesture of blessing and breaking the bread (Lk 24: 30-1). His last address to his disciples before his ascension can be seen as the culmination of the new Word:

‘These are my words that I spoke to you while I was still with you – that everything written about me in the Law of Moses, the prophets, and the psalms must be fulfilled. Then he opened their minds to understand the scriptures. And he said unto them, Thus it is written, that the Messiah is to suffer and to rise from the dead on the third day, and that repentance and forgiveness of sins is to be proclaimed in his name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem. You are witnesses of these things ...’  
(Luke 24: 44-8).

While reiterating that his very being is grounded in Hebrew Scripture, he adds to this scripture his interpretation, his teaching and the events of his life and death. He puts the responsibility of disseminating this word on the disciples who have been his witnesses. At this stage the word is still oral. The narrator of the Gospel claims to present it, as handed down by the eyewitnesses who are faithful to the word, by writing an orderly account, thus limiting its potential fluidity to his written account. The word in the prologue is thus identified as the new Word, the Gospel, which becomes the new chronotope of the *word*, where believers from all nations meet to communicate with God.

### *Conclusion*

This comparison of the chronotope of the Gospel of Luke with that of *Chaereas and Callirhoe* has shown that there are generic affinities in terms of the use of a specific time

space arrangement between the two texts according to that part of Bakhtin's theory. It has also shown that an investigation using this theory can uncover more than the author's technique in simply managing the narrative. By exploring the evaluative component of the chronotopic motifs, it becomes possible to trace the route taken by various aspects of the discourse. In this case I have followed the discourse concerning the legitimization of a new religious movement, which, while recognizing the legitimacy of the official traditional faith, employs that very legitimacy to legitimize its own divergence from it.

University of Cape Town

## Chapter 2

### Bakhtin's Carnival and the Gospel of Luke

Bakhtin's notion of a carnivalesque worldview, encompassing a dialogic as opposed to a monologic sense of truth, could be seen to be at the heart of his approach towards novelistic writing as a whole. This aspect of his theory is extensively articulated in his *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (1929). It appears in other writings as well, such as his essay, 'Forms of Time and the Chronotope' (1937-38), and takes on the central role in his *Rabelais and his World* (1940), in which Rabelais' work is analysed in the context of Renaissance carnival. In describing how the carnivalesque has manifested itself in a number of literary genres, Bakhtin expresses the opinion that the presence or absence of this element is the crucial, underlying characteristic that distinguishes the European polyphonic novel, like that of Dostoevsky, from other, in his view, monologic texts.<sup>1</sup> As he views carnival in the light of a central multi-voiced symbolic act that embodies the passing nature of life itself, as well as a reflection on it,<sup>2</sup> it is not surprising that he should estimate genres that he sees as devoid of this element as incapable of apprehending, representing, and interacting with the full range of human experience. Giving his account of the concrete, sensuous forms of carnival proper, he goes on to assert the presence of these forms in a transposed form in a variety of texts throughout history. Clearly regarding the works of Rabelais and Dostoevsky as prime examples of such carnivalized texts, evident from the space he allocates to a discussion of them, he also gives attention to what he sees to be the emergence and early proliferation of that type of text in the 'lower' genres of the Hellenistic and Imperial periods. He singles out the Socratic Dialogue and the Menippea (a label he uses to refer to a body of serio-comic genres in the Hellenistic period) as having had a significant effect on later polyphonic literature on account of the dialogizing effect of their carnivalesque component. He regards Early Christian writings, as well as the Greek Romance, within the framework of this larger body of Hellenistic literature (Bakhtin 1984:113).

---

<sup>1</sup>For a discussion of this see Chapter 4 in *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (1984: 101-180).

<sup>2</sup> See the description of the crowning and de-crowning of the carnival king on p 55 below.

The aim of this chapter is to explore a possible carnivalesque element in the Gospel of Luke in the light of Bakhtin's theory. As in the case of the chronotope, considered in the previous chapter of this thesis, the presence or absence of this element has generic implications, which would affect questions of interpretation. To begin with, I shall give a brief description of Bakhtin's account of the actual practice of carnival, explain how he interprets these celebrations within society, and how he sees this phenomenon as having had an impact on literature. Next, I shall identify what can be considered as manifestations of the carnivalesque in Luke. I shall trace these as they occur on different levels and in various modes. In line with the method employed in examining Luke in terms of Bakhtin's theory of the chronotope in the previous chapter, I shall refer to the Greek Romance for purposes of comparison, in particular to Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*.<sup>3</sup>

### *Bakhtin and Carnival*

Bakhtin does not claim to cover the phenomenon of carnival in its vast and complex entirety. His assessment of its concrete form is made from the perspective of its carnivalizing effect on literature (Bakhtin 1984: 122). Locating its origin in primordial human society, he describes it as a complex, life-creating force with great transforming power. One could say that he gives it a status that is akin to that of religious practice within communal life, almost an anti-religion that simultaneously parodies and renews the very object that it confronts. Carnival challenges the hierarchy of static, official structures of society by its vibrant, dialogic action. Bakhtin terms it a 'syncretic pageantry of a ritualistic sort' (Bakhtin 1984: 122). His interest lies in the aspect of the whole community's involvement in a set of public acts, marked by an absence of the customary hierarchical relations that separate different sections of society. Somewhere between play and real life, conducted according to a particular set of carnival rules, this

---

<sup>3</sup> Most of my description of Bakhtin's theory of carnival is taken from *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (1984), as this is the book in which he describes the carnivalistic nature of the Socratic Dialogue and the Menippeia, genres that are relevant to the Gospel of Luke, having been in existence for some time when the latter made its appearance. Although this is one of Bakhtin's early works, a work that was first published in 1929, before he had written his Rabelais book in 1940 (in which he locates the heyday of carnival in medieval and Renaissance culture), it is fundamental to his understanding of the carnivalesque worldview in relation to literature. He revised and expanded this book for its second edition in 1961, well after he wrote his book on Rabelais. Revisionary notes, entitled 'Towards a Reworking of the Dostoevsky Book' are also included in this edition as Appendix II. Other works will be referred to as well, but to a lesser extent.

action manifests itself in a wide variety of forms. These forms constitute a concrete, symbolic language, developed over many centuries, a language that is universal as it freely crosses all hierarchical and national barriers. Its many varying actions all emanate from a carnivalistic base, expressing a polyphonic, but unified, carnivalistic sense of the world. While it is impossible to translate the concrete, symbolic forms of the carnival gesture into a language of abstract, verbal concepts (scientific language), according to Bakhtin, it is possible to translate them into the language of literature. The latter's use of creative, sensuous images makes it amenable to the symbolism of the carnival forms. The result is a literary language that is shot through with carnivalesque images, a carnivalized language, as it were, the very genre of which is determined by this new component (Bakhtin 1984: 122).

From its primordial roots, at which stage Bakhtin surmises its existence as a constant component of communal life, carnival developed into a passing, but periodically repeated, communal occurrence in class society. In action during a period of permitted 'time out', one could say that it is viewed by Bakhtin as the very embodiment of 'time out', its own laws functioning while the laws of everyday life are temporarily suspended. The symbolic gestures signify a life 'turned inside out.' Latent sides of human nature, those seen as eccentric from the viewpoint of non-carnival life, are out in the open at carnival. The suspension of the laws of hierarchy, effecting an inversion of the norm in terms of social structures and values, is seen by him as extending to a familiarization on every level. As people mingle freely at carnival, regardless of their social status, there is also a frequent occurrence of what Bakhtin calls carnivalistic *mésalliances*, a mixing of concepts that are normally self-enclosed and distant from one another (Bakhtin 1984: 118). Thus, for example, profanations and blasphemies take place as a result of the removal of the barriers between the sacred and the profane. Essentially double-voiced, carnival not only interacts with the norm, but also contains that norm within itself as the 'other' voice that it challenges. Parodying the phenomena that inspire awe and fear, like the deity, death, and the power of worldly authority, it acts out the inexorable reality of change, sharply accentuating the cycle of life, death and rebirth. All this, however, happens in a spirit of affirmative laughter, laughter at the inevitability of destruction that already carries renewal within it.

The most essential carnivalistic act, in Bakhtin's view, is the ritual mock crowning of a beggar (or fool) as the carnival king, followed by a subsequent de-crowning. Performed by the people in the public square, it embodies the vicissitudes of human fortune and symbolizes the rapid passing of time, time that simultaneously destroys and renews life. The following quote demonstrates how Bakhtin interprets this ritual as the central dualistic symbol of a carnivalistic and dialogic view of the world, a symbol that simultaneously embodies and celebrates negation (death) and affirmation (birth).

The primary carnivalistic act is the *mock crowning and subsequent de-crowning of the carnival king* ....

Under the ritual act of de-crowning a king lies the very core of the carnival sense of the world – *the pathos of shifts and changes, of death and renewal*. Carnival is the festival of all-annihilating and all-renewing time. Thus one might express the basic concept of carnival.<sup>4</sup>

Crowning/de-crowning is a dualistic ambivalent ritual, expressing the inevitability and at the same time the creative power of the shift-and-renewal, the *joyful* relativity of all structure and order, of all authority and all (hierarchical) position ... He who is crowned is the antipode of a real king, a slave or a jester; this act, as it were, sanctifies the inside-out world of carnival ... From the very beginning, a de-crowning glimmers through the crowning ... and through it a new crowning already glimmers. Carnival celebrates the shift itself, the very process of replaceability, and not the precise item that is replaced ... crowning and de-crowning are inseparable, they are dualistic and pass into one another; in any absolute dissociation they would completely lose their carnivalistic sense.

(Bakhtin's italics) (Bakhtin 1984: 124-25)

Permeated by the logic of the carnival world, this act exemplifies the features mentioned above, such as free and familiar contact (there is a physical handling of the body of the

---

<sup>4</sup> It is of interest, here, to note Leila Amaral's description of the parade of the samba school União da Ilha do Governador during the carnival in Rio de Janeiro in 1994. Amaral interprets the parade as a carnivalesque version of what magic is in the New Age perspective, conveyed by auditory (music and lyrics), as well as visual (choreography, costumes, masks and floats) signs. As in Bakhtin's view, the emphasis is on transformation through destruction and renewal, and a cheerful relativity of all things (Amaral: 2003: 112-122). What Amaral describes differs from Bakhtin's description of carnival (even though central images, especially that of fire as an image of destruction and renewal, feature prominently) insofar as the carnival king (central in Bakhtin's view) does not figure. Amaral refers to La Capra (Bakhtin, *Rethinking Intellectual History: Texts, Contexts, Language*) for further reading.

'king'), inversions and carnivalistic *mésalliance*, in this case, a mixing up of the concepts of slave and king, as well as profanation in the form of playing with and ridiculing symbols of high authority. Furthermore, it embodies the motifs of scandal, spectacle, disguise (carnavalesque shifts of clothing), shifts of positions and destinies, and carnival mystifications. These are, in turn, related to the rituals of verbal *agons*, cursing matches that also functioned as blessings, and feasts with an exchange of gifts and the utopian abundance of food and drink. The motifs and images have ambivalence as their common factor, uniting within themselves both poles of change and crisis, dialogically unsettling the stasis of official, monologic certainties. Oxymoronic images abound, such as the true freedom and the servile position of the wise man, the emperor becoming the slave, the noble bandit, moral downfalls and purification, luxury and poverty. Fire is a powerful image in terms of destruction and renewal. Parody, an essential component of carnivalistic logic, is seen by Bakhtin as the creation of a de-crowning double, the same world turned inside out (Bakhtin 1982: 126).

Ambivalence is also the underlying essence of carnival laughter, the latter being particularly evident in the Middle Ages and in the Renaissance, in Bakhtin's view. Directed towards a shift of authorities, truths and world orders, a genetic link is seen by him between this laughter and ancient forms of ritual laughter. Ritual laughter ridiculed earthly authorities, and even deities, putting them to shame while forcing them to renew themselves. Also concerned with questions of death and rebirth, it reacted to crises in the life of the divine, as well as the human being (Bakhtin 1984:127).

Carnival figures of particular interest to Bakhtin are the fool, the rogue and the clown. He assesses them as figures that appear in the world of the everyday, bringing the carnival spirit with them. Creating their own chronotope around themselves, they are in this world but not of it. Not actors on a stage, but figures representing life on the borderline between life and art, they convey the sense of the theatrical world of the public square (exemplified by the mask and the spectacle) into everyday life. As their true identity is masked, their appearance should be understood metaphorically, according to Bakhtin, its function consisting of unmasking the vulgar conventionalities and falsehoods of everyday life. Their being coincides with their role as a reflection on some other's mode of living, existing within a sanctioned right to be 'other', a right not to fit into any of the categories normally permitted by society (Bakhtin 1968:8, 19, 158-60). Although Bakhtin mainly

focuses on this type of figure in the context of medieval and Renaissance culture, particularly as it is evident in Rabelais' work, he sees its existence in society going back as far as carnival itself.

### *The carnivalization of literature*

Although Bakhtin views carnival as a constitutive component of human society as such, and describes its presence in literature in terms of recognizable features, implying non-temporality, he nevertheless situates the proliferation of carnivalized literature in historical eras that are marked by a particular type of socio-political and cultural environment. First, political and cultural conflict are seen by him as conducive to the carnivalesque, the struggle between various national and cultural forces adding to the degree of hybridisation and number of diverse voices, while political upheaval actualises the sense of imminent destruction and renewal. Secondly, he sees a direct link between the celebrations of carnival proper and the production of a particular type of literature. Both these factors were operative in the two eras that are the focus of his analysis.<sup>5</sup> Thus, while he depicts carnivalized literature mainly from a synchronic point of view, describing the characteristics of such texts in interpretive terms, he also conveys a sense of movement as he describes the manifestations of this phenomenon in the context of historical time.

Bakhtin specifically mentions the Roman *Saturnalia* in antiquity as a source for the Menippea (Bakhtin 1984: 133), and uses the Carnival of the Renaissance to describe and illustrate much of his theory, placing Rabelais' work in this context. On a secondary level, however, he also sees the carnivalesque element entering literary texts via the influence of other, already carnivalized texts (Bakhtin 1984: 107). Thus, while carnivalization of a text, like that of Rabelais, could be the result of the direct, unmediated influence of carnival itself, it could also be due to the influence of other carnivalized texts. Bakhtin suggests that it is a combination of both. The process of carnivalization can thus continue independently within the medium of literature, not limited to the era that celebrates the physical event. This means that literature, rather like the phenomenon of the fool, rogue and clown, conveys the carnival spirit into non-

---

<sup>5</sup>The Hellenistic period, with its Roman *Saturnalia*, and the carnival of the Renaissance.

carnival times. So, even though Bakhtin sees a change of attitude in European society towards carnival after the Renaissance, with a concomitant decline of the carnivalesque world-view as such, he nevertheless identifies elements of this worldview in later literature, particularly in the novels of Dostoevsky.

Attention will now be given to Bakhtin's account of the carnivalized genres that are of direct relevance to the Gospel of Luke in terms of their appearance, namely the Socratic Dialogue and the Menippean Satire. Contrary to what he sees to be scholarly opinion, namely that the Socratic Dialogue originated from a rhetorical genre and that the Menippean Satire was a product of the disintegration of the latter, Bakhtin locates the origin of both these genres in a folk-carnivalistic base, that is, in folk-carnival 'debates' concerning life and death, darkness and light, and winter and summer (Bakhtin 1984: 112, 132).

### *The Socratic Dialogue*

Bakhtin assesses the Socratic Dialogue as a memoir genre at the beginning of its literary stage, consisting of transcriptions of remembered conversations framed by a brief story. However, he sees it as having moved rapidly beyond this early stage, as a freely creative attitude towards the subject matter began to liberate it from the limitations of history and memoir. What was retained was the Socratic method of revealing truth, and the form of a dialogue framed by a story. At its base lies what is central to Bakhtinian thought: the Socratic notion that truth cannot be the possession of individual people, but that it is born between people engaged in dialogue.

The dialogic means of seeking truth is counterposed to *official* monologism, which pretends to *possess a ready-made truth*, and it is also counterposed to the naive self-confidence of those people who think that they know something, that is, who think that they possess certain truths. Truth is not born nor is it to be found inside the head of an individual person, it is born *between people* collectively searching for truth, in the process of their dialogic interaction. Socrates called himself a 'pander': he brought people together and made them collide in a quarrel, and as a result truth was born.... (he) never called himself the exclusive possessor of a ready-made truth (Bakhtin's italics). (Bakhtin 1984: 110)

A prerequisite for such a dialogue in search of truth, according to Bakhtin, is the assumption that all distancing has been abolished, be it between participants of the dialogue or in the attitude towards the object of thought, however lofty. The process of the dialogue can thus be compared to the 'time out' phenomenon of carnival proper with a concomitant suspension of all hierarchical restraints. Carnival crowning and de-crowning, as well as *mésalliances* of thoughts and images, characteristically appear in this type of dialogue. Two basic comparative devices, *syncrisis* and *anacrisis*, are made use of in this exploration for truth. The former consists of a juxtaposition of various opinions. The latter is a testing of the word by the word by provoking one's interlocutor into expressing his opinion fully. Brought out into the open, the opinion is exposed for what it is, often as false or incomplete. Bakhtin sees both devices as ways of dialogizing thought, 'carry[ing] it into the open, turn[ing] it into a rejoinder, attaching it to dialogic intercourse among people' (Bakhtin 1984:1, 11).

The heroes of this kind of dialogue are ideologists,<sup>6</sup> placed in a plot situation that is used to set off the discussion itself. What is presented is the ideological activity of seeking and testing the truth about ultimate questions. Bakhtin sees this as the introduction of the hero-ideologist in the history of European literature, the embryo of what he calls 'the image of an idea', the object as another self-conscious subject. As the idea is organically combined with the image of the person who represents it, the testing of the latter is the testing of the idea itself (Bakhtin 1984: 111-12). The plot situation precipitates a 'dialogue on the threshold', as, for example, the setting of the trial with the expected death penalty in Plato's *Apology* has the effect of Socrates' defence being that of a man on the threshold of death. This would affect the way he speaks, revealing the deeper layers of his personality as he is forced to shed everything that is irrelevant (Bakhtin 1984: 111).<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Bakhtin uses the word *ideologist* in the sense of being preoccupied with ideas, investigating them, testing them and coming to some sort of truth about them by engaging in a dialogue with an interlocutor who, for that moment, enjoys an equal status.

<sup>7</sup> The Socratic Dialogue did not remain in this state for long, according to Bakhtin, not, that is, as an effective way of discovering dialogic truth. Rather, it became a means of expounding ready-made ideas for pedagogical purposes. He sees the final works of Plato as already showing evidence of having entered the service of philosophical schools and religious doctrines. Consequently, the genre lost its carnivalistic sense of the world, ultimately degenerating into a question-and-answer form for teaching a kind of catechism (Bakhtin 1984: 110).

### *The Menippea*

Bakhtin sees the Menippea as the genre that has had the greatest carnivalistic influence on European literature. Taking its name from the satires of Menippus of Gadara,<sup>8</sup> the term is treated by Bakhtin as a collective name to cover the large body of serio-comic writings of the Hellenistic era, which he sees as having continued to exist in type throughout the centuries, even into modern times. He sees both the Greek Romance and early Christian literature as having developed within its orbit.

.... This carnivalized genre, extraordinarily flexible and as changeable as Proteus, capable of penetrating other genres, had an enormous and as yet insufficiently appreciated importance for the development of European literatures. Menippean satire became one of the main carriers and channels for the carnival sense.... In diverse variants and under diverse generic labels it (Menippean satire) also continued its development into the post-classical epochs: into the Middle Ages, the Renaissance and Reformation, and of the world in literature ... (Bakhtin 1984: 113).

Bakhtin regards the forms of the genres of the Menippea as having the requisite capacity for reflecting the concerns of the turbulent, multicultural epoch of the Hellenistic and Imperial era. Over and above the double-voiced serio-comical element, he identifies three common, fundamental features, features that can also be found to be central to carnival celebrations. The first one is that the subject matter of the text concerns current and topical issues (Bakhtin 1984: 118). The accompanying familiarization, all epic distance having been abandoned, ensures direct contact with life in its current, open-ended changeability. This can be compared to the essentially topical vitality of the physical carnival act. Bakhtin calls the Menippea, amongst other things, the journalistic genre of Antiquity on account of its concern with current issues. A text of this type would (of primary importance in terms of Bakhtin's theory of the utterance as such) dialogically engage both with socio-political and literary realities of its own time.

---

<sup>8</sup>Menippus lived in the third century BCE, although the term was only coined in the first century BCE by Varro (Bakhtin 1984: 112). The actual satires by Menippus have not been found, but are believed to have been imitated by Lucian, some of whose works are extant.

The second point is that instead of a reliance on, and sanctification by history and legend, there is a reliance on direct experience and free invention. Connected to the first point in terms of immediacy and familiarization, this phenomenon can be related to the gestures of carnival proper insofar as they construct parodying doubles of life in its everyday form. Bakhtin sees an increase of the comic element in the *Menippea*, although he also stresses that this element is not absolutely essential and does not appear in every text of this kind (Bakhtin 1984: 114). The aspect of invention also corresponds with the temporary suspension of everyday rules during carnival celebrations, in this case a suspension of disbelief, free from the constraints of historical fact and legendary stories. Liberated from the sanctity of the latter's valorization as unalterable truths, a Menippean text can base itself on actual, immediate experience, invent a set of events, and construct a story to serve its needs in discovering and exposing a particular truth about life (Bakhtin 1984: 115).

Thirdly, a Menippean text does not bind itself to literary convention, particularly that of unity. Freely inserting a variety of genres into itself to suit its own purposes, it stands as a challenge to the relatively monologic authoritarian voice of the author of the classical text that operates within a systemized generic frame (Bakhtin 1984: 118). The diverse voices of the different genres (assuming intertextuality with other texts) within one text have the potential of interacting with one another, with the voice of the author, and (in their now changed, combined form) with their literary and social environment. This heterogeneity (as opposed to carefully integrated unity) can be seen to correspond with the syncretic hybrid nature of the carnival gesture.

A further disregard for convention can be found in the inversion of character representation. Ordinary people are depicted in a serious light, undermining the convention of classical genres in which they are relegated to the role of comic characters.<sup>9</sup> On the other hand, representatives of the elite within the power structure of the day are shown in a parodic light. Conventional rules are further relaxed by the free mixing of lofty, philosophical ideas with quotidian, concrete realities, a prominent feature

---

<sup>9</sup>As it is the case in ancient epic, ancient historiography and ancient drama. See also the Introduction of this thesis (p. 11) that refers to Auerbach (1953: 35-37), in which the latter, in the same vein as Bakhtin, elaborates this point in his discussion of Peter's denial of Jesus in the Gospel according to Mark.

of the Menippea, comparable to the familiarizations and *mésalliances* of carnival (Bakhtin 1984: 115).

As in the case of the Socratic Dialogue, Bakhtin describes the Menippea as a genre that is concerned with an idea that is searched out, provoked and tested. The Menippean hero as the embodiment of the idea can be placed anywhere, and can experience the most extraordinary adventures. The situations into which he is placed constitute a testing, not of him as an individual, but of ultimate questions of life, death and rebirth, the very questions that Bakhtin identifies at the base of carnival imagery. Released from the constraints of history and legend, these texts can contemplate the world on the broadest possible scale in their search for a particular truth. In contrast to the texts of the Socratic Dialogue, however, in which academic problems, such as aesthetics, may be discussed in complex modes of argumentation, the Menippean texts test ultimate questions by placing them in juxtaposition in plot situations. Free to utilize any number of forms, free to invent plots with no regard for verisimilitude, the Menippean text employs the fantastic for the purpose of investigating a truth. This may be in the form of adventure, sometimes of a religious or symbolic character, at times manifesting itself as a social utopia. As in the Socratic Dialogue, no final, abstractly philosophical or religiously dogmatic resolution is arrived at (Bakhtin 1984: 114-15).

When Bakhtin speaks about inventions that he associates with the Menippea, like the three-planed construction denoting earth, Heaven and the nether world, or the scandal scene, he is not describing phenomena that are new. The generic heterogeneity of this kind of text is, in itself, evidence of its indebtedness to the other, older genres. In Bakhtin's view, the characteristics of these genres undergo certain changes in their syncretic combination in Menippean texts. For instance, the three levels of earth, a higher sphere (as a home for divine beings), and a subterranean domain to which Zeus has expelled his father, Kronos, already appears as early as Homer's *Iliad*.<sup>10</sup> God as an omniscient Being residing in a space above humankind, and the abode of the dead, *she'ol*, assumed to be below the surface of the earth, forms the picture conveyed in the Hebrew Bible. In the Menippea, this construction assumes a different character. It becomes familiarized, is extended in a freely invented way, and may even be used

---

<sup>10</sup> *Iliad* 8.477-80, cited by Versnel (1986: 124).

parodically in relation to earlier usage.<sup>11</sup> Threshold dialogues, potentially comic in terms of entry from one level to another, are provoked by this construction. Scandal scenes are invented in the *Menippea* to break up the epic and tragic wholeness of the world, causing eccentric and inappropriate behaviour and speeches that violate established norms of behaviour. A situation, either comical or painful, is constructed for the sake of testing a particular truth. The depiction of human behaviour is thus freed from the norms that predetermine it, free to expose a side of society or of an individual that is usually hidden. The visible norm is carnivalistically turned inside out (Bakhtin 1984: 117).

### *The Gospels and the Greek Romance as part of the Menippea*

Both the Greek Romance and the Gospels appeared during the turbulent era that Bakhtin associates with the Greek manifestation of the *Menippea*. The Roman *Saturnalia* as well as other, related festivals that celebrated inversion, like the Greek *Kronia*, could, according to his theory, have had a direct carnivalesque impact on these texts.<sup>12</sup> In addition there would have been the factor of other earlier texts of the *Menippea*, the latter's carnivalizing effect having already influenced literary texts for two centuries or more (Bakhtin 1984:121). Both the Greek Romance and the Gospels could thus fall into that wider body of texts that Bakhtin associates with the *Menippea*. He, in fact, views them as carnivalized genres (Bakhtin 1984:135). Neither of them can be classed into the categories of 'high' classical literature, like epic, tragedy, lyrical poetry, or even historiography.<sup>13</sup>

Before going into any closer analysis one can note a couple of features in the Gospel of Luke and Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe* that would support the above assumption. Both texts are written in literary *koine* prose (in contrast to the classical, literary Greek of the 'high' genres), a language that is conducive to familiarity and implies that the texts were intended for a wide variety of readers or listeners. The subject matter of both texts would almost certainly have been topical, relevant to the period of their appearance. The Gospel records a story of the birth of a religious movement, a burning issue at a time. The

<sup>11</sup> See, for example, Lucian's dialogue, *Menippus*, or, *The Oracle of the Dead* (Williams 1900: 262-281).

<sup>12</sup> See Robert Brawley's article 'Resistance to the carnivalization of Jesus: Scripture in the Lucan Passion Narrative' for an account of what he sees as evidence for the carnivalesque in the cultural repertoire of Luke-Acts (Brawley 1995: 36).

<sup>13</sup> The view taken by Burridge, Stanton and others that regards the Gospel of Luke, as part of the canonical Gospels, as an ancient biography is challenged in Chapter 4 of this thesis.

era was marked by the emergence of a number of mystery cults, entered into by people searching for a religious life that could fill spiritual needs in a more personal manner than the compulsory state religion of Rome. Furthermore, as a result of the destruction of Jerusalem, there was a move by Jews, as well as by members of the new Christian sect, to reformulate and consolidate their identity within the Roman Empire under whose rule they had to survive. The latter was at that stage recovering from a civil war and a rapid succession of Emperors,<sup>14</sup> and at the same time plagued by the rebellion of some of its provinces.<sup>15</sup> One can speak of a 'threshold' period in terms of religious and political identity. The Romance, on the other hand, tells a story of love, marriage and fidelity at a time in the Ancient Near East when radical changes had taken place in terms of the individual's position in society as a result of the city-state having been replaced by empire. According to the opinion of some scholars, people were looking to private concerns rather than to civic affairs to find meaning in life.<sup>16</sup>

One can say that neither the Gospel of Luke nor *Chaereas and Callirhoe* display what Bakhtin calls epic distance.<sup>17</sup> The characters in *Chaereas and Callirhoe* are placed in not-too-remote history, and are described in a familiar light.<sup>18</sup> The Gospel story is set over a period of roughly thirty years in Palestine in a fairly recent past in relation to the estimated time of writing of the text.<sup>19</sup> Both texts are what Bakhtin would call heterogeneous in as far as other genres are freely inserted into them when needed, as, for example, the sermon, the parable and sayings in Luke, and the soliloquy and the rhetorical oration in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*. Both texts quote or paraphrase passages from earlier canonical texts,<sup>20</sup> often rendering the quoted text in the verse form of the older text within the prose narrative. In terms of character portrayal, one can say that, especially in Luke, ordinary people are depicted in a serious light.<sup>21</sup> Eating and drinking, signifying temporary, celebratory abundance, features in both texts, as does the

<sup>14</sup> After his suicide, Nero was succeeded by Galba (68-9 CE), Otho (69 CE), Vitellius (69 CE), and then Vespasian (69-79 CE), Titus (79-81 CE) and Domitian (81-96 CE) (Tacitus 1964: 321-25)

<sup>15</sup> Described in Tacitus' *Histories*.

<sup>16</sup> See Reardon (1989: 7). See also Morgan (1994: 8) concerning the connections which scholars have made between ancient novels and the mystery cults.

<sup>17</sup> Epic distance in the Bakhtinian sense means that the subject matter of a text lies in the absolute past of myth and legend (Bakhtin 1984: 108).

<sup>18</sup> See, for example, the depiction of the Persian King (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* VI. 3).

<sup>19</sup> The Gospel of Luke is dated between 80-85 CE (Fitzmyer: 472).

<sup>20</sup> The Romance quotes, to a large extent, from Homer, while the Gospel, directly, indirectly or by implication, links itself firmly to the writings of the Hebrew Bible throughout the narrative, often via the *Septuagint*. This is discussed extensively in Chapter 3 of this thesis.

<sup>21</sup> Auerbach's theory (1953: 35-7) on this issue has been noted above.

supernatural element, which can be related to the fantastic aspects of the Menippeia.<sup>22</sup> Symbolic crowning and de-crowning, at the core of Bakhtin's carnivalistic sense of the world, can be traced in both texts, to a large extent driving the plot forward, signifying life's shifts and constant changes brought about by the movement of time. Crowning and de-crowning imply spectacle, scandal and crowd involvement, all of which play a role in the Romance as well as in the Gospel.

### *Chaereas and Callirhoe and the carnivalesque*

Even though the story of *Chaereas and Callirhoe* takes place in an historical setting, the names and broader actions having recognisable counterparts in historiographical writings, critical opinion does not seem to put the fictionality (the use of free invention) of this text into question.<sup>23</sup> While the classicist, Reardon, representing the prevailing view, does draw attention to the difficulty of assessing a number of texts, texts that scholars have broadly grouped with the Greek Romance, in terms of fiction versus historiography,<sup>24</sup> he does not class any of the five central extant texts as falling within this category (Reardon 1989:3).<sup>25</sup> He states that while a text like *Chaereas and Callirhoe* does contain elements of history, it freely makes use of anachronisms, the accurate representation of an earlier epoch not being its aim. Later Greek Romances, also making use of the historical aura, show even 'less historical conscience.'<sup>26</sup> Reardon suggests that the use of the historical setting may have been an attempt to raise the status of the stories of the Greek Romance, as historiography was considered more intellectually respectable than fiction, or alternatively, that a recognisable setting may have brought the story closer, making it more attractive (Reardon 1989: 8).<sup>27</sup>

<sup>22</sup> See Decock, who discusses the significance of the ritual of the breaking of bread in the Gospel of Luke as denoting abundance, as a prayer, as a way of revelation concerning the death and resurrection of Jesus, and as anticipating the eschatological banquet (Decock 2002: 39-55).

<sup>23</sup> Graham Anderson takes the view that the plot of *Chaereas and Callirhoe* operates like those in New Comedy (suggesting fictionality), doing so against a carefully defined historical background (Anderson 1982: 17). He refers to Rohde's view of this Romance as an 'historical novel,' designed for naïve readers (Anderson 1982: 113, n.48).

<sup>24</sup> For example, *The Greek Alexander Romance*.

<sup>25</sup> The five complete, extant texts are *Chaereas and Callirhoe* by Chariton, *Leucippe and Clitophon* by Achilles Tatius, *An Ephesian Tale* by Xenophon of Ephesus, *Daphnis and Chloe* by Longus and *An Ethiopian Story* by Heliodorus.

<sup>26</sup> See *Leucippe and Clitophon* by Achilles Tatius, and *An Ethiopian Story* by Heliodorus.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Sarah Ruden's assessment of the *Satyricon* by Petronius as an 'entirely' fictional text set in a recognisable historical setting. Produced ca. 65 CE, it is usually classified with the Greek Romance, although written in Latin (Ruden 2000: 131).

Whatever the case, if one is to follow this opinion, one can consider *Chaereas and Callirhoe* to be a text that has been constructed in the spirit of free invention, the author having made use of an historical setting as a literary device. The element of invention, liberated from the constraints of history and verisimilitude, can be identified as a carnivalistic feature. As the story makes use of various genres, interacting with them, as well as with the context of contemporary reality, it can be compared to the pageants in the celebration of carnival. The latter play with and challenge the reality of everyday life by substituting an alternative version, which may be parodic or utopian.<sup>28</sup> The fictional aspect functions as a 'time out', creating a space in which rules of verisimilitude and historical veracity are temporarily suspended to enable the free run of the story.

The great number of festivities, lavishly described in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, greatly contributes to the carnival sense of 'time out' and utopian abundance. These celebrations include the whole population. The story begins with a festival in honour of Aphrodite, the goddess of love. The festival provides an occasion that is conducive to new love relationships, opening the way to new life. Banquets and feasts are held at every possible occasion in the course of the story. Alternating between weddings and funerals, these can be seen as an overall manifestation symbolizing the ongoing cycle of life, death and renewal, which is also at the core of many of the adventures. They embody the carnival sense of all consuming and renewing time. The trial scenes between these celebrations stir up a sense of threshold suspense. Thus, a huge wedding is mounted for Chareas and Callirhoe at the start of the story, soon to be followed by a very emotional trial scene, in turn followed by Callirhoe's funeral. The next spectacular feast is Callirhoe's wedding with Dionysius, to be followed not long after by the 'mock' funeral of Chaereas. Not only is the trial in Babylon spectacularly sensational, but the suspense experienced by the crowd (and the reader) is heightened as the King interrupts the trial by artificially inserting yet another festival (featuring a royal hunt) as a device to win Callirhoe for himself. The crowd eagerly expects another wedding, namely that of Callirhoe, to whichever of her two husbands is chosen by the King as the legitimate one. The

---

<sup>28</sup> See Winkler's argument that the ideal of the Greek Romance, namely, that love and fidelity (culminating in everlasting bliss in marriage) is not representative of what was happening in real life, in which marriage was an arrangement to safeguard property while erotic love usually occurred outside marriage. Winkler suggests that the Romance may be a manifestation of a longing for the combination of marriage and this ideal kind of love, and that the Romance, in turn, may have had an impact on social reality (Winkler 1994: 23-39). Seen from this angle, one could see the story of *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, which ends happily for the lovers, as an utopian double of the real world, as a carnivalistic alternative.

expectation of this feast is rudely broken off by the announcement of war containing the possibility of random death. When all seems lost, a renewal occurs unexpectedly (effected by divine intervention), culminating not in a new wedding but in the lavishly celebrated restoration of the original marriage relationship that is to last for ever. We thus have wedding, funeral, wedding, funeral, suspense of expected wedding, fear of possible death, deliverance from fear of death, reinstatement of original wedding and a utopian universal reconciliation as a happy ending.

If one is to look for the Menippean ultimate question or idea that is being tested, one can say that this is true conjugal love. Can the latter survive against all the evil forces that conspire to destroy it? The main bearer of this idea is Callirhoe, who features as the primary protagonist. This set-up can be seen in the light of inversion. In epic (classical) narrative, love in itself does not usually feature as the main topic. Rather, it is placed in a subordinate position to the deeds of the hero. Although love does feature prominently in lyrical poetry, it is not usually marital love that is in question. The type of love in this romance (and in other romances) differs from that featuring in love poetry in that it does not consist of the languishing love that the writer directs at the beloved, who may not even know about it. In this case love flares up instantaneously in both lovers, and is mutually declared within the first couple of pages of the romance. The rest of the story consists of the adventures that keep the lovers apart from each other, finally leading to a public triumph of the relationship at the end. In our story Callirhoe and Chaereas, like the Menippean hero, are the embodiment of this love. They are taken away from their homeland and undergo many adventures and trials. Each situation, posing a test to their integrity and fidelity, is a test of the integrity and resilience of love itself. The protagonists feature only in terms of this love relationship, as do all their adventures.

The ideal novel (or the *adventure novel of ordeal*, as Bakhtin refers to it) has not often been associated by scholars with humour, the novels of Petronius and Apuleius having been regarded as 'comic' novels. However, looking at the underlying carnivalistic movement and the number of carnivalistic inversions in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, a humorous treatment of many of the situations as well as of the characters by the author becomes apparent. Graham Anderson points out the element of humour in his book, *Eros Sophistes*, in which he sets out to examine the comic element in the ancient novel as a whole, suggesting that one of the reasons why this had not been done earlier is that

scholars had been preoccupied with the question of origins (Graham Anderson 1982: vii). His view is that should *Chaereas and Callirhoe* be regarded as linked to romantic historiography it will be read as serious melodrama, taking into account the potentially tragic motif of the presumed death of lovers, capture by unscrupulous pirates and the separation of the lovers. However, in comparing the story to Menander's *Sicyonius*, which also uses the motif of the young woman captured by pirates sold into slavery in Caria, and bought there by a rich Greek, the novel's indebtedness to New Comedy (and thus to the comic element) becomes apparent. Anderson points out many aspects in the novel to demonstrate how Chariton counterbalances the pathos of the situation with humour. He shows this on the level of situational incongruence,<sup>29</sup> in the use of dramatic irony,<sup>30</sup> the handling of both major and minor characters, seeing their self-interest as a comic feature.<sup>31</sup> Even the way the plot is set against the carefully defined historical background, 'Love and fourth-century politics are allowed to mix in a blithely incongruous way' (1982: 17) is a source of amusement in his view (Anderson 1982: 13-21).

Situational incongruence, dramatic irony, the humorous depiction of the self-interest displayed by the characters, and the blithely incongruous way that love and fourth-century politics are allowed to mix, described by Anderson, can all be seen in the light of Bakhtin's carnivalistic world view. They all imply a double, and thus a double-voicedness. Situational incongruence suggests that there is a norm. Dramatic irony suggests that the reader is aware of something that the character does not see. A humorous depiction of self-interest acts as a parody, while the 'blithely incongruous way of mixing love and fourth-century politics' is an inversion, the concerns of politics serving the concerns of love, poking fun at the seriousness of historiography. These aspects can be seen as the carnivalistic ambivalence that is integral to the novel, as laughter accompanies the seriousness of testing the central idea of conjugal love.

---

<sup>29</sup> An example is the fact that Callirhoe's suitors, all tyrants, form a democratic assembly in order to destroy the marriage (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* I. 2).

<sup>30</sup> For example, how each lover mourns the death of the beloved, while both are, in fact, alive (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* III. 6, IV. 1).

<sup>31</sup> The King of Persia reasons with himself that it would be nothing less than impiety for him not to be interested in Callirhoe (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* VI. I). The robber, Theron, decides for himself that it would be more just for Callirhoe's funeral wealth to belong to the living (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* I. 7).

*Chaereas and Callirhoe* makes use of *syncrisis* by displaying two different domains, two carnivalistic doubles that interact with one another via the protagonists: the utopia of Hermocrates' Syracuse, and the imperfect world of the Persian Empire. Syracuse constitutes what everyone would wish for. It has a noble battle in its history, a battle that repelled the power-grabbing Athenians whom not even the Persian King could subdue. For all his success and strength, Hermocrates is no despot. The people are in harmony with him, and he with them. He listens to them whenever they beg him to show mercy to Chaereas, even when it concerns his own daughter, showing unbelievable forbearance. First he gives his daughter in marriage to the man who is her choice (instead of his own). Then he shows compassion to that very man, who has 'killed' Callirhoe in a fit of jealousy, even supporting him in his efforts to find her again. He does, however, distinguish between Chaereas and the real criminal, Theron (a figure that does not belong to either kingdom, sowing evil as he moves between them), whom he is adamant in punishing, thus upholding justice (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* III. 4). Syracuse is the country that the heroine, Callirhoe, longs for, the country that is her point of reference as she is taken further and further away from it. In her thoughts and lamentations she refers to her father, Hermocrates, as the one constant and just person (not prey to the usual human weaknesses) with whom she identifies herself, sustaining herself by the knowledge of his existence in times of despair. Syracuse is where happiness begins, and where it is fully restored, giving final vindication and sanctuary to the reunited lovers (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* I. 11, 14; V. 1, VI. 6, VIII. 6). This depiction can be seen as an inversion of the legendary norm, in which the large, powerful nation (which, in this case, would be the Persian Empire and its Great King, referred to as such by the whole ancient world) would be described in terms of heroic splendour, fabulous riches, justice, and as the universal power that civilizes the surrounding world. In this case, however, it is the small Syracuse that is depicted with a heroic history, as displaying true justice and harmony, with no ambitions to conquer its surrounding countries, ruled by a man who has no great titles but with whom the Great (Persian) King compares rather unfavourably as he displays the usual human weaknesses and vices. Callirhoe, embodying the utopia of Syracuse in terms of perfect beauty and goodness, can be seen as a temporary threshold figure between the two worlds as she interacts with individuals of the Persian Kingdom and is an inspiration to its crowds.

*Luke and the carnivalesque*

The comparison of two kingdoms (one perfect, one imperfect) with a temporary threshold figure between the two is also presented in the Gospel of Luke, although there is a vast difference in terms of emphasis. *Chaereas and Callirhoe* shows two geographical/political kingdoms side by side, of which one can be seen as an ideal kingdom (seen, largely, through the eyes of the heroine), while the other is not ideal because it is a country that is foreign to the protagonists and in which they do not enjoy the status that they have in their homeland. There is never an active battle between the two, nor do their differences have any effect on plot action. The kingdoms function, rather, as the setting for the story in which the protagonists battle to survive the forces that threaten their lives and their love for one another. The Gospel of Luke, on the other hand, presents its story in the context of a metaphysical battle between the Kingdom of God and the forces of evil that hold sway over the kingdoms of this world.<sup>32</sup> Instead of being a part of the setting, the Kingdom of God is the protagonist, manifest in the form of Jesus.<sup>33</sup> While the heroes of the *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, struggling for their own concerns, are at the mercy of the divine beings to whom they appeal, the protagonist of the Gospel does not battle for himself, but acts as the agent for the deity that he represents. That we are witnessing a battle (a universal life and death struggle), rather than a story that simply announces good news, is introduced gradually. Only in retrospect does it become apparent that a battle is implied in the text from the very beginning, as for example, when Gabriel tells Mary that her son will reign over the house of Jacob forever, and that ‘of his kingdom<sup>34</sup> there will be no end’ (Lk 1: 33). It is also evident in Mary’s poem of praise (Lk 1: 46-55), in Zechariah’s prophecy (Lk 1: 68-79), and in the frequent use of the word ‘saviour’. The battle surfaces into visibility as the narrative continues. John the Baptist heralds it, quoting the prophet Isaiah, and projects the image of a modification of nature itself to emphasize the momentous impact of the power of the Lord that he proclaims is about to come into effect (Lk 3: 3-6). Power carries the

---

<sup>32</sup>The Devil claims that the authority of the kingdoms of the world has been given over to him (Lk 3: 6). This does not necessarily have to be the truth, given that the statement is made by a character within the text (and one viewed as a liar within the tradition), but it could be. The scene is thus set for ambiguity.

<sup>33</sup> Jesus can be seen as both the proclaimer and the embodiment of the Kingdom of God, if one thinks along the Bakhtinian notion of the protagonist being the embodiment of the idea that is being propagated in a Menippean text.

<sup>34</sup> In the context of this story, which concerns the promise of a victory in the future, the very word ‘kingdom’ implies past and potential future battles.

implication of an enemy that has to be overcome. The image is answered a little later by Jesus' quotation from Isaiah (Is 61: 1-2), which can be seen as a parallel to John's quotation in human terms (Lk 4: 18-19), as Jesus claims the power to set right the evils that prevail in this world. We thus, first have, a vision of a levelling out of nature, and then one of the setting-right of the ills of this world. While Luke 3: 3-6 predicts a Lord that is reminiscent of the image of the divine warrior in Exodus 15: 1-18 and Zechariah 14: 3-4, Luke 4: 18-19 foreshadows that the 'divine warrior' of the Gospel will feature in a different manner. Instead of momentous feats in terms of modifying nature, Jesus will send good news to the poor, proclaim release to the captives, recovery of sight to the blind, and freedom to the oppressed.

The battle becomes increasingly visible as the story progresses (Lk 10: 17-19),<sup>35</sup> reaching a climax in the trial scene and the Passion of Jesus. Just as all is lost (signifying a triumph for the kingdom of the Devil manifested in the kingdom of the world that he dominates), Jesus is resurrected by divine intervention. Re-validated in his identity, he appears to his disciples and ascends to Heaven, signifying a visible triumph for the Kingdom of God. In line with Bakhtin's view of Menippean texts, however, the final conclusion of the battle is still open. The kingdoms of this world continue to exist as before. As yet there is only a promise of their imminent destruction to make way for the permanent reign of the Kingdom of God on earth. In the interim the followers of Jesus are left with his command to spread the news to all nations, in order to propagate the Kingdom of God, to prepare for its final fulfilment, and thus have a way of conducting their own lives.

The merging of the metaphysical concept (the battle between the forces of good and evil) with the practical, quotidian matters of the life and people that Jesus interacts with in this dramatic presentation can be seen in the light of what Bakhtin refers to as 'the organic combination of the free fantastic, the symbolic, at times even a mystical-religious element with an extreme ... *slum naturalism* ...' in texts of the Menippean variety. 'The idea here', Bakhtin goes on to say, 'fears no slum ... the man of the idea – the wise man – collides with worldly evil, depravity, baseness in their most extreme expression' (Bakhtin 1984: 115). It can be seen as a literary example of the *mésalliance* that Bakhtin

<sup>35</sup> The phrase 'power of the enemy' (*echthros*) is mentioned in Luke 10: 19. There is a sense of the impending climax of the battle when Jesus delegates his healing powers, first to the disciples, and then to seventy others, giving a sense of the gathering of forces (Lk 9: 1-6, 10: 1-12). Also, as the battle intensifies, Jesus' statements become increasingly radical as he predicts destruction (Lk 17: 24-37, 21: 5-24, 23: 29-31).

refers to in carnival proper. The idea under scrutiny in the Gospel is the concept of the coming Kingdom of God that (in the form of Jesus) collides with the worldly reality of the authoritarian structures of both the Roman Empire and the current authority of the religious establishment of the people of Israel within those structures. Leprosy and other diseases, death, physical maltreatment, poverty, betrayal for money, and petty argumentation can be seen to correspond to Bakhtin's 'slum naturalism'.

In terms of the method of representing the Gospel's central concern with ultimate questions, one can note that the mechanisms of both the Menippea and the Socratic Dialogue are brought into play. *Syncretism* is effected by the dramatic presentation of Jesus as the embodiment of the Kingdom of God alongside the everyday reality of the kingdom of this world. Furthermore, ultimate questions are openly displayed in sayings (that are in dialogue with other known sayings by implication),<sup>36</sup> as well as in actual dialogues in the text, some of which consist of questions being answered by questions (*anacrisis*).<sup>37</sup> Included are fundamental existential problems, such as whether the life-creating force of good exists; whether it is directed by a deity who is subjectively involved with the existence of a people on earth; whether that force has the power, not only to overcome the evil of this world, but also to provide an afterlife in which there is an ultimate levelling out of all the injustices of life on earth; and whether it is possible to trust and follow the authority of an unseen (apart from Jesus himself) kingdom above the patent reality of the harsh authority of the kingdoms of the historical, earthly world of human existence. These and other questions are embodied in this story within an overall cycle of life, death and renewal both on the concrete, physical level (in the form of Jesus' worldly birth, life, death and resurrection), as well as in the form of a promise on the metaphysical level manifest in the prophecy of the eschatological judgement (destruction) with the subsequent triumphal take-over by the Kingdom of God of the whole world (renewal) (Lk 21: 7-28).

One can argue that the very way in which this battle is presented is a carnivalistic alternative to the norm. While there is a protagonist (God, represented by the Holy Spirit, the angels, the prophets and Jesus) and an antagonist (Satan as himself, as well as represented by the demons and earthly authorities), there is no open battle in the sense of

<sup>36</sup> The question of intertextuality is the subject of Chapter 3.

<sup>37</sup> For example, Lk 20: 1-8.

two armies of epic proportions gathering on both sides to meet in a head-on collision. Instead, the antagonist is combated by a protagonist who employs his own timing, alternative strategies (as, for example, Jesus' birth in obscurity), and weapons (Jesus' teaching and the non-violent nature of his *modus operandi* in the face of an enemy that is in power by means of military force). Comparable instances, in this respect, would be David's encounter with Goliath (1 Samuel 17: 38-49), when the latter is attacked by a strategy and weapon that he is not prepared for, and Odysseus' outwitting of Polyphemus, the Cyclops.<sup>38</sup> In each case there is a ridiculing of the superior physical might (that normally inspires fear) of the antagonist. Only once do we witness a face to face encounter between the protagonist (in the form of Jesus) and the antagonist in the Gospel of Luke, and that is conducted in words only (Lk 4: 1-13).

Although the setting of this story is not a fully-fledged version of the Menippean three-planed construction,<sup>39</sup> the latter is certainly made use of. In the main, the story takes place on a geographical/historical plane in this world, which is the visible battleground. The upper, Heavenly plane is indicated by the presence of God who, although not visible, is in his traditional position in Heaven,<sup>40</sup> as is evident from the voice from above in Luke 3:22. One can assume that his emissaries, such as the angels, come from that upper plane. Jesus is 'carried up into Heaven' at the end (Lk 24: 51). He prophesies that the Son of Man will appear in a cloud, denoting a space above the world (Lk 21: 27). Projections that he makes into the future concerning the kingdom of Heaven include the concrete images of eating and drinking and sitting on thrones (Lk 13: 29, 22: 16-18, 30). His life and work can be regarded in the light of a threshold dialogue between this world and the world above, a brief sojourn on earth before he returns to Heaven. His own references to this future event lend a sense of urgency and a testamentary significance to everything he says.

The dominion of Satan appears to be in the netherworld, indicated by the demons that beg Jesus not to send them back into the abyss (Lk 8: 31). Satan himself is presented as a supernatural figure. Like the Holy Spirit he can enter people (Lk 22: 3). He also appears

---

<sup>38</sup> Homer, *Odyssey*, Book IX.

<sup>39</sup> We do not see what Heaven and Hades look like from inside, nor do we watch the actions of the beings that exist in them.

<sup>40</sup> As it is understood in the Hebrew Bible. The Greek and Roman gods are also pictured as residing in a place above mortals.

to Jesus, rather in the same way as the angels appear and speak to other humans (Lk 4: 3-14). He is capable of performing supernaturally (Lk 4: 3-14). He is reported as having fallen from Heaven like a flash of lightning,<sup>41</sup> and is associated by Jesus with snakes and scorpions (Lk 10: 18-19). Furthermore, Jesus prophesies that Capernaum will be brought down to Hades (Lk 10: 15), and presents all three planes of the construction in his story about the rich man and Lazarus (Lk 16: 19-31).

The three-planed construction fits in with Bakhtin's description of the Menippean use of free invention as a means of opening up the possibility of creating unusual situations, and of viewing the world on a broad scale for the sake of testing an idea. A particular instance is when the Devil takes Jesus to a place from where he can see all the kingdoms of the world, and to the pinnacle of the Temple (Lk 4: 5-9). The three-planed construction gives a wider framework to the story, putting a belittling perspective on the might of worldly power structures. The frequent supernatural occurrences throughout the story as a whole<sup>42</sup> are further testimony to the use of invention, serving to create situations that are necessary for presenting the primary concern of the Gospel, namely the propagating and testing of the concept of the coming Kingdom of God. Invention can be linked to two carnivalesque phenomena: the concept of 'time out', a suspension of the rules of verisimilitude for the sake of allowing the free run of the story in whatever way is needed to serve its own particular purpose, and the creating of an alternative version of the everyday as a way of challenging it.

A further Menippean feature, according to Bakhtin, is the *idea* as the protagonist of the narrative. The hero, to whom it is organically tied, is placed into specific situations for the purpose of testing it. One could say that in the Gospel Jesus' struggle represents the struggle of the concept of the Kingdom of God within the kingdoms of this world. The existence of this coming kingdom hangs on the veracity of his identity in this story, and whether he acts accordingly. His trial revolves around the question of his identity rather

---

<sup>41</sup> Luke 10: 18 implies that Satan originally came from above (or was there wrongfully), and had fallen out of favour. The accompanying lightning is an ambiguous image. It could be seen as a weapon of God's anger and justice, linking the concept to pagan religion. It could also be a sign of Satan's anger, suggesting destructive consequences, making the battle more intense for Jesus and his followers.

<sup>42</sup> Of the twenty-four chapters in Luke there are only Chapters 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 19 and 20 (seven) that have no supernatural occurrences in the narrative. Of these, Chapter 10 records Jesus as implying a supernatural occurrence by reporting the fall of Satan from Heaven. The remaining six chapters are taken up with his teachings.

than any actual criminal action. Apart from the test embodied by the narrative as a whole (whether he calms the storm, raises people from the dead, or submits to suffering and death), there are individual instances of actual testing throughout the story.<sup>43</sup> For example, he undergoes a testing by the Devil that lasts for forty days; this scene functions as the immediate prologue to his ministry.<sup>44</sup>

The presentation of Jesus in action can be likened to the carnival figures of the clown, the rogue and the fool, figures that function to expose evil and hypocrisy within current authoritarian structures. In Bakhtinian terms, Jesus carries the features of the rogue, insofar as he does not fit into any of the conventional slots allowed for by society (for example, one can note that he does not let himself be appropriated even as a family man) (Lk 8: 21). Although at times addressed as 'teacher' (*didaskalos*), also teaching in synagogues and the Temple, he does not conform to the rules of the teachers of the current establishment. He carries the features of the clown on account of his closeness to the crowds, performing his miracles in full view of them, always on their side against the elite, at times uttering sayings that are not immediately understood (carnivalistic mystifications) (Lk 8: 9-10, 18: 32-4). He speaks with an authority that bypasses the authority of the ruling establishment. In his home synagogue he claims that God is not only concerned for the Jewish people, but also for the Gentiles (Lk 4: 23-7). Although he does not actually wear a mask (other than that of a human being), his full identity cannot be apprehended. In line with this type of figure, his visibility coincides with the fulfilling of his mission (function). He carries the features of the fool in terms of having absolutely no interest in any gain for himself, or in defending himself, as for example, at his trial. Possessing no material goods than the clothes he wears, he creates his own chronotope around himself as he moves from place to place. Even his trial and death fit into this, occurring in accordance with the prophecies that he utters. Compared with the heroic figures that appear in classical literature,<sup>45</sup> Jesus is closer to the wise man in a servile

---

<sup>43</sup> See Achtemeier who, in looking at Jesus' miracles from a Lucan perspective, notes that, of the Gospel writers, Luke appears to place a more unambiguous reliance on the possibility of miracles as serving as a basis for faith in Jesus (Achtemeier 1975: 547-562).

<sup>44</sup> Lk 4: 2. The actual word, 'test' (*peirasto* or *ekpeirasto*), referring to Jesus, appears a few of times in this Gospel (4: 2, 10: 25, 11: 16).

<sup>45</sup> For example, if one is to look at the heroes of Homer's *Iliad*, one finds that military courage and pride is highly valued in the young men, while the men of wisdom are older, holding an official position of authority in their society. Jesus, on the other hand, is portrayed as a young man of authoritative wisdom, outside the official system (far removed from any military interests), who challenges hierarchical structures while identifying himself with those who serve, rather than with those who are served (Lk 22: 25-27).

position that Bakhtin associates with the heroes of the Menippea (Bakhtin 1984: 118-119), or to the Cynic hero, like the founder of that movement, Diogenes.

Having placed the Gospel within the context of the Menippea, I shall experimentally treat this text in itself as a carnivalistic space, a 'time out', which, on the one hand, challenges what usually inspires fear, like death and the harsh reality as a result of current power structures, while, on the other hand, providing the reader (or listener) with a temporary respite from that reality.<sup>46</sup> The ruling establishment, especially the religious one, is parodied in this text,<sup>47</sup> while the concept of the Kingdom of God can be seen as a carnivalistic utopia, portrayed as a force that is capable of renewing everyday reality. Like life, this kingdom (an alternative life) is in a state of movement. Although termed a kingdom, suggesting a territory, it is not rigidly fitted into the Menippean three-plane construction of the story, but is shown to be changeable in form, dimension, shape and location. One assumes that it is the place where Jesus comes from, and to which he ascends.<sup>48</sup> At the same time, it is also embodied by him, and thus actively present among people on this earth (Lk 17: 20, 19: 41-4), presenting a temporary, carnivalistic 'time out' for those who encounter him. Jesus' miracles can be seen in the light of a suspension of the laws of nature (Lk 9: 21-22, 18: 31-33, 24: 25-26, 24: 51<sup>49</sup>). Furthermore, the Kingdom of God is a promise of a state of being and becoming, a time when universal justice will prevail, a state that is not only worth struggling for in terms of changing the world, but also a state that has to be entered into to attain eternal life.

Carnivalistic movements and images of inversion act as a leaven, according to Bakhtin, to challenge, revolutionize and renew the reality of the norm that is imprisoned in rigid, monologic structures. The central image in the Gospel is the central image of carnival: the crowning and de-crowning of the carnival king, the gesture that symbolizes the changing state of human existence within all-consuming and all-renewing time.

Following Jesus throughout the narrative, one can trace a movement of upliftment and

---

<sup>46</sup> One can note that the estimated production of this text, as well as the setting, is during a period of general political upheaval and of extreme crisis for the people in the province of Judea.

<sup>47</sup> The Pharisees, Elders, priests and lawyers, normally in a position of authority, are usually made to look unpleasant, ruthless, hypocritical, and even ridiculous in their encounter with Jesus. See especially, the trial scene (Lk 22: 1-6, 50-53, 66, and 23: 1-23).

<sup>48</sup> Jesus makes promises of a future when those who enter the kingdom will eat and drink at his table (Lk 22: 28).

<sup>49</sup> See also Luke 4: 19, 5: 33-35, 9: 26, and 22: 28.

degradation of his person throughout. In the first three chapters, in which his life span is shown from before his conception to the time when he begins his work, we see him carefully installed by divine intervention as a king (God will give him the throne of his ancestor, David), the *anointed one*, the Lord, the son of the God that is worshipped in the Temple, a *saviour* and the son of the voice from Heaven (Lk 1:32-33, 2: 8-11, 2: 11, 2: 49, 3: 22). This status is supported by the sayings of selected, enlightened humans (in terms of the Gospel, not in terms of the worldly establishment), namely, Elizabeth, Mary, Zechariah, the shepherds, Simeon, Anna, the teachers in the Temple and John the Baptist (Lk 1: 43, 1: 46-55, 1: 69, 2: 17-20, 2: 25-32, 2: 36-38, 3: 16). Within all this, there is, carnival-like, also a foretaste of the degradations to follow, in the form of the circumstances of Jesus' birth in a stable, which, however, is immediately followed by divine confirmation of his kingship by the appearance of the angels. The effect is that of a king in hiding,<sup>50</sup> not yet recognised by the unenlightened. Jesus fends off an attempt by the Devil to unseat him from this carefully established position at the brink of his mission, the first overt round of the battle between the Kingdom of God and its supernatural adversary.

After this introduction<sup>51</sup> the crownings and de-crownings are usually effected by human agency, by the people, a manifestation closer to the gesture of carnival proper. The first crowning occurs in Nazareth as Jesus announces his mission in the words of the prophet, Isaiah, which is followed by a swift de-crowning (Lk 4: 20-30). To begin with, the people in the synagogue are impressed with him. Their attitude changes when he tells them something they do not want to hear, namely, that God's concern is not exclusively for the Jewish people. As Jesus goes on to perform miracles and preach the Kingdom of God, always on the move, close to the crowd that moves with him, the latter uplifts him repeatedly. Between these incidents he is rejected by the people of the Gerasenes (Lk 8: 26-36).<sup>52</sup> Members of the establishment intermittently try to pull him down to discredit him, while the crowd raises him up high with increasing volume. At one stage this voice

---

<sup>50</sup> This image has a long literary history. Examples are the birth and childhood of Zeus in the Greek myth (Graves 1959: 91), the birth and childhood of Moses (Exodus 2: 1-10), and 'Oedipus (Graves 1957: 192). It is a common feature in the Greek Romance (Longus, *Daphne and Chloe*, Heliodoros, *Aethiopica*).

<sup>51</sup> In the light of rhetorical strategy this can be interpreted as an encouragement to the reader to take Jesus' divinely ordained kingship as a given (to take 'time out' from scepticism), and follow his subsequent actions with this in mind.

<sup>52</sup> Although, like the reaction of the demons, their reaction (fear) constitutes a recognition of him as a being from another world (supernatural), which is, in effect, a crowning.

is even augmented by that of the narrator, who starts referring to Jesus as *the Lord* (Lk 7: 19). Soon after Peter has actually named him the *Messiah* (Lk 9: 20), the disciples are confirmed in this assessment by the divine intervention of the Transfiguration (Lk 9: 28-36). As Jesus advances on Jerusalem, crowd celebration is intensified, with a concomitant effort on the part of the establishment to pull him down, signifying the steady intensification of the battle. We then see a climactic crowning as he enters the city:

Blessed is the king  
Who comes in the name of the Lord  
Peace in Heaven  
And glory in the highest  
Heaven (Lk 19: 38).<sup>53</sup>

The final de-crowning soon follows, with the rapid succession of his arrest, trial, passion, death and burial, epitomized by the crowd's 'Crucify, crucify him' (Lk 23: 21). This is followed by a crowning by divine means in the form of Jesus' resurrection and ascension. Upliftment and degradation is the principal element of the text as a whole, in the narrative, the teachings, and in the choice of images.

Within this larger overall movement there are numerous occurrences of other crownings and de-crownings throughout, in line with the complexities of the image as such. I shall briefly refer to the final de-crowning curve. Jesus de-crowns himself in terms of his physical, human existence at the last meal with his disciples by the act of dissolving and disintegrating the concept of his body and blood (his worldly being) into the material bread and wine that he offers to his disciples. He symbolically abdicates from his life before it is taken from him by the kingdom of this world, in turn de-crowning the latter's show of power (to the reader). Furthermore, he identifies himself at that point with those who serve, encouraging his disciples to do the same. He rapidly crowns and de-crowns the latter in this scene as he first acknowledges their discipleship and friendship, promising them a future in the Kingdom of God, and then sharply brings Peter down to earth by predicting the latter's denial of him. Jesus suffers an actual mock crowning and

---

<sup>53</sup> This image of kingship is intensified by the fact that it is very similar to Zechariah 9: 9, part of an oracle, which also appears in verse. These two passages are discussed in more detail in Chapter 3 of this thesis in connection with the intertextual relations between Luke and Zechariah.

de-crowning at the hands of ‘the men who were holding him,’ and at the hands of Herod and his soldiers (Lk 22: 63, 23: 11).<sup>54</sup> This is an instance of the common carnival gesture in its cruel form, the kind that some of Bakhtin’s critics claim detract from the latter’s positive evaluation of carnival proper,<sup>55</sup> acts that are violent, funny to the performers but not to the recipients who are used as the ‘props’ for this performance. In this instance the image draws attention to the fact that carnival ritual is not just a harmless game, but that it affects life in real terms. This particular scene in the Gospel, in which the actual body of the ‘king’ is maltreated, deepens the sense of outrage that increases as the story continues, paradoxically emphasizing Jesus’ kingship and thus crowning him in the eyes of the reader. The essence of the image of the ongoing crowning/de-crowning phenomenon throughout the story is projected into unmistakable visibility in this scene, comparable to how the scene with the Devil in the desert displays the battle of the kingdoms. A miniature precursor to the crowning and de-crowning of the crucifixion, it also draws attention to the ambiguous nature of the image itself. Whether a crowning is a cynical act, performed by the establishment as a show of power in a spirit of complacency regarding the status quo, or an emotional one performed by the crowd, giving a glimpse of the possibility of a different type of society, thus disturbing and threatening the status quo, it is always double-voiced, in Bakhtin’s terms, containing the opposite of its purported effect within it. So, while the establishment invalidates Jesus by the mock crowning, the image itself raises awareness of claims of his kingship, questioning the kingship of worldly authority. On the other hand when the crowd raises him as king, the very act raises a sense of illegitimacy according to the rules of due worldly procedure, causing the kind of fear on the part of the establishment that responds with violence.

In terms of Bakhtin’s view of carnival proper, a whole society participates in the crowning and de-crowning action, a familiarization between the different social classes being a characteristic feature. In the Gospel, it appears at first that one cannot speak of familiarization in this ongoing image, as the two parts of the action are performed by separate entities. The divine world crowns Jesus, and confirms this crowning throughout. The power structures of the kingdoms of this world repeatedly attempt to de-crown him,

---

<sup>54</sup> Although there is no actual crown in this Gospel, the elegant robe that Herod puts on Jesus functions as the crowning symbol.

<sup>55</sup> See Dentith (1995: 74-75).

and succeed in the crucifixion. This can hardly be seen in line with carnival action. Rather, it can be seen as the manifestation of the metaphysical battle between good and evil. What changes the picture, however, is the presence of the crowd with its familiarizing effect and its unpredictable ambiguous reactions. Increasing in volume with the progression of the story, it is a force that ultimately sweeps individual reactions with it. As the Pharisees, the high priests, Roman soldiers, Pilate and Herod proceed to (cynically) crown and de-crown Jesus,<sup>56</sup> the crowd becomes partisan, in spite of its recent ecstatic crowning action when Jesus entered Jerusalem, thus endorsing the de-crowning. The disciples, who have eagerly participated in the crowning throughout the story, are also part of the de-crowning action at the end. Jesus is betrayed by one of the twelve people closest to him; he is left alone in his agony on the Mount of Olives; and he is denied by Peter. Everyone (including the disciples, who become submerged in the crowd) witnesses his crucifixion and death. Whatever private feelings there may be, these do not feature within the overall powerful action of the moment. Nevertheless, here too the dualistic nature of the image is a central component, even though the overall picture tips in favour of de-crowning. The act of 'beating their breasts' by the women, and later by the crowd as a whole, crowns and de-crowns simultaneously. While it lifts Jesus up in terms of affection, it signifies fear as a result of despairing in his power and thus in the power of the Kingdom of God. The representation of the two criminals (Lk 23: 39-43) is a concrete depiction of this ambiguity. Thus, while the overall de-crowning action triumphs at this stage, the possibility of a new crowning at a later stage is contained in it. Entrenched concepts of kingship, authority and criminality are destabilized and challenged in this scene.

Hand in hand with crowning and de-crowning go the elements of spectacle, scandal and inversion. As these often engender humour, while the Gospel is not, on the whole, referred to as a humorous text, I shall address this aspect briefly before pointing out selected instances of scandal and inversion.

To consider the carnivalesque without the element of laughter is just about impossible. It is difficult to imagine parody without a comic component. It has been mentioned above that ambivalent carnivalistic laughter, according to Bakhtin, is as old as carnival itself,

---

<sup>56</sup> To trap him, the high priests first accord him the right to say whether he is the Messiah or the Son of God, to then destroy him anyway. Pilate states his innocence and then hands him over for execution.

reaching all the way back to ritual laughter. Furthermore, he identifies the serio-*comic* (my emphasis) element as the common factor that binds the various genres of the Menippea together, the latter taking its name from satirical writing (Bakhtin 1984: 106-7, 112-113). And yet Bakhtin also contends that laughter itself is not an indispensable part of a carnivalized text, in spite of the latter's parodic nature. The humorous element appears differently in different periods, according to him. Thus he sees an increased comic element in the Menippea when compared with the Socratic Dialogue, and he sees laughter as breaking out openly in the carnival of the Renaissance. On the other hand he sees laughter as muffled in carnivalized literature of the eighteenth century, and reduced in works by Dostoevsky (Bakhtin 1984: 164-165). One can add to this that the alternative reality invented by carnivalistic inversion can take the form of a utopia that does not necessarily have to be comic, but simply functions comparatively as another possible version of life. Lastly, one can consider that not every facet of the multiform gesture of carnival proper is transposed into every carnivalized text.

Having said that, however, it is worth re-assessing the Gospel in terms of laughter.<sup>57</sup> If one is to find scandal scenes, inversions and spectacles within a general movement of crowning and de-crowning, it seems unlikely that there would be absolutely no trace of humour, also taking into account that we are looking at this text in the context of the period of the Menippea. One cannot speak of a general, open laughter on the part of the characters in the Gospel. The only implied laughter is that of those who mock Jesus. On the other hand one can consider that the serious demeanour of a parodied character, as for example a teacher of the law, in a particular situation can engender laughter on the part of the viewer, whether a member of the crowd within the story or a reader of it. Although the text does not specifically mention it, one can imagine that as Jesus 'de-crowns' members of the establishment by exposing their faults, the crowd witnessing this may well have felt a sense of relief, satisfaction, and even laughter. Added to this one can take into account that we are looking at this text from the perspective of roughly two thousand years after its appearance. A great deal of humour, especially parodic humour, is based on situations in a topical context, many of which we almost certainly do not know. One

---

<sup>57</sup> See the review by Michel Foley of Patrick Downey's *Serious Comedy. The Philosophical and Theological Significance of Tragic and Comic Writing in the Western Tradition*. Downey argues that the Bible is a comedy rather than a tragedy, even though tragic sections are contained in it. For example, Christ's tragic crucifixion is seen as only a low point in a three-part plot with a happy ending, the other parts being a happy beginning and a happy finale that eternally consummates the victory of the empty tomb in a new Heaven and a new earth (Foley 2003: 605-6).

could argue against this that the comic nature of a text like the *Satyricon* by Petronius (a text of the same era as the Gospel, regarded by Bakhtin as a Menippean satire in the form of a novel) is easily recognizable to a twentieth century reader. The Gospel certainly projects a very different atmosphere to that text, but this can be attributed to the difference of subject matter.<sup>58</sup> One can consider, however, that in later periods, like in medieval times, dramatized versions of the Gospel stories certainly accommodated the comic element, not to mention twentieth century film adaptations of the Gospel stories, like *Monty Python's The Life of Brian*.

Jesus' actions cause many a scandal in the course of preaching the Kingdom of God and healing the sick. Examples are the conflicts concerning healing on the Sabbath (Lk 6: 6-11), assigning himself the right to forgive sins (Lk 5: 17-26), the harsh words that he has to say to the Pharisees and the lawyers (Lk 11: 42-42), the fact that he takes his meals with perceived sinners (Lk 15: 1-2), and the expulsion of the commercial dealers from the Temple (Lk 19: 45). All these actions take place in full view of the people. What causes joy to the common people (possibly laughter) is the reason for much anger on the part of the establishment. Taken as a whole, one can say that this behaviour amounts to a carnivalistic provocation, eliciting behaviour from members of the establishment that exposes a side of their character and doctrinal beliefs that may normally be kept carefully hidden. In following his purpose of propagating the Kingdom of God, Jesus, like the clever fool, fearlessly challenges the validity of the laws of worldly power structures, not only by causing the latter to collide with the concept of the Kingdom of God, but also by actively implementing the principles of this kingdom in defiance of the rules of established power structures.

The scene of Jesus' birth must have provided a great spectacle to the shepherds in the text, as well as to the readers of it; so much so that it has been retained as a vivid image of the Christmas story throughout the centuries. In this case the spectacular aspect was dazzlingly provided by the supernatural in order to confirm Jesus' identity as the Messiah, the Lord, the future king whose birth had been prophesied by the angel Gabriel. It is the image of the language of the utopian concept of the Kingdom of God. If one were

---

<sup>58</sup> The *Satyricon* displays two characters who are persecuted by the god, Priapus (a minor fertility god), a subject that lends itself to rather bawdy humour. Any humour in the Gospel is likely to be caused by an inversion of a hierarchical given, which is also the case in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*. Both types of humour would be consistent with the Menippean.

to take away the element of the angels and the ‘the glory of the Lord’ (Lk 2: 9) that shone around them, one is left with a scandal (in terms of current moral practice) in the form of Mary’s pregnancy before marriage, and the ignominy of the location of Jesus’ birth, a carnivalistic inversion of what is expected of a royal birth. The latter would ideally be publicized in the context of splendour accompanied by a preoccupation with proof of legitimacy. The birth in the Gospel, on the other hand, signals a different type of order, one that ridicules the worship of worldly wealth, power structures and legitimacy. It may, in fact, be a parodic reference to a topical, historical matter. The scene is set in the reign of Caesar Augustus. The historical Augustus had not been hailed as the future king at the time of his birth and was never able to accept that title. It is recorded, however, that there were stories in circulation about special portents at the time of his birth, childhood and young adulthood that legitimated his future position as Emperor of Rome (Suetonius 1957: 104-80). The question of legitimacy was a problem for later Emperors as well.<sup>59</sup>

The scene in which Jesus reveals himself and his mission in the synagogue of his hometown, Nazareth, is an example of both spectacle and scandal, in this case, involving the worshippers (Lk 4: 16-30). As mentioned above, he is crowned and de-crowned in rapid succession. In fact, two events occur simultaneously. The scene can be regarded as an introductory depiction of the overall crowning/de-crowning movement that is to accompany Jesus’ ministry as a whole. First, he is accorded the status of a teacher, the people listening respectfully to hear what he has to say. Having read out the text from Isaiah, he then says something that they interpret as fitting into what they want to hear, namely that the promised release from hardship is near. As they admire him, they benevolently belittle him, keeping him in his place as *Joseph’s son* (rather than recognizing him as a prophet). Jesus shocks them out of their complacency, implying that he is a successor of the prophets of Hebrew scripture, while they are like the people in that same scripture who do not respect the proclamations of the very prophets that feature in their current religious practice. He points out that God, according to scripture, did not exclusively favour the people of Israel. His listeners react with such anger that they actually drive him out of town in order to kill him, thus verifying what he has exposed about them. The scandal lies in the fact that the religious establishment has been publicly

---

<sup>59</sup> Succeeding Emperors that the writer of Luke would probably have known about. For example, see the story of Gaius Caesar (Caligula) (Suetonius, *The Twelve Caesars* IV.7 ff.), and that of Galba (Tacitus, *The Histories* XII.12-22).

dislodged from its rigid complacency, lost face in terms of its authority, and has been exposed as having the potential to use naked violence to protect the status quo. In a carnivalistic sense one can say that the scene shows these people in a parodic light, turned inside out in respect of their usual behaviour. One can also speculate that a dramatic representation of this scene could certainly contain features of comedy by virtue of the shock brought about by a turning of tables between the people and Jesus.<sup>60</sup>

A sense of the comic, mingled with a sense of painful awkwardness, can be found in the next scene to be discussed in terms of scandal (Lk 7: 36-50). This is the scene where a woman

... in the city, who was a sinner, having learned that he [Jesus] was eating in the Pharisee's house, brought an alabaster jar of ointment. She stood behind him at his feet, weeping, and began to bathe his feet with her tears and to dry them with her hair. Then she continued kissing his feet and anointing them with the ointment... (Luke 7: 37-38).

Initially we have two crownings of Jesus. The Pharisee Simon invites him to his house for a meal, according him the status of a guest and a teacher, while the woman honours him by caressing his feet (itself presumably a divergence of the norm). Through this action it transpires that the crowning by the Pharisee was not a genuine one. Jesus had not been given the honours customarily afforded to a guest (the opportunity to wash his feet and a welcoming kiss), thus drawing a distinction (hierarchical separation) between him and the other guests. As the reader is informed of the Pharisee's unspoken doubts about Jesus' identity, the Pharisee outwardly still addresses him respectfully as *teacher*.

---

<sup>60</sup> Kolasny, in analysing this scene using rhetorical criticism, points out the pattern of an opening action, interruption, a second action, rejection, and an expansion element, noting the sudden change from positive response to negative response and rage. She links this pattern to other incidents in Luke and Acts, demonstrating that such an analysis, with a subsequent broader understanding, is possible when looking at the work as a whole. Focusing on the citing of the Elijah and Elisha narratives in this text, she sees this in the context of an overall purpose and pattern used by Luke as a literary device to further the notion of both Jews and Gentiles as God's people (Kolasny 1990: 67-77). While this interpretation brings the intertextual element to fore, the immediacy of the scandal, crowning and de-crowning, with the dramatic challenge to existing perceptions of God's people, is lost. See also Robbins who points out the self-laudatory aspect on the part of the protagonist in this scene as he announces his programme. Pointing out the parallel in this scene and a corresponding one in Plutarch's *Alexander*, Robbins sees this as an example of an inoffensive self-laudation as it is not done for personal gain, blended with praise by the audience, and as Jesus does not claim the credit but gives it to God (Robbins 1981: 303-304).

Through the use of comparison (*syncrisis*) Jesus effects a crowning of the woman and a de-crowning of the Pharisee. The initial scandal is caused by the woman (herself deemed an inappropriate person in society), who intrudes into a male dinner party, acting inappropriately in terms of social convention. This scandal causes the second scandal, the exposure of the lack of love and the hypocrisy of the Pharisee and his friends. We are left with a carnivalistic situation, in which there is an inversion of the status of the established sinner and the established religious person. Characteristically, a sense of familiarity (painful from a social angle but vindicated from the basic human perspective) is brought about by the action of the woman in taking the liberty of actually touching and caressing Jesus' person.

Jesus' triumphant entry into Jerusalem can be seen as a major spectacle and scandal. First, a large crowd hails him as *the king* in violation of Roman authority that does not tolerate popularly acclaimed kings in defiance of Rome's role as king-maker. Secondly, the crowd hails him as *the king who comes in the name of the Lord*, implying that he is the expected Jewish Messiah. This violates the authority of the religious establishment that has not recognized him as such. The Pharisees put themselves into the awkward position of asking Jesus to 'stop his disciples', to prevent uncontrollable crowd emotion, awkward because they have been at odds with him in the narrative thus far. His answer that 'the very stones would shout out' exacerbates the situation. In suggesting that the most lifeless objects of nature would assume human faculties to shout out what cannot be kept silent, he assumes an authority that lies far beyond human power structures, an authority backed by the force that controls the universe. His processional (albeit spontaneous) entry, a large crowd putting out the carpet (their own garments) for him, risks punitive, violent measures from the Roman authorities. However, all this is shot through with carnivalistic inversion. Jesus rides a donkey (instead of a royal steed) that has never been ridden, which nevertheless obeys him.<sup>61</sup> He does not come as the victor of a military battle. There are no regalia, not even a saddle, only the garments of his disciples. There is no crowd control to protect him, no guard, no trophies in the form of treasure and prisoners of war. In this case there is only the crowd itself, the people for whom he battles. Purely from a visual point of view this scene can be viewed as a parody of the Roman triumphal procession (practised both in the period of the setting of the

---

<sup>61</sup> This scene features as a fulfilment of Zechariah 9: 9. The full implication of this intertextual use of Zechariah is discussed in Chapter 3 of this thesis.

Gospel, as well as during the period of its estimated production), by which a triumphant general was rewarded amid crowd rejoicing on his return to Rome.<sup>62</sup> Apart from its comical undertone, the parodic element has the effect of confusing the clarity of the situation in a worldly sense. Were Jesus to come in the full regalia of a king, accompanied by soldiers (his followers) wielding weapons, he would clearly have featured as a rebel. However, his completely different, poor appearance and non-aggressive behaviour makes it impossible to combat him by military means without committing an outrage. The scene, causing nervousness on the part of the establishment, is a brief moment of visible triumph for the Kingdom of God in its ever-intensifying battle with the forces of evil.

Moving closer to the final scandal and spectacle of the crucifixion we come to the scandal and spectacle of the trial. On one level one could say that the scandal lies in the fact that it cannot even be rated as a trial, and that Pilate sends Jesus off to his flogging and execution even though he openly considers him to be innocent (Lk 23: 4, 25).<sup>63</sup> A substantial crime in legal terms is missing, while the man imprisoned for an actual crime (murder) is set free (Lk 23: 18, 25). The trial is about Jesus' identity, which is the crucial question of the story as a whole. Jesus is hustled from hearing to hearing before appearing before the people. When questioned by the elders, the high priests and the scribes, Jesus answers, first, by predicting their reaction and refusing to answer their question, then, with a mystification, and then, by telling his interlocutors what they say (Lk 22: 66-71). When questioned by Pilate, Jesus simply replies by telling the latter what he has said to him (Lk 23: 3). When questioned by Herod he says nothing (Lk 23: 9). All these responses can be seen in the light of the actions of the carnival fool. He makes no effort to defend himself; he answers indirectly, repeats what people say to him, and assigns to himself the right to remain silent. What makes this an anti-trial, amongst other things, is that there are none of the rhetorical speeches so popular in the trials of the Graeco-Roman world, no prosecution and no defence. Figures of authority are shown in a degraded, familiarized light, openly displaying human weaknesses and vices. The high priests make themselves ridiculous by showing their undignified position in the face of a

---

<sup>62</sup> The lavishly celebrated triumphal procession of Titus after the destruction of Jerusalem is described by Josephus (1959: 148-51).

<sup>63</sup> This may be a parodic reference to the way Roman Emperors, such as Caligula, Nero and others, dealt with people that they wanted to get rid of, other than simply having them murdered (see *The Twelve Caesars* by Suetonius (1957)).

Roman official, whom they address with ingratiating lies. Herod is shown up in an equally undignified manner, preoccupied with his own selfish anxieties about his past deeds (including the execution of John the Baptist (Lk 9: 7- 9, 23: 8)), while Pilate cuts a pathetic figure as the representative of Roman justice in his indecisive behaviour and his refusal to take responsibility. The serious dignity of the assemblies of the religious establishment is exposed as a travesty, while Roman justice is shown up to be ineffectual in terms of universal justice.

The culminating spectacle and scandal scene in the Gospel is the crucifixion. The sense of scandal is overwhelming, whichever angle it is viewed from. Seen from the perspective of the believer in Jesus' divine kingship, the scene presents a terrible outrage. Seen from the perspective of the non-believing religious establishment, the emotion of the crowd and the inscription on the cross of a man they believe to be an impostor and a threat to orthodox religion constitutes a scandal. The execution of an innocent man is a scandal from the perspective of justice. This scene is saturated with carnivalistic features. The crowning/ de-crowning aspect has already been discussed above. The actual image presented of this is Jesus on the cross with the inscription of 'This is the King of the Jews' above him. The innocent man, installed as a king by divine intervention, is raised on the cross, executed as a criminal with a mock inscription above his head, which, paradoxically, visually confirms his kingship. General destruction (the forerunner of renewal) is predicted by Jesus at the start. The presence of the crowd ensures the element of spectacle, the actual word 'spectacle' (*theoria*)<sup>64</sup> being used by the narrator (Lk 23: 48). In a brief moment, a sense of euphoria, that is, a suspension from the reality of the agony, is presented on the cross when Jesus promises the criminal that 'today you will be with me in Paradise' (Lk 23: 43), thus vividly calling to mind an alternative world, the Kingdom of God that relativizes all earthly authority. Supernatural happenings occur, such as when the normal course of nature goes awry, with the light of the sun failing at noon and darkness occurring over the whole land for three hours, coinciding with Jesus'

---

<sup>64</sup> See Klumbies (2003), who takes the view that the crucifixion in Luke is presented as a theatrical spectacle by an author who was familiar with Hellenistic theatre. Klumbies points to an anonymous work, *On the Sublime*, ascribed to a certain Longinus, dated 25-40 CE, with which Luke may have been familiar. This work, influenced by Aristotelean theory, was in touch with the Septuagint, evident by quotations from Genesis. Klumbies compares the reaction of the crowd in Luke (who beat their breasts and then turn away) to that of an audience at a Greek tragedy who undergo the process of catharsis (Klumbies 2003: 197-200).

last three hours before his death (Lk 23: 44-6).<sup>65</sup> The sacred curtain of the Temple, the barrier erected between the people and the sanctuary, tears by supernatural means just before Jesus hands his spirit into the hands of his father, signifying the destruction of the power of the old system, which is forced to make way for the new. The 'outsider' in terms of Judaism, the Roman centurion, speaks out for Jesus in the end. This can be seen as linking up the scandal at the beginning of Jesus' ministry, when the latter proclaims in Nazareth that salvation is not exclusively limited to the people of Israel (Lk 4: 24-30).

On another level, the presentation of the trial and crucifixion in the Gospel can be seen as an inversion of what is presented in 'high' classical texts, especially in the case of Greek tragedy. Much of the trial in the Gospel is behind closed doors, instead of in full view of the people, while Jesus' execution (physical violence) is depicted as a spectacle instead of happening behind the scenes, as it would, say, in a text like Sophocles' *Oedipus Rex*.

### *Parables*

I shall now consider selected parables that appear in the Gospel, narratives within the main narrative that are particularly vivid and display a number of Menippean features. Recounted by the protagonist of that main narrative, they are invented stories that demonstrate and test a particular idea, in this case concerning the Kingdom of God, the idea central to the overall story.<sup>66</sup> In line with the Menippea, the issues and settings that feature in these stories are familiar, there being no epic distance or valorization. A familiar image of life (always in movement) is displayed. Reversals of the expected norm play a major part, as does the inversion of hierarchy. There is upliftment and degradation. Each story can be seen as a carnivalistic space within the reality of the main narrative.

---

<sup>65</sup> Chapter 3 of this thesis discusses the intertextual relation between Luke and Zechariah concerning the modification of nature that will be effected by the warrior king, Yahweh, as the 'day of the Lord' approaches.

<sup>66</sup> The fact that these stories have been found to have similarities with other stories, stories outside the New Testament (see I H Marshall's *Commentary* on Luke), does not change the fact that they are presented within the story-reality of the Gospel as constructed stories recounted by the protagonist for a particular purpose.

*The Good Samaritan (Lk 10: 30–35)*

This story is told within the framework of a dialogue.<sup>67</sup> It is the reply to a question asking who our neighbour is. The story describes a man in desperate need. Three possible responses are dramatically impersonated, of which two are the same, implying that that is normal behaviour on the part of the elite class of that society. At the end of the story the listener is asked to choose who was a neighbour to the man who fell into the hands of robbers. This is a simple use of *syncretism*. The story is set in a familiar location. It parodies members of the establishment (the priest and the Levite), as well as the ritual purity laws that act as a barrier between people and their suffering fellow people. The priest and the Levite (respected members of society) are exposed in their lack of compassion, their concerns for ritual laws making them insensitive to human concerns. There is something ridiculous about their fear of contamination as they pass by on the other side of the road, fearing a man that is (only) half dead. This image stands in contrast to Jesus' behaviour in the main story. The latter has no difficulty in touching the sick to heal them, and in touching the bodies of the people he raises from the dead (Lk 5: 13, 8: 54). While the members of the establishment are de-crowned in the context of this story (hierarchical inversion), the Samaritan, usually the one to be despised, is crowned by being shown as behaving with compassion in a spirit of familiar immediacy, unhampered by any purity laws, prepared to sacrifice his time and money for the sake of, simply, a fellow human.<sup>68</sup> The morality of the laws in their rigid application is attacked, implying that the system in its current form is ready to be toppled to make way for a renewal effected by the Kingdom of God.

---

<sup>67</sup> See Phillips (making use of the theories of Kristeva, Bakhtin, Barthes, and others), who views the *Good Samaritan* as part of the dialogue between Jesus and the lawyer, as well as of the episode between the sisters, Mary and Martha, and Jesus, as one discourse in which multiple intertextual activities takes place (Phillips 1992: 266-301).

<sup>68</sup> S G Wilson interprets this parable as demonstrating that 'doing the law rather discussing and refining it' is a requisite for obtaining eternal life. He suggests that the fact that it is a Samaritan who is shown as 'doing' the law is a shock tactic, something not uncommon in parables (Wilson 1983: 15-16). He points to Berger, who suggests that in this parable Luke presents salvation as dependent not on obedience of the law, but on response to the teaching of Jesus, some of which can be found in the Old Testament when it is read properly, understanding love to one's neighbour primarily in terms of almsgiving (Wilson 1983: 16). The approach taking Bakhtinian theory of carnivalesque inversion into consideration sees this parable in a more radical light, that is, it sees it as actively attacking current religious practice.

*The Rich Man and the Beggar, Lazarus (Lk 16: 19-31)*

The listener is shown a reversal of the fortunes of the poor man and the rich man after death in this story. It is told in response to the Pharisees' ridiculing of Jesus' teaching in the main story on the issue of money. Here, too, *syncretism* is the central tool. First, there is the presentation of the comparative image of the lot of the two characters on earth, then of their lot after death, displaying hierarchical inversion. Furthermore, there is the implied comparison of the Law of Moses with current practice, the latter at most allowing for compassion towards close relatives but ignoring the obvious plight of a fellow human in drastic need.<sup>69</sup> As in the previous story, the idea in question is responsibility to one's neighbour. A carnivalistic vision (an alternative life) of the Kingdom of God is displayed showing how the latter levels out the injustices of this world in the world to come (in line with Jesus' quotation from Isaiah at the beginning of his ministry) (Lk 4: 18-19). Humans are shown to have a choice in this life between following the Law of Moses and the prophets, and the law of current worldly practice. The latter is exposed as having deviated from the former. To abide by it means dire consequences in the life to come. Use is made of the Menippean three-planed construction in this story. Heaven is the place where Abraham is, and where Lazarus is taken to by the angels after he dies. Hades is where the rich man lands after burial, where he is tortured by flames, and from where he raises his eyes to see Lazarus. Fire is a prominent carnival image of destruction and renewal in the Gospel as a whole (e.g. Lk 12: 49). The story as such favours (crowns) the poor man, giving him a name, Lazarus, while the rich man, regarded highly in this world, is presented only as 'a rich man'.

*The Lost Son (Lk 15: 11-32)*

While the two parables discussed above are fairly clear, close to many of Jesus' sayings in terms of giving definite direction to the listener concerning ethical behaviour (Lk 6: 27-31), the parable of *The Lost Son* is more complex. It is told in response to the grumbling of the Pharisees and the scribes at Jesus' free interaction with the tax

---

<sup>69</sup> S G Wilson interprets this parable as demonstrating that the law and the prophets are an adequate guide for those who wish to enter the Kingdom of God (Wilson 1983: 17-18). While a Bakhtinian reading of this parable would not deny this, it actively emphasizes the urgency of showing compassion to one's fellow human being. It becomes apparent that both *syncretism* and *anacrisis* are at play, the latter interacting dialogically with the Law of Moses, challenging the current interpretation of it in common practice.

collectors and sinners (Lk 15: 1-2). In other words, it is part of an ongoing dialogue concerning hierarchy. As in the case of the two parables discussed above, it hinges on *syncretism*. An image of the behaviour of the two sons is presented successively, not only comparing the two, but also giving a sense of movement in time, leaving the question of further behaviour open. The finality of the Pharisees' judgement of sinners is thus challenged. Then there is the implied comparison of the younger son with the sinners that Jesus interacts with in the main narrative, and of the elder son with the Pharisees and scribes. In its position in the Gospel, the story also stands in comparison with its two direct predecessors, the stories of *The Lost Sheep* and *The Lost Coin*, both of which are posed as a question that challenges the Pharisees directly. The two make the same point and are followed by almost the same saying, a saying that is the overt idea addressed in *The Lost Son*: 'Just so, I tell you, there will be more joy in Heaven over one sinner who repents than over ninety-nine righteous persons who need no repentance' (Lk 15: 7), and 'there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner who repents' (Lk 15: 10).

This saying, and the three stories that play it out, could be interpreted as being an inversion of justice in terms of expected reward for good behaviour and punishment for bad. A dialogue is implicitly opened. Why should the wasteful son be rewarded above the son who has remained faithfully at home? The son who has de-crowned himself is crowned by the father on his return, while the elder (who should, in any case, be the privileged one), through no action of his own (other than remaining faithfully at home with his father) sees himself as de-crowned. This could be the reasoning of the Pharisees and scribes who, as the religious establishment, feel themselves to be 'more righteous' in God's eyes than the sinners and tax collectors, being those who faithfully safeguard the laws of Scripture. The parable challenges this reasoning.

If one is to look at *The Lost Son* in terms of carnivalistic considerations, one can say that justice in human terms is not the primary issue. The primary issue is the restoration of life. Embodied by the story is the movement of sin and repentance, loss and restitution, sorrow and joy, in sum, the movement of degradation and upliftment at the core of carnival. Although we do not witness an actual death and resurrection, the father identifies his son's actions in terms of this phenomenon, and repeats these words in the closing sentence of the parable, also reflecting the extreme degree of his own experience

(the new sense of life that surges up in him) (Lk 15: 24,32). The story does not reflect any judgement based on calculation. Rather, it reflects an intense emotion, the joy at the restoration of life, which can only take place because it has been preceded by loss. We thus have the affirmation of life, death and rebirth. The prominent carnival image of celebration (the image Jesus uses in connection with the Kingdom of God in other instances), and its symbols, the robe, the sacrificial killing (*thuo*) (Lk 15: 23) of the calf and the banqueting accompanied by music and dancing, is not only implemented in this story, but is also emphasized by being verbally repeated several times.

Regarding this parable in terms of these features of carnival one can consider the younger son's action in the light of an initiation rite, a descending to the very bottom (below the pigs in a foreign country, in this case) to be able to rise to a new life, a life as a full adult member of his father's family. Two realms (kingdoms) are presented, the utopian one of the father and the foreign one in which no compassion is shown, spelling out death for the stranger who fails to leave it having first wandered into it. The younger son comes to himself (*eis eauton de elthon*) (Lk 15: 17), rising up, as it were, in his realization of the nature of his father's kingdom (made possible by having had experience of the other one) and the necessity for him to return to it, knowing that he has forfeited his original position in it. He thus embraces the challenge of life, whatever the risk. By contrast, we see the elder son, who has not taken the leap forward into manhood (he has obeyed his father like a slave), who is in a state of stasis (complacent in a sense of his rights). Although in his father's kingdom, he is not of it in spirit. Imprisoned in an officious rigidity of thought and behaviour, he cannot think beyond the constraints of human calculations of justice, and has no access to a sense of compassion and joy. Nor can he distinguish clearly between justice and injustice. He exaggerates his brother's misdemeanours and judges his father as having acted unjustly. The father, in fact, has not been unjust. He divided the property between the two. In terms of fatherly love one can say that as much as he is filled with compassion for this younger son, so does he show compassion in his response to the elder son's rude challenge. Instead of responding in the same vein, he raises his son to the same status as himself as he invites him to join with him in the celebrations.

Although this story has parallels with the two preceding it in terms of loss and joy in restitution, there are differences that make a comparative distinction possible. Jesus

challenges his critics in the first two stories to think about their own behaviour in a given situation and compare this with their criticism of his behaviour. What is described in both stories is what can be seen as a common human phenomenon regarding the reaction to loss: the moment something is lost, it becomes infinitely more valuable to its owner than those possessions that are not lost. In these two stories the lost items are material possessions. The behaviour of the owner in his joy cannot be seen as logical (just) if weighed up in terms of calculation. And yet, the emotions of pain at the loss and subsequent joy at restoration outweigh considerations of the relative material value of the actual item. What is pointed out with this comparison is that the critics of Jesus' behaviour, who imply that their good behaviour, deserving reward, justifies their elite status above sinners and tax collectors on the basis of careful logical calculation (legalistic considerations), do not themselves act logically when placed into situations in which emotion is involved. Their criticism is exposed as being hypocritical.

These two preceding stories are then put into a comparative relationship with the parable of *The Lost Son*. What we see now are two stories reflecting ordinary, worldly joy at the restoration of material goods side by side with an image of superlative joy at a restoration in terms of a human relationship, a restoration that engenders new life. The third story reflects an alternative, carnivalistic kingdom. The father, in contrast to earthly authorities, does not try to possess his son or force him into obedience. He freely gives him the means to choose his way of life. The son has enough reverence and trust in his father to enable him to put his life at his mercy, in spite of the sense of his own transgression, which could have prompted him to stay away. Instead of calculations concerning justice and retribution, the great joy informed by the father's love for the son sweeps away all other considerations as the latter is reinstated amid celebration, heralding a new era for everyone that participates. Instead of showing displeasure at his elder son's petty calculations, the father expresses his love for him in the way he recognizes and affirms the latter's worth, inviting him to let go of the rigid thinking that prevents him from moving forward into a new vision of life.

Finally, this story, an image of an alternative way of life, stands opposed to the rigidity of the behaviour of the officious Pharisees who grumble in the main narrative. It becomes clear that Jesus is not simply justifying his own behaviour but that he is announcing a coming force that operates far beyond petty, hair-splitting, uncharitable, legalistic

concerns of human calculation, a force that sweeps away all hierarchical barriers between people, opening the way to a new existence. He does not engage with the Pharisees on their own terms, although he could, as is shown by the first two stories that he poses as questions. The rigid structures of the world of the main narrative are challenged, leaving the Pharisees, like the elder son, with the choice of adhering to their worldview and their elite position in a state of stasis, or of moving forward, becoming participants of the celebration of new life. The 'good' behaviour of those who strictly adhere to the law cannot prescribe divine action or hold up the movement of life any more than the tyrannical behaviour of the elder son can prescribe and curtail the father's response to his younger son.

### *Conclusion*

I began this chapter by giving a brief account of the concepts of carnival and carnivalization of literature as put forward by Bakhtin, as well as his interpretation of the Socratic Dialogue and the Menippea in the light of this phenomenon. I then experimentally examined the Gospel of Luke in terms of this theory. Building on my investigation in Chapter 1, in which I drew a comparison between the Gospel of Luke and the Greek Romance, *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, using Bakhtin's theory of the chronotope, I made a brief comparative reference to that same romance text using his theory of the carnivalesque.

I have found that the Gospel, displaying many Menippean features, is thoroughly carnivalized in the Bakhtinian sense. The central carnival image of the crowning and de-crowning of the carnival king accompanies the movement of life, death, and rebirth that underlies the story as a whole. The fundamental idea that is displayed, propagated and tested in this narrative is the coming Kingdom of God. The battle (test) with the forces of evil that have taken over the kingdoms of this world is embodied by the protagonist, Jesus, who features as the carnival king. The latter displays characteristics of Bakhtin's description of the carnival figures of the rogue, clown and fool, figures that function to unmask the falseness and hypocrisy of static, authoritarian structures.

In order to test the concept of the Kingdom of God, in an attempt to grasp its nature and location, various devices are used. The principal one is the use of invention

(characteristic of the Menippea), creating a space, a 'time out' from the constraints of historical reality and verisimilitude, so that the concept under interrogation can be examined from all angles. In this case, an image of an interaction between two worlds is created, worlds that throw light on each other by means of *syncretism*, direct dialogue and collision. One world is depicted as a given, in a state of stasis, while the other is seen as an alternative version, in the process of coming, projecting itself into the future. The static world is a parodic version of a selected excerpt of everyday reality (this world) that represents rigid structure, while the dynamic world is the image of the alternative world of the Kingdom of God that promises a release from the imprisonment of this structure. The Menippean three-planed construction is made use of as a way of locating the kingdoms of this world in a limited space, while the Kingdom of God, in a constant state of movement, is represented as unlimited in terms of location, size, time and dimension.

The battle between the kingdoms represents the metaphysical battle between good and evil, fought out in this world in practical terms, impacting on the lives of people. There is mixing of metaphysical, religious concepts with practical, quotidian matters. This familiarizes the metaphysical conceptualisation, literarily bringing it down to earth, making it accessible to all people, as opposed to only a small elite group. In line with the spirit of carnival, the Kingdom of God is represented in the light of unexpected reversals, equalization and carnivalistic inversion, be it in Jesus' behaviour, his teaching by sayings and parables. There is a potential for humour to be found in the scenes of hierarchical inversions, usually accompanied by scandal, but one cannot speak of an obvious, openly played-out humour. The carnivalistic parody in this narrative lies in the way the establishment is depicted. This would be the primary invention, which can be seen as challenging the real world outside the text. The next level of invention is an image of how this carnivalistic parody reacts to a carnivalistic utopia, the concept of the coming Kingdom of God.

In line with Bakhtin's vision of dialogic truth, as he sees this functioning in carnival by the constant upheaval of and challenge to accepted concepts and structures, the Gospel of Luke is not a closed book. The ending is left open, even though Jesus, and hence the existence of the Kingdom of God in the eyes of his followers and in the eyes of the reader of the text, is triumphant at the end. So, while the Kingdom of God is propagated as a powerful force that will inevitably take over the kingdoms of this world, the incompleteness

of this event at the end of the Gospel challenges people on earth to work and prepare towards the final victory.

The question to be asked here is just what is it that this text is attempting to revolutionize, challenge and dislodge if seen from the carnivalistic perspective? Like carnival itself, this text does not encourage a political revolution. Rather, in propagating the Kingdom of God, it emphasizes the inevitable movement of life and its changes that spell out hope. It stands for the opposite of stasis, sweeping away all strictures, whether in the form of authoritarian, hierarchical structures, rigid thinking or, simply, fear. Carnival plays with the things that inspire fear, according to Bakhtin, like the deity, death and earthly authority, as a way of living with these while challenging prevailing concepts of them. All three of these entities are central issues in the Gospel. The prevailing perception of the nature of God is challenged, the belief in the finality of death is overturned, and the power of the authorities is shown to be temporary in relation to the eternity of divine power. With eyes fixed firmly on the vision of the Kingdom of God, personalized in Jesus, all people can be released from the paralysing effect of fear (a fear of death and suffering that must have been particularly acute in the Ancient Near East in the first century, if one is to believe the accounts by Josephus, Tacitus and Suetonius), and thus be free to embrace life courageously in the awareness of its inevitable changes through time.

Coming back to the brief account of *Chaereas and Callirhoe* at the beginning of this discussion, one can venture to make some comparative connections with the Gospel, although there are clear differences, especially in emphasis. The sense of movement, symbolizing death and rebirth, has already been mentioned, as has the propagating of one central idea, the use of invention, and the comparative display of two different kingdoms. To this one can add that both narratives promise unlimited joy in the future, although, in the case of the Romance, this is already achieved at the end of the story, while it is still incomplete at the end of the Gospel. While both stories present a protagonist that is worshipped by the crowd, this theme is more in the forefront in the Gospel. Both the concept of the Kingdom of God and the concept of true conjugal love are idealist, gentle in their manifestation but resilient in their battle against the forces of evil. Both offer a way of life for ordinary people in a hostile environment.

## Chapter 3

### Intertextual Relations between the Gospel of Luke and the Book of Zechariah

An investigation into the dialogic nature of the Gospel of Luke is inevitably faced with a field that is far too large to be addressed within one chapter. To be comprehensive, it would have to cover a number of aspects, each of which would require a great deal of consideration. One aspect would be the internal dialogism of the text itself: contending discourses made possible by different styles of language,<sup>1</sup> by differing genres and by the interaction of a wide variety of characters. In this specific text, these are not limited to various social and political groups of this world, but they also represent the supernatural, posing a dialogue between the two spheres, between quotidian concerns and metaphysical, eternal matters.

Another aspect would be the dialogic interaction between the text in question and its historical socio-political environment. The context of the appearance of the Gospel of Luke, inestimable in its multiform vastness, was dominated by the supremacy of Roman rule (Rome being engaged in a power struggle of its own, both internally and in terms of keeping her provinces in subjection) which posed an overwhelming military and cultural threat to the inhabitants of the province of Judea in the first century CE,<sup>2</sup> and, to a lesser extent, to Jews and early Christians living in other areas of the Empire. Hellenism, which, amongst other things, included the emerging mystery cults, can be seen as the prevailing cultural force. A practice that existed officially during this period (discussed in my previous chapter) was the folk festival of carnival, in the form of the central *Roman Saturnalia*, as well as the *Kronia* in more remote, mainly Greek locations.<sup>3</sup> One could contemplate the Lucan Gospel in terms of responding to some of these factors, as well as in terms of possibly eliciting a response to itself by whoever it is addressed to, be it the

---

<sup>1</sup> See I H Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. Marshall distinguishes different styles of language throughout this commentary, for example (Marshall 1978: 39).

<sup>2</sup> This is the subject of *The Jewish War* by the first century historiographer, Josephus. See also Stern for an account of Josephus' angle when describing the events that led to the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple (Stern 1987: 71-78).

<sup>3</sup> See Versnel, 'Greek Myth and Ritual: The Case of Kronos' (Versnel 1986).

direct addressee, Theophilus (should he have existed outside the text), or a particular community.<sup>4</sup>

Thirdly, the dialogic dimension of the Gospel of Luke can be studied in terms of its interaction with other texts. This is the area that this chapter will focus on. But even here, many possibilities are open to examination, necessitating a selection. To begin with, there are the many references in the text itself to passages in books of Hebrew Scriptures, both overt and covert. Added to this, one can consider that this text was produced within an oral tradition, and has co-existed from the start with other gospels, canonical and apocryphical, sharing large sections of its content with them. Furthermore, it is unlikely that it would have been completely unaffected by texts of other genres of its own time and of preceding periods. Bakhtin places early Christian writing, including the Gospels, within the group of genres that he refers to as the Menippea,<sup>5</sup> the body of texts that were not seen as part of the 'high', classical genres of the literature of the time. It is possible that the Gospel of Luke, Menippean-like, freely incorporated aspects of other genres, including the classical genres, for its own specific purpose.

While the dialogism of a text as such, according to Bakhtinian theory, involves a response to both a previous utterance as well as to an expected future reaction to itself, this particular chapter will focus on the former. It will investigate relations between the Gospel of Luke and texts where an assumption of *pre-existence* can safely be made. An attempt to establish what the author may have had in mind in terms of eliciting a response to his text, or whether later texts actually appeared in response to it, would require a different sort of study. For this reason it is not possible here to regard the other three canonical Gospels other than in terms of comparison. Although all four Gospels clearly share a tradition, it is impossible to say with certainty which of them preceded which; which was responding to which. Scholarly opinion, on the whole, places the Gospels of Mark and Matthew at an earlier date to that of Luke,<sup>6</sup> supporting the Two-Source

---

<sup>4</sup> There is some debate concerning the identity of Theophilus (friend of God). Talbert states that the identity of the 'most excellent Theophilus' is unknown, 'possibly Christian' (Talbert 1986: 10-11). Craddock states that the name may be a literary device for addressing Christian readers. On the other hand, the address 'most excellent' may point to the addressee being a Roman official (Craddock 1990: 15-16).

<sup>5</sup> Bakhtin locates the early manifestations of novelistic writing (the genre that he judges to be the most accommodating in terms of dialogism) in texts of the Menippea. For a description of the Menippea in Bakhtinian terms, see Chapter 2 (pp. 60-63) of this thesis, or Bakhtin's *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (Bakhtin 1984: 113-15).

<sup>6</sup> Marshall 1978: 30-31.

Hypothesis.<sup>7</sup> The fact that sections of those texts also appear in Luke is regarded as a direct response to them. But there are also those who dispute this.<sup>8</sup> The very fact of an uncertainty regarding this point makes it difficult to produce an argument based on the assumption of a conscious intertextual response on the part of the Gospel of Luke to any of the others, even though this may well have been the case.<sup>9</sup> Likewise, in considering other texts within the range of the Menippea in terms of intertextual relations with Luke, it is not possible to assume a deliberate response by the Gospel of Luke to Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe* (the text used for comparative purposes in my two previous chapters). It is not certain whether this or other specific Greek Romance texts existed before the Gospel text (although scholars believe that the genre as such did).<sup>10</sup> Here, too, only comparisons can be made.

Texts that exist outside the Gospel of Luke that can be identified within the Gospel text itself, either by name or direct quotation, where there is no doubt as to priority, are certain books within the canon of Hebrew Scripture. As this overt identification can be taken as proof of a definite intertextual involvement on the part of the Gospel with sections of these books, it is possible to assume an extension of this involvement to covert usage as well, providing, that is, that the corresponding sections can be definitively identified.

This chapter will thus focus on the dialogic interaction between the Gospel of Luke and selected sections of the Hebrew Bible. For the sake of clarity, I shall use the term *intertextuality*<sup>11</sup> when referring specifically to the dialogic relation between texts, while

---

<sup>7</sup> The Two-Source Hypothesis holds that besides the sections taken from Mark, the common material between Matthew and Luke comes from a common source referred to as Q (from the German word *Quelle*, meaning source).

<sup>8</sup> In a paper read by B E Wilson, entitled *Synoptic Format Phenomena*, at the 2001 International Meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature at the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome, it was argued that all three of the writers of the synoptic Gospels each independently took their material from a common source (i.e. they were not directly based on one another). The common source is a set of teaching notes in Greek called the Greek Logia. These, in turn, had originated as a translation of the Aramaic Logia of the Papias tradition. See also Talbert (1986: 7), who also does not assume the priority of Mark. See also S G Wilson, who, in pointing to an increasingly vocal minority as to the inability of the Two-Source Hypothesis to explain the synoptic problem, does not see the necessity for the adoption of any hypothesis about the relationship of the synoptic Gospels for a consideration of Luke's narrative (Wilson 1983: 13).

<sup>9</sup> Luke (1: 1) mentions previous accounts, but does not identify these by name.

<sup>10</sup> See Reardon (1989: 5). James Tatum identifies *The Education of Cyrus*, written c. 360 BCE by Xenophon the Athenian, as a precursor to the Greek Novel (Morgan 1994: 15).

<sup>11</sup> Todorov points out what he sees as a difficulty in Bakhtin's use of the term *dialogism*, also making use of the term *intertextuality*. My use of both terms differs somewhat from Todorov (Cf. Todorov 1984: 60).

using the word *dialogism* for the phenomenon as a whole. As Bakhtin regards every text in the light of an utterance, I shall first give a brief account of his theory of the *utterance* as a necessary preliminary step. From there I shall move on to the issue of how the Gospel of Luke, as an utterance, appropriates and presents the utterances of other texts within itself; to what extent it engages in a dialogue with them as it makes use of them for its own purposes. Lastly, I shall attempt to establish what significance this relationship may have in terms of the Gospel's discourse as a whole.

*The utterance, according to Bakhtin*<sup>12</sup>

Bakhtin makes a distinction between language elements (as, for example, the sentence, the word) that are the means of an utterance and the utterance itself. In his view, a sentence as a linguistic unit can stand by itself. It is not enunciated by anyone in particular to anyone else. It has no evaluative dimension and can be reiterated. It becomes an utterance only once it has been embodied by a speaking voice directed at an addressee.<sup>13</sup> As such, it always takes place within a specific social context and can therefore not be reiterative. It has become individual, evaluative and expressive of a worldview. It has become discourse. This crucial, discursive facet of the utterance is inherent in the linguistic raw material of language, but only becomes manifest in the concrete situation of verbal communication.<sup>14</sup> Bakhtin thus distinguishes between two ways in which a text can be perceived: one that recognizes the reiterative elements of speech, which he sees as the means, and one that interprets the non-reiterative utterance, which he sees as the end. The word is the basic unit for both the means and the end. Furthermore, he distinguishes between two types of relations that can be identified in an utterance: the relation between signs (the object of linguistic studies), and the relation between the utterance and reality, between an actual speaking subject and other real utterance.<sup>15</sup> In studying the latter relation, the critic must think in terms of *metalinguistics* as opposed to *linguistics* (Bakhtin 1984: 81).

<sup>12</sup> A great deal is said about the utterance in *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* (first published in Russian in 1929) by V N Voloshinov, a member of the Bakhtin Circle. This text has been ascribed to Bakhtin by V V Ivanov in 1973, and the theory in this work is, on the whole, confirmed by Bakhtin's later writings. However, as this question of authorship has neither been proved nor disproved, I shall (while taking this work into account) focus here on sections of texts that were published in Bakhtin's own name.

<sup>13</sup> This addressee need not be an individual. It can be a social group.

<sup>14</sup> Bakhtin, 'The problem of texts in linguistics, philology, and the other human sciences: An essay of philosophical analysis.' Written during the period 1959-1961, cited by Todorov (1984: 50).

<sup>15</sup> Todorov (1984: 50-51).

An utterance is not simply a reflection of something that already exists, as, for example, the observed facts, the felt emotion, or another utterance. Rather, it creates something new out of these givens, something that has a relation to values, such as truth, the good, the beautiful and others. It takes a particular stand in terms of a worldview. As such it can act and be responded to dialogically. In studying a text, Bakhtin sees the challenge in apprehending this particular dimension of what is uttered rather than simply identifying the givens that initially have given rise to it.

Essentially discursive, thus, the utterance is, in Bakhtin's terminology, *interindividual*. It does not exist in a vacuum. Not only is it addressed to someone, but the addressee, as the expected respondent, also has an effect on its making. The utterance is further affected by the many other utterances that have already been made regarding the particular object under discussion, positioning itself in relation to them. There is thus interplay between the voice of the speaker (or writer), the expected voice of the listener, and the voices of previous utterances.<sup>16</sup> The tone of the utterance is determined by the relationship between the speaker and the expected respondent.<sup>17</sup>

### *Language heterology*

Regarding language as a set of utterances that reflect a concrete opinion of the world within a verbal community (as opposed to an abstract system of normative forms), Bakhtin points to the variety of languages inherent within a given language. Examples are languages that evidence certain professions, languages typical of particular genres, languages representing age groups, languages that promote specific political aims, and current, fashionable languages. Stratified to a larger or lesser degree in any given period, language, as it moves forward in time (invariably tied to the movement of social life), is engaged in a constant struggle between centripetal forces that aspire towards a unified, central, common language, and centrifugal forces that move towards diversification. Bakhtin refers to diversity within a language as *heterology*,<sup>18</sup> and sees it as occurring naturally. Opposed to this is the drive towards centralization. The language resulting

---

<sup>16</sup>Todorov (1984: 50-51).

<sup>17</sup> Bakhtin, M, 'Extracts from notes from the years 1970-71', cited by Todorov (1984: 52).

<sup>18</sup> In contrast to this, Bakhtin refers to the co-existence of a variety of different languages as *heteroglossia*.

from the latter is always ordained, imposing limits upon heterology for the sake of maximal, mutual comprehension. The product is what is then considered the 'correct' language, the common language of truth, having been determined as such by a central authoritarian system.<sup>19</sup>

### *Verbal art*

When utterances are made in the form of verbal art, the writer makes use of a particular genre. Some genres strive towards a unitary language in which heterology is reduced to a minimum, while others allow for, and make use of heterology. In Bakhtin's view, the art of poetry aims towards a maximally unitary language, while artistic prose, particularly in the form of the novel, is the medium that accommodates maximum language diversity (Bakhtin 1981: 261-263). Diverse languages can be actively utilized in a text to represent various, contending worldviews, or voices. Historically, language diversity has thrived in environments of general diversification, that is, during times of political upheaval. The resultant struggles between different cultures often go hand in hand with a weakening of a stable, centralized monopoly of ideology. The Hellenistic era is seen by Bakhtin as such a time of contending cultures. He locates early manifestations of artistic prose in this period.<sup>20</sup>

However, a word of caution must be made here. Bakhtin emphasizes that the presence of language variety *per se* in a text is not necessarily a guarantee for, or manifestation of, what he calls *polyphony*, that is, dialogic interaction between various voices, various discourses. Rather, it can be seen as one way of providing the potential for it. Actual dialogic interaction, according to Bakhtin, depends on the extent to which each voice maintains its autonomy, even as it is subjected to a higher stylistic unity within a text. The degree of polyphony in a text is thus not dependent on the number of languages or styles contained in it,<sup>21</sup> but rather on how the various discourses (whether in the form of different languages, or, different discourses in the same language) are placed in relation to one another (Bakhtin 1984: 181-82).

---

<sup>19</sup> Bakhtin, 'Slovo v romane' (Discourse in the Novel: 83-106), quoted by Todorov (1984: 56-8).

<sup>20</sup> Todorov (1984: 56-8).

<sup>21</sup> Bakhtin, in fact, sees the possibility in the use of a professional jargon, for example, as serving a monologic text to objectify a character (Bakhtin 1984: 82).

Besides the question of language variety, Bakhtin makes a further distinction in terms of dialogic interaction between the art of poetry and that of prose. Poetic language is, in his view, the unmediated, direct language (voice) of the poet. Any interaction with other utterances, languages or discourses on the same subject matter is avoided as far as possible. The language of prose, on the other hand, is separable from that of the author. Within the context of authorial discourse a variety of other people's languages, voices and discourses can be represented. The distance between these and the voice of the author varies, according to how far it identifies or distances itself from them. They thus interact with one another and with the voice of the author to a larger or lesser degree on a given subject matter.<sup>22</sup>

#### *Representation of another's discourse within a text*

There are various ways in which the discourses of others can be represented within a text, the author making use of them to further the aims of his own discourse. Bakhtin puts forward three considerations when approaching this phenomenon. The first is a question of *locus*. Where in the text is the other's voice encountered? Is it at the object under discussion itself, as in the case of direct or indirect polemic? Or, is it an encounter with various voices that surround the object, past utterances, that is, a conflict between various substitutable denominations of the same object? Or is it encountered in the potential (future) voice of the expected respondent? An example of this would be rhetorical discourse.<sup>23</sup>

A second consideration is the question of *form*. For example, is the voice of the other represented in the form of a particular character's speech? In this case one would look to see whether the author treats it as a passive object, part of his own discourse, or whether the voice of the character maintains a certain autonomy concerning the subject matter, thus standing in a relationship that resembles a dialogue with the discourse of the author. Or, does the voice of the other appear in the form of a direct quotation from another text? Is it in the form of imitation (where the other's voice is absorbed into the voice of the

---

<sup>22</sup> Bakhtin, 'Slovo v romane' (Todorov 1984: 62-3, 97, 112).

<sup>23</sup> Bakhtin, 'Slovo v romane' (Todorov 1984: 72).

author), or in the form of stylisation (where the other's voice is presented as that of another, the voice of the author identifying itself with it, using it as a reinforcement of his own discourse), or in the form of parody (where the voice of the other is also presented as that of another, but, in this case, the author's voice clashing with it by means of ridicule)?

The third consideration concerns the varying *degree* of the presence of the other in the text. There can be full presence as in the case of direct dialogue. At the other end of the spectrum the voice of the other does not materially appear in the text: nevertheless, it can, and has been summoned into the text because it exists in the collective memory of a given verbal community. This is the case when parody or stylization is made use of. The voice that is actualised in the text is presented in the light of another voice, even though this second voice is not realized, remaining outside the text itself.<sup>24</sup>

Between these two extremes there is an intermediary degree of presence of the other's voice, which Bakhtin refers to as hybridisation. Todorov calls it a generalization of free indirect style (Todorov 1984: 73). In this case the text belongs to a single speaker in terms of its syntax and composition, while, nevertheless, containing a second voice in terms of style and worldview expressed within it.<sup>25</sup>

### *Intertextuality between the Gospel of Luke and books from the Hebrew Bible<sup>26</sup>*

It is hardly necessary to point out the overwhelming presence of the voices of the Hebrew Bible in the Gospel of Luke, voices that are themselves in intertextual relationship with each other. Simply by glancing at the Gospel text one is struck by overt references to the older texts. Actual books of the older canon are mentioned by name, like the Law of Moses (Lk 2: 22) and the Book of the prophet Isaiah (Lk 3: 4). The protagonist, Jesus, specifically refers to the Law of Moses, the Psalms and the Prophets as authoritative texts at the end of the Gospel (Lk 24: 44). Sections of the HB texts appear in the Gospel in the form of quotation without specifically naming the source (Lk 4: 4, Deut 8: 3; Lk 4: 8, Deut 8: 3; Lk 4: 10-11, Ps 91: 11-12; Lk 4: 12, Deut 6: 16), while others are named and

<sup>24</sup> Todorov, (1984: 73).

<sup>25</sup> Todorov, (1984: 73).

<sup>26</sup> It must be noted here that the author of Luke made a great deal of use of the Septuagint (LXX) translation of the Hebrew canon (Marshall 1978: 53). I shall thus refer to this translation where I feel it is relevant, as, for example, when the discussion revolves around a particular word or a matter of style.

quoted (Lk 3: 4-6, Is 40: 3-4). Furthermore, both the narrator and characters in the Gospel, evidencing the author's assumption of a general pre-knowledge of the older texts, mention characters from the Hebrew canon. Examples are Aaron (Lk 1: 5), David (Lk 1: 32), Abraham (Lk 3: 8), Elijah (Lk 1: 17), Elishah and Naaman (Lk 4: 27), Jonah (11: 29-32). Characters from the HB, namely Moses, Elijah and Satan, actually appear in the Gospel (Lk 9: 30, 4:1- 12).

Further evidence of the connection can be seen in the Palestinian setting of the Gospel. Jerusalem and the Temple play a major part at the beginning and at the end of the narrative. In addition there are references to festivals, such as the Passover, and character names, such as Zechariah, John, Mary, Jesus, and others, who have counterparts in the older canon. Lest there be any further doubt as to the author's intention of ensuring a direct, continuous link between the narrative that appears in the Hebrew canon and the narrative of the Gospel of Luke, one need only look at Luke 3: 23-38, where the genealogy of the protagonist, Jesus, confirms the Angel Gabriel's statement (Lk 1: 32) as to the latter being a descendent of David, thus establishing this character as the embodiment of the link between the old canon and the new Gospel text.

Apart from these easily observable features that are evidence of an intertextual relationship between Luke and the older texts, there are other less obvious connections, which, nevertheless have a profound impact on the discourse of the Gospel. To begin with, it is noteworthy that the Gospel follows the example of the books of the HB in quoting or paraphrasing passages from the various books of the canon that have gone before. These quotes, evidencing an intertextuality between the various texts of the older canon, open the potential for a larger or lesser engagement between them. They can serve either to reinforce or to challenge a particular point, or they may simply reinforce the sense of continuity and legitimacy of a particular text. The Gospel, in following this example, takes over this whole potential for intertextuality between itself and the texts of the Hebrew canon.

A parallel use of form is another way in which the Gospel interacts with these older texts, an example being, amongst others, the use of genealogy (Genesis 5 and 1, Chronicles 1-9, Lk 3: 23-38). Further examples are the use of specific formulations and the way the narrative is placed into history. Both the latter can be seen in the following example: 'In

the fifteenth year of the reign of the Emperor Tiberius ... the word of God came to John son of Zechariah in the wilderness' (Lk 3: 1-2), to be compared to Zech 1: 1, 'In the eighth month, in the second year of Darius, the word of the Lord came to the prophet Zechariah son of Berechiah son of Iddo.' Another example is the repetitive use of the phrase 'on that day', referring to Yahweh's Day of salvation in Zechariah (e.g. Zech 14: 20), and the day that the Son of Man will be revealed in the Gospel (e.g. Lk 17: 31). Furthermore, one can find many instances where the Gospel makes use of words, names, imagery, motifs and situational parallels in order to interact with the older texts by way of association. One can contemplate how, one way or another, and on various levels, these factors affect the themes that make up the discourse of the Gospel as a whole.

What is striking at the beginning of the Gospel, as the narrative gets to its feet to reach the point of Jesus' ministry, are the multiple strands that root it in the Hebrew canon. Possibly for the purpose of legitimisation, the later text is placed in close proximity to the older, already canonized narrative. By means of what could be called a grafting technique, it is implied that the Gospel narrative is a continuous development of the narrative of the older texts.

I shall begin my investigation by a close intertextual reading of the first two narratives in Luke, namely, the Annunciations of John and Jesus, approaching this from a broad perspective in order to demonstrate the multiple use, at times even simultaneously, that the Gospel makes of the texts from the Hebrew Bible. After that I shall pursue one strand of this multiplicity, namely, the intertextual movement between Luke and the Book of Zechariah, treating this as a case study, with the awareness that other such strands can be pursued with equal validity. Lastly, in line with my previous chapters, I shall look comparatively at Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe* in terms of that text's intertextual use of older, attested texts of the Greek canon.

#### *The Annunciations of John and Jesus (Luke 1: 5-38)*

Miraculous conceptions as such hint at an intertextual connection with the HB, being nothing new to anyone who is even vaguely familiar with that tradition. The opening narrative of the Gospel recounts two parallel stories, each announcing an unusual conception and birth. Recounted directly after one another, these two stories, thus

juxtaposed, invite comparison. The first announcement, proclaiming the coming event of John's miraculous conception, entrenched in the framework of the current religious establishment, has counterparts in HB tradition, as will be shown.<sup>27</sup> John's father, acting within the sanctuary of the Jerusalem Temple, is a priest, while John's mother (too old to conceive a child) is also of priestly descent. John himself, who is to become the agent who inaugurates the major legitimising event of Jesus' baptism, is thus already fully legitimised in terms of mainstream Jewish tradition, that is, already before his conception, even before the Angel Gabriel announces his special role in the future. The announcement is then linked in multiple ways to the second announcement, the conception of Jesus, infusing the latter with its own legitimacy. Marshall points out the parallels in these two stories: both announced events are initiated by divine intervention, both are announced by the angel, Gabriel, and both are given a confirmatory sign (Marshall 1978: 49). To this one can add that in each case a special, God-sanctioned destiny is foretold for the child to be born.<sup>28</sup> A further connection between the two stories is the family relationship between the mothers of the two babies to be born, linking Jesus' family to the priestly family of John (Lk 1: 36). Thus the announcement of the conception of Jesus, strange on its own (as I shall point out later) is anchored in the legitimacy of the more traditional announcement of the conception of John, which, in turn, is anchored in the HB narratives.

In Bakhtinian terms these two short narratives are in a dialogic relationship with each other, for, while emphasis has thus far been put on the parallels, there are divergences as well that serve to mutually illuminate them, this process ultimately carrying the crucial element of the Lucan discourse. While the story of John's coming conception strengthens the legitimacy of the second announcement, the latter also uses it as a point of departure from which a totally new story is heralded. For a better understanding of the relationship between these two announcements, it is worth examining the role of the HB involvement more closely.

---

<sup>27</sup> Mary's song (Lk 1: 46-55) evidences echoes of Hannah's prayer in the HB (1 Sam 2).

<sup>28</sup> Robbins, in demonstrating parallels in Josephus' *Moses* and the Gospel of Luke and Plutarch's *Alexander*, points to this feature, combined with a prophecy that this child (Jesus) will also be the downfall of many, as one that links Luke to Jewish biographical history on the one hand, and Graeco-Roman historical biography on the other (Robbins 1981: 294-6). One can note here that the 'downfall of many' does not feature in the prophecy concerning John's future, linking John firmly to the prophecies concerning his predecessors in the HB in terms of miraculous conceptions, which also do not feature 'the downfall of many.'

### *Miraculous conceptions*

In terms of conceptions brought about by divine intervention, the Gospel story roots itself in a tradition that goes all the way back to Genesis, examples being the story of Abraham and Sarah (Gen 17: 19, 21: 2-3), and that of Jacob and Rachel (Gen 30: 22). The phenomenon can then be further traced in Judges in the story of Manoah and his wife (Jdg 13: 2), and in 1 Samuel, the story of Hannah and Elkanah (1 Sam 1: 1-28).<sup>29</sup> These stories share a number of features. In each case the child that is born is destined to play a special role in the life of the people of Israel, featuring at a crucial point in its history, a point when a major change is about to take place. Isaac is the son with whom God makes the covenant (Gen 17: 21). Joseph, saving his people from starvation, is responsible for bringing them into Egypt, while Samson will deliver Israel from the Philistines (Jdg 2: 5). Samuel, the first of a line of prophets, is instrumental in inaugurating Israel's transition from a society ruled by judges to a monarchy (1 Sam 8: 22). The Gospel Annunciation stories rank themselves with these HB stories, implicitly claiming the imminence of a momentous event that will radically change the lives of the people of Israel.

Other features that appear in the Gospel announcements are found in all or some of these earlier models. The miracle in the earlier models hinges on the fact that the mothers are barren, the barrenness not being a form of divine punishment, even though the women suffer under human judgement on its account. God's intervention opens the womb in order that a child of special significance to the people of Israel may be born. Disbelief in the announcement, in part on account of the advanced age of the prospective parents, features both in the case of Abraham and in that of Zechariah. In the same two stories concerning Isaac and John, as well as that of Jesus, the name of the children is pre-ordained by divine will. As the significance of Isaac lies in the fact that God chose him with whom to make His covenant, there could be a foreshadowing implication that the divine plan concerning John and Jesus would also concern matters of covenant between God and his people. This is confirmed shortly afterwards in the Song of Zechariah (Lk 1:72).<sup>30</sup> Another foreshadowing can be seen in the question of human sacrifice that features prominently in the Isaac story.

<sup>29</sup> Mary's song (Lk 1: 46-55) evidences echoes of Hannah's prayer in the HB (1 Sam 2).

<sup>30</sup> *Diatheke* in Greek. Cf. LXX Gen 17: 21, *diatheke*.

The fact that the announcement of the coming conception is made by a divine agent (or a God-inspired human agent) is another parallel feature between the various stories. In the case of Abraham, God himself tells him, while at a later stage three men who turn out to be angels tell him again. Manoah's wife is told by a man who turns out to be an angel, while the priest, Eli acts as intermediary in the case of Hannah. The Angel Gabriel announces the conception of both John and Jesus. The divinely inspired manner of communication vouches for the truthfulness of the announcements.

A third feature is the Naziritic element, presumably for the purpose of purity and sanctification.<sup>31</sup> Manoah's wife (Samson's mother) is told not to drink wine or strong drink, or eat anything unclean, and that she must raise her son as a Nazirite, not allowing a razor to come to his head (Jdg 13: 4-5). Hannah (Samuel's mother) promises God that, should she be given a male child, she will dedicate him to God. He will live as a Nazirite, drinking neither wine nor intoxicants, and his head shall not be touched by a razor (1 Sam 1:10). Gabriel orders Zechariah not to allow John to drink wine or strong drink, not specifically spelling out the Naziritic identification as such; nevertheless, the allusion to it connects it to the case of Samson insofar as in each case this order is issued directly before the sanctified future role of the child is announced (Lk 1: 15, Jdg 13: 5).

In terms of Bakhtin's scheme of how the other's voice is appropriated into a given text, one could say that in terms of the *locus* of the intertextual encounter the HB texts are situated at the point of the future response of the receiver of the Gospel text. They reinforce the host text, serving proactively to counter any possible disbelief in the veracity of the miraculous recounted in it. Heavy emphasis, in terms of Jewish tradition, is thus placed on the legitimacy and significance of the two characters to be born.

In terms of the *form* of the encounter, in Bakhtinian terms, one could say that the HB texts, appearing both in the narrative voice and in the voice of the characters, are formally subsumed in the voice of the author of Luke as in an imitation. The older texts are not mentioned by name as such, nor do they appear as a quotation. However, one could say that the texts are there just under the surface of the author's voice, present in what Bakhtin would call the intermediary *degree*, one of hybridisation. They are not subsumed

---

<sup>31</sup> See Numbers 6: 1-21 for the Nazirite vow.

in such a way that they are not recognisable. The names of two important HB characters (outside the HB conception stories) are referred to by Gabriel, one in each announcement, each in conjunction with the respective character's future role. John's role is linked to that of Elijah, Jesus' to that of David. The former is thus linked to prophetic activity, the latter to kingly rule. Furthermore, character names in the Gospel text are significant, not only in terms of their meaning,<sup>32</sup> but in terms of their being the names of HB characters that can be seen to have relevance to the story at hand. Zechariah can be seen to have his counterpart in the HB prophet. The name Elizabeth goes back to the name of the wife of Aaron, reinforcing the latter-day Elizabeth's priestly connection. Mary has her counterpart in Miriam,<sup>33</sup> the sister of Moses and Aaron, the woman who helped to facilitate Moses' fulfilling his monumental role in releasing the Israelites from the bondage of Egypt. Jesus has a significant counterpart (apart from the man who led the children of Israel into the Promised Land) in the high priest, Joshua, in the book of Zechariah,<sup>34</sup> implying, together with the reference to David, a combined role of regal and priestly function.

Apart from the situational parallels with HB texts evident in the Gospel, there are also a number of formulaic parallels as, for example, 'Then God remembered Rachel and God heeded her and opened her womb' (Gen 30: 22), which can be compared to Hannah's story, 'The Lord remembered her' (1 Sam 1: 19) and to Elizabeth's situation 'for your prayer has been heard. Elizabeth will bear you a son' (Lk 1: 13).<sup>35</sup> Another such detail is 'drink neither wine nor toxicants, and the head shall not be touched by a razor' (1 Sam 1: 10, Jdg 13: 5, Lk1: 15), as shown above, and, concerning the possibility of the seemingly impossible in terms of conceiving a child, the angel's 'Is anything too wonderful for the Lord?' (Gen 18: 14),<sup>36</sup> can be compared to Gabriel's 'For nothing will be impossible for God' (Lk 1: 37).

---

<sup>32</sup> Zechariah - Yahweh remembers; John - gracious gift of God; Gabriel - man of God; Mary - exalted one; Joseph - May God add; Jesus - Yahweh saves

<sup>33</sup> Mary is *Mariam* in the Gospel. Miriam is *Mariam* in LXX.

<sup>34</sup> Jesus is *Jesus* in the Gospel. Joshua is *Jesus* in LXX.

<sup>35</sup> Marshall is of the opinion that Zechariah's prayer was not for a son, but possibly for the coming of the Messiah (Marshall 1978: 56). However, considering the fact that the announcement is that of a son, and taking into account the HB precedents that are heavily alluded to, I think it more likely that Zechariah's prayer would have been for the issue at hand, the birth of a son. The fact that he is primarily filled with disbelief does not necessarily cancel out his longing. Also, the disbelief could be seen as part of the divine plan to necessitate a drastic sign for the sake of the people to draw attention to God's intervention.

<sup>36</sup> The Greek text of the Gospel has the same wording as the LXX translation of the Hebrew text, except that the phrase appears in the form of a question in Gen 18: 14, while it is a statement in Lk 1: 37.

In terms of *degree*, thus, one can say that the older text does not appear in full presence, as in a direct dialogue, or quotation, but is summoned by virtue of its existence in the memory of a particular verbal community, namely the community that is familiar with the HB tradition. The receiver of the Lucan text does not necessarily need a close knowledge of each book of the HB in order for this intertextuality to operate. The stories of Isaac, Joseph, Samson and Samuel, referring to monumental national figures that have played a crucial part at points of drastic change in the history of Israel, would have been generally recognisable. The author of Luke aligns John, and, by extension, Jesus, to these figures, implying another impending drastic change.<sup>37</sup>

#### *Differences between the Annunciations of the births of John and Jesus*

Having established the parallels between the two NT announcement stories and the HB models, it is of interest to look now how the story of Jesus differs from that of John, and, by extension, to the HB models. First of all one can note that the announcement of the conception of Jesus follows hot on the heels of that of John. It is directly linked to it, the effect being one of duplication in significance. While the HB stories stand on their own, Jesus' story is inaugurated by John's, the latter functioning as a forerunner, which is the function that is assigned to the character, John, in relation to Jesus in the story as a whole. The implication is that Jesus is the greater of the two, also surpassing the monumental characters in the HB models. The latter had not been ushered in in this way. The phenomenon of the forerunner preparing the way lends a regal connotation to the figure of Jesus, which is reinforced by the words of the heavenly messenger, Gabriel: 'the Lord God will give him the throne of his ancestor David' (Lk 1: 32).

The second difference is that Jesus' Annunciation does not take place in the Jerusalem Temple, or even in its surroundings, the area of what had been Judah (in the post-exilic era). It takes place in Nazareth in Galilee, outside the inner priestly domain of Judaism. It is the area from where Jesus is to begin his ministry. This geographical divergence from John's case implies and forecasts a spreading out from the constriction of the Temple, its surroundings and, by implication, its power structure.<sup>38</sup> Linking up with the HB models discussed above, it reaches back to Genesis, a book that is set in legendary time, one that

<sup>37</sup> For another description of the intertextual link between the Gospel of Luke and the Hebrew Bible see Joel B Green (1995: 24-28).

<sup>38</sup> The question of the geographical divergence is discussed in Chapter 1 (38-43) of this thesis, in which the Gospel of Luke is examined in terms of Bakhtin's theory of the chronotope.

predates the cult in Jerusalem, featuring a wider, more universal dominion of God's reign. A further factor that could be seen as forecasting a challenge to the status quo of the current, priestly power structure is that, unlike John's parents, Mary and Joseph are not of priestly stock, but are of a family that is descended from David. This could recall the exilic and post-exilic restoration period, characterized by the power struggles between priestly authority and the drive for monarchical rule as alluded to in, amongst others, in the books of Haggai and Zechariah.<sup>39</sup>

The principal difference between the two Annunciation stories is that of the conception itself. Unlike the mothers in the other stories, who have not conceived previously because of barrenness, Mary's reason for not having conceived thus far lies in her virginity. She is not barren and has not prayed for a child. There is a sense of untouched purity and youth, God's intervention initiating something completely new. Gabriel's description of the manner of the coming conception also constitutes a change from the old. The conception will not happen as a result of physical intercourse with a man, but by means of the Holy Spirit and the power of the Most High (Lk 1: 35), in other words, by supernatural means. Before the receiver of the text can recover from this shock he or she learns that the issue of this conception will be holy, and will be called the Son of God. This appellation was not applied to any of the other miraculously conceived characters, who, although chosen by God for a specific role, were conceived in the natural way and remained strictly human. The story of the conception of Jesus, initially legitimised by that of John and the HB predecessors, has now moved into a different dimension, a dimension that links the sphere of the supernatural to the realistic earthly sphere in the form of the child to be born. The manner of divine intervention represented here is of an unprecedented kind within the HB tradition.<sup>40</sup> Having first established itself within that tradition, it then breaks with its pattern.

What has been described thus far is a fairly easily detectable presence of texts from different books of the Hebrew Bible in the Gospel of Luke. In appropriating them,

---

<sup>39</sup> See Hanson (1975: 209-269), the chapter on the origins of post-exilic hierocracy.

<sup>40</sup> There are reports of similar births in the Graeco-Roman tradition. The births of Alexander the Great and Julius Caesar were claimed to be the result of their mothers having been impregnated by gods. See Robbins, who suggests that this particular feature (the protagonist being generated by God (the Holy Spirit)) is a crucial element in showing that the Gospel of Luke has moved beyond the *topoi* of Jewish literature into the literary world of Graeco-Roman writings such as Plutarch's *Alexander* in terms of the portrayal of the protagonist (Robbins 1981: 305-6). Thinking along Bakhtinian lines one could add here that the break from HB tradition in this respect is a literary device, deliberately interacting dialogically with

primarily for legitimising purposes, the author of the latter has absorbed them into his text, identifying his own voice with them to begin with, in order to strengthen the credibility of the story of the coming conception of Jesus, which, on its own, might come across as an incredible, isolated incident. At the same time, however, there is also ambivalence towards these old texts in the authorial voice as a divergence from their pattern comes to the fore in that same story.

*The appearance of the angel (Is 6: 1-13, Lk 1: 10-20)*

The conception stories are not the only HB texts that operate in the Gospel Annunciation stories. Another such presence, one that also has a significant impact on the discourse of the Gospel of Luke, can be found on a less obvious level. When the angel appears to Zechariah (Lk 1: 10-20), one is reminded of the story of Isaiah (Is 6: 1-13), in which the prophet recounts a vision of God on a throne attended by seraphs, one of whom approaches him. The setting is the same as the scene described in Luke. Other parallels include a priest in the sanctuary of the Temple at a holy moment, an angel conversing with him, terror on the part of the human as a result of the proximity of the divine presence, something burning, and an instruction given by the angel to the human. In each case the angel performs an action that physically affects the human in terms of speech. In Isaiah's scene there is a promise of eventual communal healing after repentance, but only after great devastation. In the angel's message to Zechariah the imminent coming of the Lord is foretold for which the people must be prepared through repentance. In both cases one can detect the pattern of salvation to come, which must be preceded, first, by the purification of the human agent, who must then, in turn, persuade the people to repent, that is, to be purified to prepare for the event of God's saving action. While Isaiah is the recipient of the message, as well as the future conveyor of it, Zechariah, as the receiver of the message is punished and disabled, the onus of conveying the message of repentance resting on his future son, who, from the start, must keep himself, nazaritic-like, pure for this task.

One might argue here that these parallels in the two scenes are coincidental, and that, while comparisons can be drawn, there need not necessarily be an actual connection, an

actual employment of the older text by the Gospel text. Strictly speaking that could be true, but it is not likely. Reading further into the Gospel, there is a clear indication of the presence of the Book of Isaiah in this text, both by name and by quotation (Lk 3: 3-5, 4: 17-19). We know therefore that the author of Luke consciously employed this text.

The scene of Isaiah's experience is infinitely more impressive than that of Zechariah. The former actually has a vision of God himself surrounded by worshipping attendants that are described in amazing visual terms (Isa 6: 1-5). The presence of God, although it is only the hem of his robe that fills the Temple,<sup>41</sup> causes a shaking of the pivots of the thresholds and fills the house with smoke. This implies that the divine presence is mighty and dangerous, sweeping everything that is unholy out of the way. The smoke carries the connotation of fire itself with its purifying effect. The seraph then actually applies a hot coal to cleanse the prophet's lips in order to blot out his sin (Is 6: 6-7).

The Gospel description of Zechariah's experience is a weak echo of the Isaiah story. God is not actually seen. The angel is given no physical description. Instead of the immensity of the divine presence in the form of the hem of the robe and the all-filling smoke, Zechariah has his vision at the time of the human activity of burning incense as an offering. While Isaiah confesses his sin and then, after having been cleansed, offers his willingness to serve, Zechariah shows disbelief in the message and is struck dumb as a temporary punishment. The angel disables him, the disability then being used by the divine power to carry the truth of the intervention to the people, to enable them to believe that it has occurred. Nevertheless, the Isaiah vision is summoned up in the Gospel story as the archetypal version, giving the latter a framework of grandeur. Like the other HB models discussed above, it has a reinforcing effect on the legitimacy of the Annunciation of John. Although neither the proximity of God himself, nor his visible splendour are described in the Gospel, his imminence is felt by association. Thus when the angel says: 'I am Gabriel. I stand in the presence of God' (Lk 1: 19), the imagination of anyone familiar with the old story can summon up the divine scene, reinforcing an impression of awe in terms of God's presence behind the angel that brings the message.

---

<sup>41</sup> In LXX there is no mention of the hem of the robe. It simply states that the "house was full of his glory" (Is 6: 1).

Thinking along Bakhtinian lines in terms of dialogic interaction between the two texts one would ask why the author of Luke, keen to emphasize the significance and veracity of his story, should give this rather anticlimactic version of the older model. The answer to this can be found in what follows next. The Annunciation of the birth of Jesus (the protagonist) is presented as the scene that, according to the Gospel, is *the* most significant of all the miraculous conception scenes. While Isaiah features as the main character in the HB story in terms of the divine plan to inaugurate salvation, Zechariah and John are secondary figures to Mary and Jesus in the Gospel. The Isaiah scene underlies both Gospel announcements, grafting the two stories together on a deeper level. It is the scene featuring Zechariah and Gabriel that lends the encounter between Gabriel and Mary (at a location removed from the Temple) the sense of holiness by virtue of association. Featuring as a comparatively depressed version of the older story, it acts as the link between Isaiah's vision and that of Mary, at the same time allowing the latter to be highlighted.

The Temple no longer necessary for legitimization, the scene between Mary and Gabriel is placed in a new location that is only specified in broad terms. There is a direct, uncluttered interaction between the angel and the human. Mary takes over the role of Isaiah in relation to the divine intervention. However, as the human agent for the plan of salvation, unlike Isaiah, she does not have to be purified, as she is young, innocent, and has never been touched by a man. She is already pure. After initially expressing wonder on account of what appears to be a physical impossibility as to her ability to fulfil the angel's prophecy (unlike Zechariah, she is not punished for it!), she, like Isaiah, commits herself to becoming God's instrument: 'Here am I, the servant of the Lord. Let it be with me according to thy word' (Lk 1: 38), which can be compared to 'Here am I: send me!' (Is 6: 8).

In this encounter between Mary and Gabriel, connected to the other Annunciation scenes as well as that of Isaiah by association, the author ushers in a new era. In declaring herself willing to be the servant of the Lord in this matter, however incredible it seems in terms of human reasoning, Mary, as a woman, follows the path of the prophet Isaiah in terms of faith in the power of the divine. However, the manner and content of her ordained service differs from that of Isaiah. She is not a prophet, nor a priest. She does not have to be purified. She will not be a messenger to persuade the people to repent to

enable salvation to take place. Instead, she herself will be the locus through which salvation (later to be described as the Kingdom of God) will appear in human form in the person of Jesus. Instead of salvation being referred to simply in terms of its coming, as is the case in the older text, the manner and form of its coming is spelt out in the Gospel. Instead of eventual re-growth after near total destruction with God at a far distance in Isaiah, the divine world will enter the human world in human form through the womb of a woman in the Gospel.

In terms of dialogic interaction one could say that the author, while using the Isaiah text, transmitting a sense of momentous grandeur in terms of God's intervention in the Gospel, as well as introducing the issue of purification of the human agent, also challenges it by implication. Having first accepted and identified itself with the HB tradition, the discourse of the Gospel announces a radical change. The simplicity of the scene between Gabriel and Mary, as well as its distance from the Temple, together with the actual content of the message, proclaims that salvation will come in an unprecedented form that poses new challenges, shaking the very structures in which it roots itself. While Isaiah is the only one who sees God's proximity, eventual healing for the people being promised in the far future after much suffering, the imminent divine presence in human form amongst the people themselves is foretold in the Gospel Annunciations. In line with the HB prophets of old, Zechariah's son will 'make ready a people prepared for the Lord' (Lk 1: 17), while Mary's son is the coming salvation itself.<sup>42</sup>

### *A people prepared for the Lord*

The notion of the people having to be prepared for the coming of the Lord by repentance, featuring in the Annunciation of John (Lk 1: 16-17), is a prominent theme in various HB texts. It is of primary importance in the scene with the seraph in the Book of Isaiah that

---

<sup>42</sup> Although Marshall does not discuss this text in terms of this particular intertextual connection, it is noteworthy that he cites Burger's opinion, who regards this story as a Lucan composition, Marshall himself stating that the story could only have been, either, based on information from Mary herself, or a theological construction, or both (Marshall 1978: 63). This would tie up with my conclusion that the author of the Gospel deliberately crafted the Annunciation stories to further the discourse of the text as a whole. However, even if the text did rely on a particular tradition, it could still have appropriated the HB texts for enhancing its discourse. Marshall furthermore notes that both Annunciation stories are expressed in HB terminology (Marshall 1978: 72). Fitzmyer sees the Annunciation as a dramatic composition by Luke in which he refashions elements of the tradition so that the reader may grasp the full identity of Jesus (Fitzmyer 1981: 341).

has been discussed above. The intertextual link between these two texts concerning this notion is confirmed as the Gospel story progresses, surfacing by actual name and quotation (Lk 3: 2-6, Is 40: 3-5).

Another HB prophet with the same notion of preparing the people for the coming of the Lord through repentance, namely Elijah, is mentioned by name in the Annunciation of John: 'With the spirit and power of Elijah he will go before them, to turn the hearts of parents to their children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the righteous, to make ready a people prepared for the Lord' (Lk 1: 17). This turns out to be a near-quotation from the Book of Malachi: 'Lo, I will send you the prophet Elijah before the great and terrible day of the Lord comes. He will turn the hearts of parents to their children and the hearts of children to their parents, so that I will not come and strike the land with a curse' (Mal 4: 5-6). This can be seen as another example of the new text having appropriated an HB text in order to strengthen the legitimacy of its own discourse, while also diverging from it. As in the vision of the Temple scenes, the divine power in the older text features as much harsher than the one in the new text. John's birth and mission will bring joy to many in expectation of the coming of the Lord, while the coming of the Lord will be expected with fear in the case of Elijah, lest by finding the people unprepared in terms of repentance he will strike the land with a curse. What emerges from this implies that the Lucan discourse points towards a new era in terms of God's relationship with his people, a relationship that will be on a more familiar, compassionate level.<sup>43</sup>

This analysis of the involvement of texts from the HB in this minimal portion of the Gospel story featuring the Annunciation stories, shows, not only that the author must be familiar with the older texts, but also that he relies on that knowledge on the part of (at least some) of his readers and listeners, making it possible to engage in a dialogue between the Lucan text and the HB as well as with the expected reader. The same kind of analysis can be applied to other sections of the narrative as well. To do this fully would be a task too long to fit into one chapter. Therefore I shall now confine myself in concentrating on one strand (The Book of Zechariah) of this dialogic relationship

---

<sup>43</sup> See also Chapter 2 of this thesis where I point out that as a result of the Gospel using the idiom of the Menippea there is a more familiar, personal depiction of the relationship between the human and the divine. In terms of this consideration it may be possible to make a case for the Annunciation of John to be seen in a comic light; an anti-climactic version of the Isaiah vision.

between the Gospel and the Hebrew Bible. However, not even this can be done exhaustively, and will have to be done selectively, to serve merely as a demonstration of the interpretive implications that can be generated by a consideration of the Gospel narrative in terms of Bakhtin's theory of intertextuality.

### *The Book of Zechariah<sup>44</sup> in the Gospel of Luke*

At first glance there is not all that much *prima facie* evidence that the author of the Gospel of Luke was familiar with the Book of Zechariah. There are, however, pointers worth following up. Considering the multiple HB voices that are clearly present in the Gospel by either quotation, name, or parallel situations, some of which have already been discussed in connection with the Annunciation stories, one can say that the author of the Gospel is likely to have had knowledge of other texts of the Hebrew Bible as well, including the Book of Zechariah. The quotation from the Book of Malachi about Elijah, noted above, also points in that direction, Malachi being the book directly after the Book of Zechariah in the canon. Some scholars class it as constituting a part of the second part of Zechariah.<sup>45</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> Modern scholars are, on the whole, of the opinion that the Book of Zechariah consists of at least two separate parts, seeing the divide between Chapters 8 and 9. Petersen (1984) treats them separately, combining Chapters 1-8 with the book of Haggai in his book, while discussing Chapters 9-14 together with the book of Malachi in his second book (1995). See also Hanson (1975: 280-401), who sees Zech 1-8 to be in line with the establishment of the day while he interprets Zech 9-14 as reflecting a movement outside the establishment. The second half of Zechariah has been seen to be particularly complicated in terms of interpretation, there being many conflicting opinions on it. Inevitably, various theories as to the integrity of the text have come forward, different scholars classing different sections as primary or secondary text. Boda, in listing various research works on this issue, notes a new opening to considering the unity of Zechariah 1-14 (Boda 2003: 36). This investigation will take the synchronic approach. The division into two major parts made by later scholars does not have to complicate a consideration of the book's interaction with the Gospel of Luke. The book appears in the HB as one book under the name of Zechariah, as it does in the Septuagint translation. The Gospel writer would not have been affected by the concerns of later scholars. Nor does the apparent disparateness of the text have to be an obstacle in terms of viewing any intertextual interaction between the two texts. A feature of a Menippean text, with which the Gospel shares a number of features, is to make eclectic use of many different texts and genres in whatever manner suits the particular purpose of its own discourse (see Chapter 2, pp. 60-3) of this thesis.

<sup>45</sup> See Petersen (1995: 1-3), where the argument is advanced that there may not have been a separate book called Malachi originally. Petersen separates Zechariah 1-8 from Zechariah 9-14, joining the latter with Malachi. His argument hinges, amongst other factors, on his consideration of the latter combined text in terms of three oracles (Zech 9: 1 - 11: 17; Zech 12: 1 - 14: 21; Mal 1: 1 - 3: 24). Petersen argues that the Malachi in Mal 1: 1, which means 'his messenger,' is not necessarily a proper name, and thus does not need to constitute a separate book (1995: 165-66). Hanson contends that Malachi was at some point given independent status from Zechariah so as to expand the Minor Prophets to the holy number twelve (Hanson 1975: 292-93). Again, these later theories would not have affected the Gospel writer, but the physical proximity of Zechariah and Malachi in the canon, together with the related subject matter could have led to them being combined in their use by the writer of Luke.

Major parallel themes in Luke and Zechariah include the return of the Lord to his people, who, on their part must first be prepared for this coming, the battle between God and the forces that oppose him, and the theophanic conception of God that underlies both texts. To this can be added that both texts look towards the future salvation for the people, brought about by the direct intervention of a deity that is the sole God of all peoples, Yahweh's Day in Zechariah being comparable to the Day of the Son of Man in the Gospel. Although these themes appear differently in the two texts, the Gospel having reworked them into a more familiar mode, they can be seen as parallel underlying concerns in the two discourses.

### *A priest named Zechariah*

In themselves, these thematic parallels need not evidence a relation between the two specific texts in question as they can equally well be used to support a claim for intertextuality between the Gospel of Luke and other HB books, as for example the Book of Isaiah. Looking for features that point more specifically to the book of Zechariah, one cannot help seeing the actual name *Zechariah* at the beginning of the first narrative in the Gospel.<sup>46</sup> The HB book of the prophet is immediately conjured up via association. On the other hand, this could be coincidental, as the name *Zechariah* (*Zachariah*, *Zacharias*) is a name commonly used in priestly families in the Judaic tradition. It appears frequently in the HB,<sup>47</sup> and is also mentioned later in the Gospel by the protagonist, Jesus, referring to another Zechariah in the HB canon.<sup>48</sup>

Nevertheless, there are parallels between the Zechariah in the Gospel and the HB prophet that justify consideration. Petersen, in his commentary of the Book of Zechariah, argues for the significance of the actual name (Yahweh has remembered) in it. The name is conservative, 'evoking a sense of continuity with earlier Israelite tradition. Such a name suggests that Yahweh remembers what he did for and with Israel at an earlier period. And it presumes that he will act again in a similar manner' (Petersen 1984: 110). He suggests that the name, Zechariah, was deliberately used to strengthen the validity of the prophet's visions and the book as a whole. Arguing along the same lines one could say that the

<sup>46</sup> This particular character does not appear in the other three Gospels.

<sup>47</sup> 2 Kings, 1 Chronicles, 2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Isaiah and Zechariah.

<sup>48</sup> Lk 11: 51, 2 Ch 24: 20-21.

name, Zechariah, far from being coincidental in the Gospel, is used deliberately to proclaim the resumption of God's benevolent intervention in the fate of the latter day Children of Israel.<sup>49</sup> Continuity with the HB tradition in terms of God remembering the promises of old is thus announced. The Song of Mary (Lk 1: 54-55) and the Song of Zechariah (Lk 1: 72-73) both support this notion.

Petersen goes on to draw attention to the importance of the HB Zechariah's genealogical background, which gives him his authority. A member of a priestly house, he was 'known to be familiar with ritual matters' (Petersen 1984: 109). The date of the setting of the book, stated at its beginning, is the second year of Darius' reign (Zech 1: 1). Petersen dates the prophet's activity, as well as the book itself to the early post-exilic period, pointing to the frequency of the use of genealogy as an introductory identification in literature of this period. Using the Latter Prophets as an example he states: 'genealogies played a very important role in establishing continuities with the past for those who lived in the early postexilic period' (Petersen 1984: 17-18).<sup>50</sup> It can be noted that the Zechariah in the Gospel, who, like his counterpart, converses with an angel and proclaims prophecy, is also introduced in genealogical terms, also belongs to a priestly family, and is also familiar with ritual matters (Lk 1: 11, 76-79, 5, 9).

The writer of the Gospel could thus be using the name, Zechariah, as a literary device directing the reader's memory to the HB book and circumstances. In intertextual terms one could say that the reader is encouraged by implication to believe in God's promise as still being applicable in first century times. The time and setting of the Gospel (as well as that of its appearance), although centuries had passed in between, is equated with the reconstructive circumstances in Jerusalem and its surroundings of the early post-exilic period as depicted in the HB. Jews and early Christians of the first century CE, like the Jews of the post-exilic era, lived under the yoke of a foreign power. A sense of continuity with the earlier era, when there had been a great need for restoration, which had been achieved, evidenced by the Second Temple, would have been a powerful tool to encourage faith in the liberation and restoration that the Gospel is about to announce.

<sup>49</sup> Interestingly, Rose, in connection with the Branch (Zech 3: 8, 6: 12-13), notes a similar phenomenon between the Book of Jeremiah and the Book of Zechariah (Rose 2000: 134-35).

<sup>50</sup> He cites Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Joel, Jonah, Zephaniah and Zechariah (Petersen 1984: 18). One could consider that in terms of a rhetorical viewpoint the credibility of what the speaker says depends a great deal on his credibility as a respected person in a community (*ethos*).

*Satan and Jesus: The fourth vision/ desert scene (Zech 3: 1-7, Lk 4: 1-12)*

A further pointer to an involvement of the Book of Zechariah in the Gospel of Luke is that the character, Satan (Zech 3: 1 LXX: *diabolos*, Lk 4: 1: *diabolos*), appears in both texts, in each case challenging a central character called Jesus (Joshua in the NRSV; *Jesus* in LXX).<sup>51</sup> Although one can argue that Satan appears in other HB texts as well, as for example the Book of Job, he only appears in the HB in combination with a character called Joshua (Jesus) in the Book of Zechariah. The challenge by Satan in the latter book, like in the Gospel of Luke, constitutes an assault on the legitimacy of the character, Joshua, as the sanctified agent for the divine plan of restoration (Zech 3: 1-2, Lk 4: 1-13).

What is striking when the two texts are compared is how the function of the HB figures of Satan and Joshua is extended in the Gospel. Satan, the accuser, only appears in one sentence in the older text, and does not even feature in direct speech. Nevertheless, he constitutes a force that challenges Yahweh's choice of the human agent for the divine plan (Zech 3: 1-2). In the Gospel, he is given a longer appearance and is depicted as the active tempter. Having dominion over a kingdom of his own (Lk 11: 17), his role has been elevated from a brief appearance as challenger (silenced before the reader can hear what he has to say) to being the opponent-in-chief in the overall battle between the coming Kingdom of God and the forces of evil. He is brought into the consciousness of the reader in Luke 4: 1-12 as he is depicted (as in the older text) in the form of a character, this scene showing the only visible, face-to-face struggle between the two kingdoms. After that Satan features covertly in the form of his representatives, such as the demons and those humans that are under his authority. His continued presence is felt throughout the narrative by Jesus' repeated references to him.<sup>52</sup> Besides the desert scene, he is also referred to by name by the narrator one more time at the crucial point of Jesus' betrayal (Lk 22: 3). Jesus in the Gospel, in contrast to Joshua in Zechariah, is given the role of the protagonist in the text he appears in as a whole. While Joshua features as a

---

<sup>51</sup> These two characters also appear together in The Gospel of Mark and the Gospel of Matthew. It is thus possible that the scene in Luke could be derived from them, or from another common source, the scenes in Matthew and Luke being almost identical. As the priority of the one text over the other, or the possibility of another intermediary source cannot be stated with absolute certainty, I shall focus here on the similar elements in Luke and Zechariah, disregarding, for the time being, the route the connection may have taken. The question of source is discussed by Marshall (1978: 165-68).

<sup>52</sup> Lk 10: 18, 11: 18, 13: 16, 22: 31

passive human, organized by divine beings, with no text, Jesus actively proclaims and propagates the coming Kingdom of God.

How does Satan feature in Zech 3: 1-7 and Lk 4: 1-12? Petersen identifies him as a divine being in the older text, part of the divine council, 'one who acts in a legal context, (although, one) whose action inspires a negative connotation' (Petersen 1984: 190). This is in contrast to the Satan in the Gospel who tests Jesus in a non-legal context (Lk 4: 1-12). The two characters do not meet within a council, as in the older text, but are on their own in the desert. A legal challenge to Yahweh's choice of the human agent, Joshua, is revolutionized in the Gospel to a targeted offensive in a move to seduce Jesus to submit to the opposite kingdom in order to derail the divine plan (Lk 4: 8). Having seen him as a character without text, merely present in his capacity as challenger in Zechariah, we see the Satan of the Gospel as a voluble character, obsequiously familiar with Jesus, having been transformed from a challenger within the heavenly system to an outer opposing force. At a later stage he is described by Jesus as having descending like lightning from the sky (Lk10: 18), suggesting a god-like force that comes down to destroy, signalling that a crucial battle is about to take place on earth. Furthermore, it could mean that he has been expelled from God's realm,<sup>53</sup> signifying the final break from the sphere that he had been formerly part of in the HB text, thus shifting the battle into a wider, cosmic dimension. This image is opposed to a related image of Jesus as the Son of Man in Lk 17: 24, 'For as lightning flashes and lights up the sky from one side to the other, so will be the Son of Man in his day.'

One could see the scene in the Gospel as a possible variation of the Satan-Joshua scene in Zechariah. While the latter scene depicts a legitimisation ceremony taking place within the divine council, the former shows a one-on-one struggle taking place on earth, bringing to consciousness the fact that the narrative has a battle as its subtext, a battle that will come more and more to the fore as the story progresses. Jesus, on his own, is directly exposed to an active attack by the force that opposes his very being. The challenge levelled in Zechariah in terms of the validity of the agent for the divine plan turns into an attack on Jesus' identity as the Son of God in the Gospel (Lk 4:3). The scene presents a

---

<sup>53</sup> For an opinion on this possibility see Marshall (1978: 428-429), who relates this passage to the myth of the fall of Lucifer from Heaven that he sees as also underlying Is 14: 12 and Lk 10: 15.

rigorous testing of the integrity of his person, as opposed to a challenge in terms of ritual purity in the case of Joshua in the HB scene. Unlike Joshua, who is depicted as a passive human, defended, purified and installed by a presiding divine being, the Jesus of the Gospel, exposed to Satan on his own, withstands the attack on his integrity, passing the test in terms of who he is.

One can say that Zech 3:1-7 features in Lk 4:1-13 as a source, a means of comparison, and as a dialogic partner for the depiction of the earthly meeting between Satan and Jesus. The *locus* of the intertextual action is amongst notions concerning relations between God and his opposite. The Gospel text responds to the older text with its own perception by demonstrating an attack by the one force upon the other in an allegorised form. Concerning the *form* of the intertextual interaction one could say that the HB text is formally subsumed in the Gospel text. However, it is recognisable for anyone familiar with the two books by the character names, as well as the parallels of encounter and situation in terms of challenging an agent for the divine plan. The old text is thus present by implication, serving as a starting point for the new text, which having first identified itself with it, diverges from it, putting the two into dialogic tension. The *degree* of presence of the older text in the new is high, the Gospel aligning itself with the older text to begin with to give weight to its own scene through association with the canonized narrative. Its divergence signals a shift in the perception of the role of Satan and Joshua/Jesus. The location of the battle scene has been moved to a space outside the divine council. There is also a redistribution of power. The figure of Satan has been empowered by having text of its own, which the reader is able to hear and weigh up. Jesus takes on his own battle without any heavenly mediation, the implication being that he is part of God himself, thus confirming his divine nature, as announced by Gabriel (Lk 1:35). The depiction of Satan as an independent, subversive force, outside God's system of justice, has shifted the battle onto another plane. While Yahweh is depicted as being solely in control of both Joshua and Satan in Zechariah, the depiction of Satan as the opposing force in the Gospel suggests that he is another deity.<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> This reaches back to notions of warring deities in the ancient conflict myth. See Hanson (1974: 301ff), who discusses the conflict myth and the related Divine Warrior Hymn in how it plays a part to a greater and lesser extent in Israel's religion in a modified form. Hanson traces it as emerging prominently in what he identifies as apocalyptic literature of the exilic and post-exilic periods in 2 Isaiah and Zechariah 9-14. This would point to an interaction between the second part of Zechariah and the Gospel of Luke.

A further implication of this intertextuality can be seen in terms of genre. The HB scene makes use of the vision or dream that Zechariah (presented as a historical figure within the framework of a realistic description) experiences. This can accommodate supernatural figures, like Satan and the angel meeting with the historical human, Joshua, without sacrificing its historical credibility. In the Gospel, on the other hand, which promises to give an historical account in its prologue, no effort is made to stay within the boundaries of realistic, historical description in this scene. Two figures, one supernatural, the other semi-divine, meet without the covering frame of a vision. Generically, one could relate this feature to Bakhtin's assessment of the Menippea, the texts of which frequently include supernatural descriptions that are invented in order to test the main idea in the narrative. The idea being tested in the Gospel is the coming Kingdom of God, and whether Jesus is its embodiment. The desert scene features as a hybrid, as a Menippean representation incorporating the text of the prophet, Zechariah, the host text belonging to a different genre to the appropriated text. The presence of the Zechariah text with its prophetic character lends the notion of Jesus as the embodiment of the Kingdom of God credibility, while the divergence from it reinforces a notion that has been projected in the Annunciation of Jesus, namely that unprecedented occurrences are about to happen in terms of the fulfilment of the divine plan. Significantly, the weapons employed in this battle between Jesus and Satan consist of quoted passages from the HB (Deut 8: 3, 6: 13, Ps 91: 11, Deut 6: 16), emphasizing that the contest between Jesus and Satan is fought within the tenets of the moral system of the HB. The Lucan discourse speaks in light of the voices of the earlier canon.

### *The trial of Jesus*

Although the testing of Jesus' integrity in the desert scene is not within the setting of a legal proceeding, its association with the scene in Zechariah, which *is* a legal proceeding, connects it to the trial of Jesus further on in the Gospel. The scene in Zechariah thus links the desert scene with the trial scenes in the Gospel by means of its intertextual relations with both.

What is striking in Jesus' trial is that it can be seen as a travesty, an inversion of a court of justice. Nevertheless it is set in the mode of a legal proceeding. As Joshua in Zech 3:

1-2, Jesus stands before a council to be tried on the question of his identity in terms of the divine plan. The presiding angel of the HB scene is absent. Instead, we have successive human judges in the form of the High Priest, Herod and Pontius Pilate. At first glance it seems that Satan is also absent, but this is not so. In the earlier desert scene Satan has claimed that he has authority over the kingdoms of this world (Lk 4: 5). Having failed to corrupt Jesus, he ostensibly disappears from the scene, his representatives acting for him from this point on. Jesus stands accused by people who, according to the Gospel, are opposing the divine plan of the coming Kingdom of God. In other words, although the character, Satan, like Yahweh in Zechariah, does not appear in person, he is present by representation in the form of Jesus' accusers.

What we see here is an inversion of the trial situation in Zech 3: 1-7. In that scene, Joshua is surrounded by benevolent divine beings that represent God, the angel in charge acquitting him of a ritual impurity that would prevent him from inaugurating worship in the reconstructed Temple, while a silent Satan only features as the accuser. In the trial scenes in the Gospel, Jesus (mostly silent) is surrounded by voluble, malevolent people who represent Satan. We are presented with the cosmic battle between good and evil in human form. In terms of power, the status quo has ostensibly tipped in favour of Satan, turning matters upside down in terms of the HB scene. The test of Jesus' integrity and thus his identity as the embodiment of the Kingdom of God, and, by extension, the reality of the advent of this Kingdom, has been drastically intensified, the trial constituting a testing of Jesus according to two different sets of criteria. He is tried and condemned on the physical, earthly level, discrediting him as a Messiah in terms of worldly power. On the other hand, this very maltreatment and condemnation constitutes a testing of the truthfulness of his identity in terms of the divine plan for salvation. Defeated according to earthly standards, his identity in terms of his divine being remains untouched.

Along with the inversion of the trial itself, we get the inversion of the symbolic process of attire. In Zechariah, Joshua has his filthy clothes that symbolize his and his community's ritual impurity,<sup>55</sup> replaced with pure robes, and a ritually pure crown is put

---

<sup>55</sup> Petersen suggests that the impurity and guilt lies in the fact that because of the Babylonian exile, Joshua and the members of the community were born in an 'unclean' land, and thus had to be purified before worship could be re-instated in the newly built Jerusalem Temple. The question that Satan and the community may reasonably ask is whether this 'unclean' priest can remove the people's guilt when he,

on his head to legitimise his role as the high priest. He is thus validated as the agent of the divine plan to restore worship in the Jerusalem Temple, so that Yahweh can come and dwell in it amongst his people. In contrast, the Jesus in the Gospel is stripped and scourged and is then robed with a regal gown in mockery. What is a *bona fide* crowning within the system of Yahweh's council in Zechariah, is a carnivalistic mock crowning in the Gospel. This, as well as Jesus' condemnation, is consistent with the situation of inversion. As the forces of Satan ostensibly control this particular scene in the Gospel, it follows that the actions performed on Jesus are the direct opposite of what the messengers of Yahweh perform on Joshua in Zechariah.<sup>56</sup>

What conclusions can be drawn from this intertextual relation in terms of affecting the discourse of the Gospel? To begin with, the basic parallel situation in the two books serves to reinforce the legitimacy of Jesus as the divinely chosen agent for God's plan, rooting it in the HB text. Secondly, the presenting of the Gospel scene as a carnivalistic inversion of the trial scene in Zechariah exposes that the latter was also not a true trial in the sense of the distribution of justice, as the messenger of Yahweh simply rebukes the accuser on the grounds that Joshua has been chosen, thus emphasizing unilateral divine action (Zech 3: 2). The divergence in the Gospel from Zechariah's vision indicates that a new era has approached. Legitimacy and sanctification are at the heart of both texts, but the battle shows itself on familiar ground in the Gospel, exposing its hard realities in human terms. It comes across as fiercer, a more equal distribution of power between the sides becoming apparent. The unseen God of the older text is no longer the sole controlling being. Both Satan and Jesus have become empowered. Satan is depicted as acting from a space outside God's jurisdiction, while Jesus, in contrast to Joshua, actively fights for the coming Kingdom of God in his capacity as the Son of God. Paradoxically, his divine nature is affirmed by his own physical involvement, as he exposes himself directly to the forces of Satan in this world. One could say that he embodies a new theophanic conception of God, a god who is visible in human form, who, instead of using cosmic power and the sword of earthly enemies to effect his plan, uses Scripture, the embodiment of human vulnerability and gentleness as his weapons. The trial can thus be

---

himself, is contaminated by the exilic experience (Petersen 1984: 195). See also Driver et al (1912: 150-151)

<sup>56</sup> The trial scene as a carnivalistic inversion in the Hellenistic world, a mock crowning in the Bakhtinian sense, is discussed in the Chapter 2 of this thesis (pp. 78-80).

seen as confirming a number of previous allusions to the divinity of Jesus in the Gospel text.<sup>57</sup>

A further implication of the trial scene in the Gospel in the light of the scene in Zechariah is that the restoration of the Children of Israel will come about in a new dimension altogether. Implying that the establishment of both the priesthood and the secular Roman power is under Satan's authority, the Gospel makes the radical suggestion that the physical Temple and its establishment, as well as the city, will be replaced by another kind of temple and city for God to dwell in amongst his people, a symbolic or other-worldly one. One might conjecture that it may be the community of believers that Jesus has been teaching and that he urges at the end to proclaim repentance and forgiveness of sins in his name to all nations (Lk 24: 47). It could also refer to a future, ideal city beyond the geographical and temporal constraints of this world. While the Book of Zechariah is deeply concerned with the reconstruction of a new, physical Temple, one can detect the opposite movement in the Gospel. Jesus tries to cleanse the Temple of existing corruption by evicting the traders<sup>58</sup> and by personally proclaiming the good news of the Kingdom of God (Lk 20: 1)<sup>59</sup> in it, but nevertheless prophesies that the Temple and the city will be destroyed (Lk 19: 43-44, 21: 6). Similarly, there is the implication that the priesthood, under the dominion of Satan, can no longer be entrusted with representing the holiness and purity of the community as in the case with Joshua in the Book of Zechariah.

#### *The Branch (Zechariah 3: 8-10)*

While the scene featuring Satan and Joshua in Zechariah's vision ostensibly deals with matters of reinstating the worship of Yahweh in a near-future rebuilt Temple in Jerusalem in the post-exilic period, featuring what can be seen as an historical Joshua,<sup>60</sup> another figure is heralded in this vision that defies any definitive interpretation in terms of

---

<sup>57</sup> The first time that Jesus' divinity is alluded to in the Gospel occurs in Gabriel's words (Lk 1: 35) 'Son of God' (in the Greek text and KJV). Another example can be found in Elizabeth's words 'mother of my Lord (*kurios*)' in Lk 1: 43, when referring to Mary. The narrator's conviction of Jesus' divinity is evident from the way he refers to him as *the Lord (kurios)* in Lk 7: 13, 10: 1, 11: 39, 12: 42, 13: 15, 17: 6, 18: 6, 19: 8, 22: 61 and 24: 3.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. Zech 14: 21.

<sup>59</sup> In Lk 4: 43, Jesus states that he was sent for the purpose of proclaiming the good news of the Kingdom of God. All his teaching can be seen with this in mind.

identity or chronology. Joshua, having been purified and ritually instated as the High Priest, is told, together with those with him, that a servant of Yahweh, called the *Branch*, will be brought to them. Nothing more is said about this character at that stage, but he is mentioned again in a later vision (Zech 6: 12-13), in which the prophet is told that a man called *Branch* 'shall flourish from his place ... will build the Temple of Yahweh ... will acquire majesty ... as a ruler (he) will sit upon his throne ... beside his throne will be a priest (and) peaceable council will exist between the two of them.'

Scholars have debated the identity of this character and the length of the interim period between the promise and the future fulfilment. Petersen, voicing the mainstream view, suggests that in the post-exilic period the coming of the *Branch* would have been seen as the fulfilment of a hope for the return of a Davidic ruler in the person of Zerubbabel, the descendent of David who returned with the exiles from Babylon as governor of Yehud (Petersen 1984: 212). He points out how the word, *Branch* (*zumah*), and plant imagery as such is used in the HB, often metaphorically, referring to a Davidic ruler, and at times in a physical sense, signifying growth, and thus material wealth.<sup>61</sup> As the *Branch* appears in the first half of Zechariah,<sup>62</sup> Hanson also identifies him as Zerubbabel, who would be crucial in rebuilding the Temple (Hanson 1975: 253-4). In contrast, Meyers and Meyers, although interpreting the *Branch* as a (possibly messianic) Davidic king, place the fulfilment of this promise into a distant future, contending that it was unlikely that the prophet would promote a monarchy in the contemporary period, which would constitute a political rebellion against Persian rule (Meyers & Meyers 1987: 202-203). Rose goes further than this, maintaining that on the evidence of the text the *Branch* cannot be Zerubbabel, and that the Temple he must rebuild cannot be the physical one of the post-exilic period.<sup>63</sup> Instead, referring to Jer 23: 5-6 as the direct background to Zech 6: 12-

---

<sup>60</sup> Son of Jehozadak (Hag 1: 1, Zech 6: 11). See Petersen, who identifies him as the first 'historical' character (grandson of Seraiah, the High Priest, during the defeat of Jerusalem in BCE 587), apart from Zechariah himself, appears in the night visions (Petersen 1985: 188).

<sup>61</sup> For example, in Ezek 16: 7 the term *zumah* is used to designate Jerusalem. In Is 11: 1, plant imagery, although the term *neser* (branch), and not *zumah*, is used for the notion of a future Davidic ruler, while Jer 23: 5 uses *zumah* in association with David to refer to a future king who 'will rule wisely, and shall execute justice and righteousness in the land' (Petersen 1984: 212).

<sup>62</sup> Hanson separates Zechariah 1-8, which he sees as presenting the legitimisation of the programme of reconstruction of the ruling Zadokite priesthood, from Zechariah 9-14, which he interprets as presenting the apocalyptic view of the visionary, disenfranchised group.

<sup>63</sup> Rose's argument against the view that the *Branch* refers to Zerubbabel hinges on four points: (1) the fact that it is Joshua who is ritually crowned, not the *Branch*, (2) the use of the name, the *Branch* (*zumah*), when Zerubbabel could have been used (as it is in Zech 6: 10), (3) the discontinuity in terms of historical means conveyed by the imagery of the word, *zumah*, implying that 'growth', unlike 'branch', emerges from the

13, he sees the *Branch* as a messianic figure raising ‘expectations focusing on a future royal figure sent by God who will bring salvation to God’s people and the world and establish a kingdom characterized by features like peace and justice’ (Rose 2000: 248-49).

The *Branch* as such does not ostensibly feature in the Gospel of Luke. However, if one is to follow Rose’s interpretation of that character in Zechariah as a future messianic figure, and consider this in the light of what the Angel Gabriel says to Mary in Lk 1: 32-33, namely, that her son will be given the throne of his ancestor David, and that his kingdom will have no end, one could tentatively consider whether this passage proclaims a fulfilment of the prophecy (Zech 3: 8 and 6: 12-13). In both instances an angel announces the divinely mediated coming of a future ruler of a kingdom of utopian proportions.

Rose opposes ‘branch’ (part of an existing plant) as the translation of the Hebrew *zumah* (Rose 200: 120). He argues for ‘vegetation’, ‘greenery’, ‘growth’ (plants as a whole, possibly in a collective sense, growing directly out of the soil). He distinguishes the use of *zumah* in Zechariah from other plant imagery that refers to a future Davidic king, as for example the ‘shoot/sprout’ (*neser*) imagery from Isa 11: 1 as a metaphor for offspring, pointing out that there is no mention of the name *David* in connection with the *Branch* in Zechariah. If one is to analyze Rose’s translation of ‘vegetation, greenery, growth’ for *zumah*, one could say that one element of this meaning is that it is a process that has an unlimited future. Another element is that of plenty. A third element is that of new life. All these meanings could be said to be consistent with a utopian kingdom.

In the Septuagint the word *zumah* is translated with the Greek *anatole*. This word does, in fact, appear in the Gospel. First, it is uttered by Zechariah (Lk 1: 78), while the second time it is spoken by Jesus (Lk 13: 29). NRSV translates *anatole* in the Song of Zechariah as ‘dawn’,<sup>64</sup> while the NIV translates it as the ‘rising sun’. On the face of it, this meaning has little to do with ‘vegetation’, ‘greenery’, and ‘growth’ that Rose uses to translate *zumah*, or for that matter with the word, ‘branch’ or ‘shoot’, the standard translations.

---

soil rather than from an existing plant (cf. Jer 23: 5-6), thus necessitating divine intervention, and (4) the fact that the coming of the *Branch* is consistently referred to as an event in the future.

<sup>64</sup> So does the Amplified Bible. Similarly, the New American Bible translates it as ‘daybreak’, while the KJV translates it as ‘dayspring.’ The New American Standard Bible translates it as ‘sunrise’. The Rheims

However, if one takes these concepts in a metaphorical sense (the name, *Branch*, in itself being metaphorical), thinking of a future utopian kingdom ruled by a Messiah, then the element of new life inherent in Rose's translation of *zemaḥ*, and the realization that the sun is vital for vegetation, greenery, growth and new life, then 'dawn', 'dayspring', 'sunrise', and 'rising sun' could be seen as signifiers related to 'vegetation', 'greenery' and 'growth'.<sup>65</sup>

It is of significance that the word *anatole*, that is, the LXX translation of *zemaḥ* in the Book of Zechariah, is used at the climax of Zechariah's prophecy in the Gospel (Lk 1: 78). We see a Zechariah uttering this particular word in both the HB and the Gospel texts in terms of a promise of salvation. The content of Zechariah's song in the Gospel consists of praising God for fulfilling his promise in sending a mighty Messiah (Lk 1: 69), while the vision in the HB promises a figure that will become a majestic ruler in a peaceable relationship with the priesthood (Zech 6: 12-13). As in the vision in the HB text, there are two co-operating figures mentioned in the Gospel, of which one has a higher status than the other. In other words, the Messiah and his forerunner (the descendent of a priestly family, John) in the Gospel can be seen to correspond with the *Branch* and the priest in the Book of Zechariah. Furthermore, one could see a parallel in the future temple that the *Branch* will build with the coming Kingdom of God that Jesus proclaims and propagates. The word *anatole* in Lk 1: 78 is not meant in its physical sense but is a metaphor for the Messiah, for the son that is about to be born to Mary.<sup>66</sup> This 'dawn' is not about to occur in the natural way, that is, a rising of the sun from the horizon. Instead it will *come down* from 'on high', that is, from Heaven. Apart from the coming utopia that this vivid image suggests, there is the implication that the Messiah, the Son of God, comes down in person to fight the coming battle here on earth, which can be seen to correspond to another image presented in the Book of Zechariah, namely, that of the divine warrior, Yahweh, who is to come and stand on the Mount of Olives to fight for Jerusalem 'on that day', the final day of restoration (Zech 14: 1-21).

---

New Testament translates it as 'the Orient.' The latter is close to the sense in which Jesus uses it later, namely 'the east.'

<sup>65</sup>Marshall, points to a double meaning of the word *anatole* in Lk 1: 78. First, while not specifically linking it to the *Branch* in Zechariah, he does interpret it as the Davidic Messiah, the Shoot from Jesse,<sup>65</sup> and, secondly, as a heavenly body, linking it to the star of Jacob in Nu 24: 17 (Marshall 1978: 95).

<sup>66</sup>If one is to follow Marshall's interpretation, Zechariah, like Elizabeth, would be aware of the conception of the Messiah as Mary's unborn child (Marshall 1978: 91, 93).

Contemplating the possibility that the Gospel appropriates the figure of the coming *Branch* in Zechariah to coincide with the figure of Jesus as the fulfilment of the prophecy, one can note a parallel quality in the being of these two figures, a being that is characterized by a duality that makes it difficult to definitively identify them. The *Branch* is introduced as a coming servant of Yahweh, ostensibly human, who will rule an ideal kingdom. The fact that he is specifically introduced as the servant<sup>67</sup> suggests that he is closer to the deity than other humans, as for example Joshua and his colleagues. This could be interpreted to mean that he is someone between the human and the divine, possibly already in existence but to be brought at a later stage to perform a specific task in the divine plan. He is inseparable from the ideal kingdom he will inaugurate and rule (Zech 6: 12-13).<sup>68</sup> The vegetation imagery associated with his name could suggest that he rules the kingdom while also being its embodiment. While this kingdom could optimistically refer to a future, physical one in a reconstructed Jerusalem, there is also a possibility that an apocalyptic one is envisaged. This ambiguity opens the possibility of the figure being used as a source for the figure of Jesus in the Gospel.

Jesus is announced in the Gospel as someone who will be given the throne of his ancestor, David, to rule a kingdom that will have no end (Lk 1: 33). He appears in the Gospel as the Messiah in human form, although his conception takes place under the shadow of the Holy Spirit, resulting in him being called the Son of the most high. At the same time he represents the Kingdom of God, which is a state in the process of coming. In the Gospel, when Zechariah predicts that the dawn will come down from Heaven, he refers to both aspects, that is, the Messiah himself, as well as the coming Kingdom of God when light will 'shine on those living in darkness and death to guide our feet into the path of peace' (Lk 1:79).

One can conclude at this stage that the Gospel of Luke has made use of Zech 3: 1-8, as well as Zech 6: 9-13. Apart from using it as a source for the function of the characters Jesus and Satan in terms of the battle between the divine plan and the forces that oppose this, there is the use of the figure of the *Branch* to support and legitimise the messiahship of Jesus. The fact that the identity of the *Branch* in Zechariah is impossible to pinpoint

---

<sup>67</sup> The appellation, 'Yahweh's servant', can simply apply to a king. Rose points out that this only applied to David and Hezekiah (Rose 2000: 122).

<sup>68</sup> The 'servant'/Messiah/kingdom component of the old prophecy also appears in Lk 22: 26-30.

with certainty, that even the meaning of the word itself is not absolutely clear, makes it possible to appropriate the character into the new text, moulding it to suit its own purpose.

How does this intertextual reinforcement function in the Gospel? For one thing the old text features in the new text as a prophecy that is in the process of being fulfilled, thus strengthening the validity of Jesus as the Messiah. Process, as opposed to stasis, is at the core of the Gospel as such.<sup>69</sup> In Zech 6:13 the Branch is visualized statically, sitting on a throne while the priest stands beside it. In the Gospel, the Messiah (Jesus) is in movement, like life itself, as he comes, represents and propagates the Kingdom of God, dies, is resurrected, and leaves, promising a future coming. The descendent of the priestly family (John) is also in movement as the forerunner who preaches and baptizes to purify the people to receive the Lord. Both feature as moving beyond the confines of Temple and palace. A new era has arrived; the old prophecies are being fulfilled, but an active, desperate struggle to overcome the evil forces that threaten to obstruct final fulfilment still has to be fought. The followers of Jesus, outside the establishment of priestly and secular power, are given the promise, are purified, and are encouraged to fight this battle in a manner that disengages from conventional warfare. The fact that both Joshua and the *Branch* in the Book of Zechariah are source figures for the Jesus in the Gospel carries two implications concerning his being: like Joshua he is placed in history as a historical figure, while his divine quality, that is beyond historical time, is implied by his identification with the *Branch*. Secondly, there is the implication that both priestly and kingly properties are combined in him.

*Cosmic battle between God and the forces that oppose him (Zech 8-14)*

Thus far the discussion of intertextual relations have focussed on passages in the first part of the book of Zechariah (Zech 1-8). This section presents a promise of the return of the Lord to his people and how their salvation will come about in practical terms in a restored Jerusalem. The cosmic battle is not in the foreground as such but it is an integral part of Yahweh's intervention in terms of inaugurating and ensuring Israel's restoration.

---

<sup>69</sup> Movement is at the core of carnival, the subject of Chapter 2 of this thesis. It also features briefly in Chapter 1(pp. 41-2).

The enemies of the latter will be punished by means of military conquests. We thus see both restoration and divinely controlled military action run concurrently on the surface of the story, the restoration concerning the physical Jerusalem and the cultic practice within it. In other words, it reflects a Temple theology that views eschatology in terms of being realized in geographical space and historical time.<sup>70</sup>

The Gospel, however, also makes use of the second part of Zechariah (9-14),<sup>71</sup> in which the cosmic battle is overwhelmingly in the foreground from the start, evident in what Hanson identifies as a poem in the pattern of the archaic Divine Warrior Hymn (Zech 9: 1-17; Hanson 1975: 296). It has been mentioned above that this section reflects a more apocalyptic vision, interpreted by Hanson as the expression of the visionary group, who, in direct opposition to the ruling Temple theology, view eschatology in terms of the cosmic vision of Yahweh's sovereignty, not translatable in terms of plain history (Hanson 1975: 11). The text could be interpreted as an extreme indictment of the current leadership of the community, looking forward to an ideal future of final, divine justice in a utopian Jerusalem from which Yahweh, the supreme Lord rules all the nations of the world. The divinely organized battle is visualised as moving towards the fulfilment of Yahweh's Day. The latter will be preceded by a rigorous preparation of the people, a repeated purging and reducing of the community to an ever smaller purified remnant. Extreme suffering is foretold as part of this process. Even as late as on Yahweh's Day itself, the city will still be captured, the houses ransacked, the women raped, and half of the inhabitants will go into exile before the Divine Warrior himself stands on the Mount of Olives to effect the concluding fulfilment (Zech 14:2). This fulfilment is vast in its grandeur, including modifications of nature and geography (Zech 14:6-8, 10). The battle won, the Lord will be king of the whole world, the enemies of Jerusalem will be struck by a plague, and all nations will come and worship Yahweh in a Jerusalem that exudes euphoria, that is sacred down to its last pot. The Temple is purified of all traders (Zech 14: 21).<sup>72</sup>

In contrast to this picture, the Gospel does not initially display a battle. No promise of the destruction of any military enemy forces is announced. Instead, the story, to begin with,

<sup>70</sup> See Hanson 1975: 245-46, 282.

<sup>71</sup> Referred to from now on as Deutero-Zechariah.

<sup>72</sup> LXX and KJV have 'Canaanites' instead of 'traders'. Cf Lk 19: 45.

revolves around a priest, an angel, a virgin and the expected birth of two babies. This peaceful picture is deceptive. Gabriel's message to Mary concerning the throne of David, when seen in the light of the HB texts, assumes that the latter has been made inoperative by hostile forces, necessitating divine intervention to restore it. The imagery and form of Mary's song (Lk 1: 46-55), both referring to an age-old tradition of power conflict, adumbrate the magnitude of the underlying battle, the imagery being reminiscent of the theophanic image of Yahweh as the Divine Warrior in Deutero-Zechariah. The predicted purging by fire and division that Jesus sees himself to be the bearer of (Lk 12: 49-53), as well as the violent imagery in some of his later sayings, like his prophecy of the upheavals marking the time preceding the coming of the Son of Man (Lk 21: 7-28), are in stark contrast to his non-violent behaviour in the story line. In terms of the latter, the Gospel continues to underplay the battle itself, which features covertly as a subtext throughout the narrative, mostly through images and by implication. The battle comes to the surface in an ostensibly non-combative manner in scenes like the one between Jesus and Satan in the desert, the scene of Jesus riding on a donkey into Jerusalem, the trial of Jesus, and the crucifixion. None of these show a battle in the conventional, military sense. One could say, rather, that the embodiment of a particular situation carries the battle by implication.

*The king on a donkey (Zech 9: 9, Lk 19: 35-40)*<sup>73</sup>

This image is perhaps the most obvious indication of the presence of Deutero-Zechariah in the Gospel of Luke. As in the case of the *Branch*, the identity of the king in the HB image is not absolutely clear. Ostensibly human, he has the attributes of the divine king. He is just, victorious and a saviour (LXX, Zech 9: 9).<sup>74</sup> The ambiguity of the image

<sup>73</sup> As is the case in the Satan - Joshua/Jesus scenes, the issue of whether there is a direct link between the Gospel and Zechariah is complicated here. Zech 9: 9 is quoted (rather than reworked) in the Gospel of Matthew, as well as in the Gospel of John (Mt 21: 4-9, John 12: 14-15), both quotations differing slightly from the HB text and from each other. As an image embedded in the narrative of the fulfilment of Zechariah's prophecy, it also appears in the Gospel of Mark (Mk 11: 6-10). It is possible, therefore, that the presentation of the image in Luke was derived from one of the three other Gospels. Marshall sees it as following Mark, although he does point out differences (Marshall 1978: 714). However, this need not necessarily be so. For one thing, Luke's version of it is not identical with that found in any of the other three texts. Both Matthew and Mark (Mt 21: 9, Mk 11: 10) spell out a *Davidic* king, John's version (King of Israel) sounding similar to that (John 12: 13). The image, as represented in Luke, on the other hand, does not spell out the name of *David*. While this could be interpreted as Luke simply editing the version of the other Gospels, it must be noted that the HB text does not spell out the name of *David* either.

<sup>74</sup> Petersen does not see this image as presenting the expectation of the return of a real or ideal Davidide. Instead he sees the king as a corporate character (Petersen 1995: 59). Driver et al suggest that the writer has

makes it suitable for appropriation into the Gospel in terms of the duality of Jesus' human and divine being. In Luke this image is presented as a fulfilment of the ancient prophecy in contemporary, historical time. Deceptively gentle, it has radical implications in terms of having the potential of causing a popular uprising against the worldly establishment within which it functions.<sup>75</sup> Its cosmic dimension is implied in Lk 19: 40, when Jesus says that the very stones would shout out, should the people be prevented from doing so. However, the fact that, in contrast to the other Gospels, this image stays in line with the HB prophecy in terms of not mentioning the name *David*, leaves open the possibility that, as in the older text, an altogether different kind of king is referred to, one that bypasses the corruptive kingship of political power (shown to be under the authority of Satan in the desert scene), transcending worldly power struggles and historical time, thus more in line with Hanson's interpretation in terms of the apocalyptic nature of the prophecies of Deutero-Zechariah.<sup>76</sup> If this king were to be a Davidic king fighting for worldly sovereignty in order to establish a kingdom of peace and righteousness, he would be fighting Satan's kingdom on the latter's ground and terms. Instead, Jesus, as the king on the donkey, using the weapon of simply embodying the old prophecy of Scripture, bypasses that type of engagement, and, true to his divine nature, propagates the Kingdom of God on his own terms.

Considering the intertextual use of the HB image in the Gospel, one could say that the presentation of a visual, physical fulfilment of the visionary prophecy puts forward a powerful confirmation of Jesus as the predicted Messiah. The image of a king that does not take up arms fits with Jesus' unmilitary mode of action. Without the HB text behind it, however, the scene in the Gospel would simply feature as an incident without the resonance of the underlying battle that is so vividly described in Deutero-Zechariah. The fact that the passage in the HB text, although in itself peaceful, is set amongst scenes of violence, warfare and rigorous purging of the community, serves to emphasize the

---

combined the Servant of Yahweh as pictured in Is 50: 8, 53: 11 and the royal conqueror as in Deut 33: 29 (referring to Yahweh) in this image (Driver et al 1912: 273).

<sup>75</sup> The donkey is not an inferior animal in the HB image. It could be the appropriate mount of a king, the Hebrews traditionally disavouring the horse because it was a symbol of foreign power (Driver et al 1912: 355). One could say that it acts as an ambiguous symbol in the Gospel. On the one hand it is reminiscent of the image in Deutero-Zechariah as an appropriate animal for a king, recognisable to the people, while (Menippean-like) it acts as a carnivalistic inversion in the Gospel, making fun of the Roman triumphal processions of its setting.

<sup>76</sup> Hanson 1975:Chapter IV.

magnitude of the battle, and validates Jesus' later predictions about the devastating events that are to precede the days of the Son of Man (Lk 8: 26).

*The Crucifixion (Lk 23: 26-31)*<sup>77</sup>

Jesus' sayings on the way to the cross continue the pattern of the warnings of future destruction uttered earlier in the Gospel (Lk 11: 49-51, 13: 1-5, 34ff, 19: 41-44, 21: 20-24), predicting great suffering for the community, suffering that is reminiscent of that preceding the coming of Yahweh's day in Deutero-Zechariah. The women's behaviour of wailing and beating their breasts not only indicates that they have a foreboding of this suffering, but it can also be seen as an embodiment, at least partially, of the great mourning visualized in Zech 12: 10-14 for 'the one that they have pierced.'<sup>78</sup> The author of Luke may have used the HB prophecy as a source, portraying Jesus' crucifixion as the fulfilment of it. Another image from Deutero-Zechariah, one that follows soon afterwards, is combined with this, in part, namely, the prediction of the euphoric modification of the natural order of climate and light on Yahweh's Day (Zech 14: 6-8). In the Gospel there is an inversion of the light modification in Zechariah. We hear that just before Jesus' death, darkness came over the land from noon until three in the afternoon (Lk 23:44). Should the figure of Jesus be, in fact, linked to 'the one that they have pierced' in Zechariah, it is possible that the image of the modification of the natural order would also have been made use of. It would link Jesus to the all-victorious Yahweh of the HB prophecy. The message is sent out that even though one sees Jesus in his darkest hour, when the forces of Satan appear to be triumphant, his unfailing divinity is still existent in terms of not reneging on anything that he has stood for thus far, and his final victory is in sight, the image of the divine warrior at the end of Zech 14 lending him divine grandeur by association. The ostensibly inverted form of the combined HB images

<sup>77</sup> Boda mentions Dodd (1952), Lindars (1961), Bruce (1960-61) and Mitchell (1997), who have traced the impact of Zech 9-14 on Christian literature, particularly on the story of Jesus' Passion. Mitchell goes on to consider the impact of the eschatological programme in Zech 9-14 on eschatological schemata of the Gospels, Hebrews, 2 Thessalonians and Revelation (Boda 2003: 54). Boda goes on to mention Black (1990) and Laato (1997: 348-52), who argue that the idea of a suffering and dying Messiah should not be traced to Is 53, but rather to Zech 9-14. Black (1990) and Evans (1997: 327 n. 56) trace the close narrative correspondences between the final acts of Jesus in the Gospel Passion stories and the overall shape of Zech 9-14.

<sup>78</sup> Petersen suggests that the HB image of the 'one pierced' possibly refers to a sacrificial killing in order to save the city (Petersen 1995: 121). He also refers to a Christian interpretation that sees this image as a prophecy of the death of Jesus of Nazareth (1995: 120).

imply that Jesus' victory, and thus that of salvation in the form of the Kingdom of God will come about in a way that is least expected, unprecedented, inverted, and thus impervious to any conventional attacks by worldly authorities.

*Preliminary conclusion*

Having given a brief account of Bakhtin's theory of intertextuality, this chapter then established the heavy presence of HB texts in the Gospel of Luke on many levels. Taking the Annunciation stories of John and Jesus as an example, the investigation went on to demonstrate how the Gospel makes use of multiple texts from the older canon, at times simultaneously, both to legitimise and give depth to its own narrative, and as a point from which to diverge. One strand of the HB intertextual presence, namely, that of the Book of Zechariah, was then pursued as a case study. To do this exhaustively, however, would exceed the constraints of one chapter. A selection of what are deemed the most relevant sections of Luke in terms of this particular relationship has thus been made.

The analysis of the Annunciation stories has shown that the Gospel makes use of various HB divinely mediated conception stories to legitimise the Annunciation of John. By linking the latter to these stories in terms of similarities, the impression is created that the Gospel narrative is simply a continuation of the narrative of the already accredited older canon. The Annunciation of John is closely linked to that of Jesus, lending it its own legitimacy and credibility, even though the latter differs from it, and by extension, from the HB stories in some fundamental aspects, like the supernatural conception of Jesus. In turn, the divergences in the Annunciation of Jesus create dialogic tension with that of John, and thus with the older canon, highlighting the unprecedented form of the advent of the Messiah, setting the stage for other unprecedented phenomena that are to follow. At the same time the Temple vision of Isaiah (Is 6: 1-13) can be seen to interact with both Annunciation stories. The two are bound together on a deeper level by this interaction, the Isaiah text lending them its grandeur and a sense of the imminence of the divine presence. This is in contrast to, but also underpins the modest, simple account in the story line of the Gospel, the latter moving out of the space of the Temple in the Annunciation story of Jesus. Concerning the issues of purity and willingness of the agent for the divine plan of salvation, the Isaiah story, by means of contrast, draws attention to the unprecedented purity of Mary as the agent and locus through which Jesus enters this

world. This reinforces the sense that something unprecedented is about to happen, underpinning Gabriel's utterance on the surface of the text, that Jesus is the Son of God, different from all his predecessors in terms of divinely mediated conceptions.

Turning to the presence of the Book of Zechariah in the Gospel, the name *Zechariah* could be seen as a device to direct the reader's memory towards the Book of the HB prophet and the promise of Yahweh's restoration of the Children of Israel. A consideration of Lk 4: 1-13 in the light of Zech 3: 1-6 points to the use by the Gospel of this scene as a source, both for the characters of Satan and Jesus and for the issue of challenging the divinely chosen agent., thus presenting the struggle between God and the forces that oppose him in the form of the two characters. The characters of Satan and Jesus gain vastly expanded roles to their counterparts in Zechariah, Satan having been transformed into an opposing force outside the divine council. The battle scene in action has been moved from a vision to a specific geographical space on earth. The issue at stake has been shifted from the ritual purity of the human agent, Joshua, who is to restore worship in the Temple, to the integrity of Jesus in his identity as the Son of God, who as the Messiah proclaims the good news of the coming Kingdom of God to this world. In contrast to Joshua, Jesus actively takes on the battle against Satan without divine mediation, the implication being that as part of the deity itself, he embodies a new theophanic conception of God.

From the connection that has been made between Zech 3: 1-6 and Lk 4: 1-13, it is possible in the light of the legal aspect in the former also to view the overtly legal scene in the Gospel, namely, the trial of Jesus, in terms of intertextual relations with the same scene. It emerges that the trial is a continuation of the battle in the desert (Lk 4: 1-13) in an intensified form, because Jesus' identity as the Son of God is tested to an extreme degree. The trial turns out to be an inverted version of the legal proceeding in Zech 3:1-6. Satan, ostensibly missing, is in fact active in it through his representatives. Looking at the trial scenes in the light of the HB scene it becomes apparent that in terms of an equal distribution of power, the HB scene is overwhelmingly in favour of Yahweh, who is depicted in complete control while openly favouring one of the parties. The Gospel scenes show a more equal distribution of power between the forces, having moved Satan outside God's council. In the Trial of Jesus the scale appears to tip in favour of Satan. However, this is only according to worldly standards. In terms of his identity, Jesus has

withstood yet another assault on his integrity, emerging intact as the Son God. This can be seen as a further step in persuading the reader towards an apocalyptic (as opposed to an historical) view of salvation. The implication that the priesthood and other worldly authorities are under the dominion of Satan suggests that the restoration of the Children of Israel will come about in a new dimension, the final objective of the physical Temple within a Judah ruled by a messianic king being replaced by a symbolic Temple, a space that includes the whole world, ruled by a heavenly king by otherworldly criteria, a king who bypasses earthly rulers.

The character called the *Branch* in Zech 3: 8 and Zech 6: 12-13 has been identified as another possible source for the character of Jesus, that is, in addition to Joshua. An investigation concerning the word *zumah*, the standard translation of which, the *Branch*, does not feature in the English translation of the Gospel, has shown that the LXX translation *anatole* for *zumah* does feature in the Greek Gospel, significantly, in Lk 1: 78 when referring to coming salvation in the form of the Messiah. What the *Branch* and Jesus have in common is that it is impossible to identify their being definitively, both of them depicted as human while also embodying something else. The *Branch* is described as 'branching out from his place' (Zech 6: 12), as though he himself is the vegetation that symbolizes a kingdom. Jesus, while talking about the Kingdom of God, can at times also be seen as embodying it (e.g. Lk 17:21). Taking Rose's interpretation of the *Branch* as a future Messiah, together with the figure of Joshua as source characters for Jesus, makes it possible to see Jesus portrayed as the fulfilment of the HB prophecy. In him are combined priestly, regal, human and divine features. While embodying this fulfilment, however, Jesus acts in his own unique mode of inversion towards the promised salvation, a salvation that will come about in a way that bypasses and transcends worldly power.

The investigation then turns to focus on the involvement of the second part of the Book of Zechariah in Luke, especially in terms of how it functions to reinforce the presence of the cosmic battle between God and the forces that oppose him that underlies the ostensibly non-aggressive story line in the Gospel. Covertly present in the form of images as well as in thematic parallels, such as final salvation being preceded by much suffering and a purging of the community, the presence of Deutero-Zechariah comes to the surface in Luke 19: 35-40 (Cf. Zech 9: 9). Although the image is a peaceful one, it has radical implications. In Deutero-Zechariah, set among scenes of violence, it shows the expected

triumph of Yahweh's plan in terms of a messianic king that brings peace. In the Gospel the scene appears as a fulfilment of the prophecy, signalling a triumph for the divine plan, in character with Jesus' non-aggressive mode of action. It is further noted that Jesus' sayings become more and more radical in terms of coming destruction before final salvation can take place. This is particularly evident in Lk 21: 7-28, when the latter describes days preceding the coming of the Son of Man. The crucifixion scene shows the distress of the women, which can be compared with the mourning for the one 'they have pierced' in Zech 12: 10. As in Zech 14, there is also a modification of the natural order, although in an inverted form, the implication being that the cosmic order interacts with what is happening to Jesus because of his divine nature. As the scene shows Jesus in his darkest hour, the forces of Satan ostensibly having triumphed, the presence of Zech 14 as a subtext contests that triumph. Its powerful display of Yahweh's power as 'that day' approaches, as well as the image of Yahweh himself intervening for his people in the form of the Divine Warrior, implies that Jesus, via the unexpected method of worldly defeat, is in the process of actively (in a non-aggressive manner) fashioning a final victory in terms of the greater battle between God and the forces of evil.

At the core of the sections of the Gospel that have been discussed in this investigation is the question of Jesus' identity as the Son of God, each scene constituting a testing of his integrity.<sup>79</sup> The HB involvement in these passages brings in the element of legitimisation. One way in which this is achieved is by securing a legitimisation of the Gospel narrative itself by grafting it to the older canonized narrative by multiple strands, as has been demonstrated by the analysis of the Annunciation stories. However, even though the impression is created that the Gospel is a continuation of the older canon, and even though the presence of the older texts feature in the various scenes in the Gospel, the latter differs strikingly from the HB texts that it makes use of. The most striking difference is one of grandeur. It has been shown how the Annunciation story of John appears like a weak echo of the Temple scene in Isaiah. The Annunciation of Jesus is depicted as taking place between the Angel Gabriel and Mary, outside and away from the Temple and all its grandeur in terms of holiness. The scene in the desert shows a reduction to a conversation between two characters, its counterpart in Zechariah having

---

<sup>79</sup> The question of testing the hero of the Menippean text, the latter embodying a specific idea, is discussed in Chapter 2 of this thesis.

presented a legal proceeding within a council. The trial scene shows what can be described as an ignominious inversion of that same scene, the trial itself showing itself to be a travesty of court procedure, with Jesus being hustled from one place to another within a very short time, there being no glorious vindication of his person. The crucifixion, making use of Zech 14 in terms of the imagery associated with the advancement of Yahweh's Day, features miserably when compared with the HB story in terms of the presentation of the divine protagonist figure.

Apart from the simplification and familiarization of the Gospel story line, also apparent in the use of *koine* Greek as its medium, one could say that much of the sense of anticlimax rests on the Gospel's deliberate use of inversion of the grand older stories. This fits in with its carnivalesque nature as discussed in the previous chapter of this thesis, the inversion creating a discourse with the older text, which could not function if the latter were not there to interact with. The HB text is thus the norm from which the Gospel text diverges. At the same time, paradoxically, the older text is used to validate the inverted Gospel version.

#### *Chaereas and Callirhoe: a comparison*

This chapter, having investigated some of the intertextual relations between the Gospel of Luke and texts from the HB, will now, in line with the method of comparison employed in the two previous chapters, focus briefly on Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe* to see whether and if so how that text makes use of older texts from the Greek canon. What has been found is that the characters address deities from Greek mythology, like Aphrodite, Eros, Poseidon, Artemis, Nemesis and Fortune. Aphrodite is the goddess that is most frequently invoked, significant events taking place at her festivals and in her temples. This can be seen to be in line with the central idea that is tested in this novel: whether romantic love can withstand all the odds against it to finally culminate in a happy ending in the form of marriage.<sup>80</sup>

---

<sup>80</sup> See Chapter 2 of this thesis for an account of Bakhtin's theory of the Menippean novel having a central idea that is propagated and tested in the form of the hero surviving vicissitudes of fortune. In *Chaereas and Callirhoe* it has been found that the two lovers, but mainly Callirhoe, embody the idea of romantic love. Aphrodite is the patron goddess.

The narrator and one of the characters mention Homer by name (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* I. 5, II. 3). Quotations from the latter's epics occur regularly in the text of the novel, mainly from the *Iliad* (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* IV. 1, V. 2, V. 10, VI. 1, VI. 2, VIII. 5, II. 9, III. 5, V. 4, V. 5, VII. 2, VII. 4), but also from the *Odyssey* (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* IV. 4, V. 5, VI. 4, VII. 4, VIII.1). This kind of appropriation from older well-known texts is consistent with what Bakhtin identifies with the Menippea, of which this romance would be a part.<sup>81</sup> What is clear from this overt manner of representing another's text is that the author plays on an assumed knowledge of the older text, at least of the narratives, on the part of the reader. What is also clear is that the references in this text are all within the belief system and literature of the Greek world. Even though this novel presents two kingdoms, that of Syracuse and the Persian Empire, there does not seem to be any reference to Persian heroes or gods. So, for example, the Persian court is compared with the gods in *Iliad* 4.1 (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* V. 4), and the Persian King, in his quandary as to how to win Callirhoe for himself, is compared with Achilles in *Iliad* 24.10-11 after Patroclus' death (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* VI. 1).

In terms of how the Homeric texts are represented in *Chaereas and Callirhoe* in the Bakhtinian sense, one could say that the *locus* is at the expected response of the reader. As in the case of the Gospel of Luke, the connection with canonized narratives lends stature to the new text for the reader of a particular tradition.<sup>82</sup> Furthermore, recognizable figures and narratives could make the story seem *almost* true, as well as attractive to identify with. In this case the author uses the older text to stress the magnitude of the emotions felt by the lovers, and the life-threatening consequences if this love goes awry. In terms of the *form* of the intertextual presence, it is by quotation, as has been stated, the verse form of the quoted text embedded in the prose of the new text giving emphasis to the particular phenomenon described. Furthermore, the connection can be found in the form of thematic and situational parallels, as will be shown. In terms of the *degree* of the interaction, one can say that the older texts are clearly visible, distinct from the host text,

---

<sup>81</sup> In a general discussion of the Greek Romance, Reardon states that there was a substantial core of love-romance by the time of the early Christian era, and that this was influenced by a wide range of earlier literature, like epic, tragedy, comedy, and love poetry (Reardon 1989: 7).

<sup>82</sup> Reardon states that while no Greek novel purports to represent its own time, an aura of historicity would render a work of fiction more respectable (Reardon 1989: 8). Although the Homeric epics present narratives that are prehistoric, the romance in its pseudo-historical fictionality would give the impression of credibility in a connection with those heroic figures and times (Reardon 1989: 8).

and can be seen as forming a sub-text to the romance narrative. For these quotations to have the desired effect, knowledge of the narrative as a whole from which they are extracted is necessary for them to be effectual to the reader. One can thus say that this romance text directs the reader's attention to the older texts via the quotations as it tells its story assuming the presence of those older narratives in the collective memory of the verbal community for which it was written.

The fact that many of the quotations are taken from the *Iliad*, the story of which is set during the Trojan War, draws attention (as is the case in the Gospel) to an ongoing, if unstated battle in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, indeed a larger battle that contains various battles within it. As is the case in the Gospel, the primary battle is not a worldly military one. Instead, in this case, it is the battle between faithful, romantic love and the forces that oppose it. The two protagonists embody the idea of that love, and each calamitous situation that tests their integrity constitutes a battle. In the *Iliad* the internecine quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon, and all the situations that result from this, features within the context of the larger war at hand. In both stories divine beings are involved in the battle.

Staying with the *Iliad*, many of the quotations from that epic in *Chaereas and Callirhoe* concern Achilles and his sorrow over the loss of Patroclus (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* IV. 1 (*Iliad* 23. 71), V. 2 (*Iliad* 18. 22-24), V. 10 (*Iliad* 22. 389-90), VI. 1 (*Iliad* 24. 10-11), VI. 2 (*Iliad* 1. 317)). The character usually compared with Achilles is Chaereas. In pursuing this connection, one can find other parallels. Both men are unusually handsome. Chaereas is actually compared to Achilles in looks (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* I. 1). Near the beginning of the narrative both characters expose themselves in a negative light as a result of an extreme, self-centred fit of anger, resulting from wounded pride in terms of their position. Both betray what they initially stand for. Achilles withdraws his most needed services as a warrior from his compatriots, while Chaereas actually attacks and almost destroys the very object of his love, Callirhoe, without hearing her side of the story. The two narratives revolve around the consequences of these initial actions from then on. Both heroes undergo a change of heart as the story progresses. Achilles throws himself into the battle against Hector to avenge his friend, Patroclus, while Chaereas turns from a passive suicidal mode to engaging in military action to revenge himself on the Persian King. In each case, the action has suicidal overtones. Achilles has been told

by his mother, Thetis, that he will die soon after Hector's death (*Iliad* 18. 100-101). Chaereas consciously goes into battle as a suicidal act (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* VII. 1). In military terms, both win their battle.

To describe Chaereas' grief on hearing of his wife's unfaithfulness (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* I. 4), *Iliad* 18. 22-24, the passage describing Achilles' reaction to the death of Patroclus, is quoted. In each case it signifies the reaction to an immense loss. On the point of hanging himself, Chaereas speaks in Achilles' words (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* V. 10) concerning his determination never to forget the dead Patroclus (*Iliad* 22. 389-90), vowing that he will never forget Callirhoe, even after death. When Callirhoe dreams of Chaereas (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* II. 9), *Iliad* 23. 66-67 is quoted, which describes a dream that Achilles has of Patroclus. Both dream figures urge the dreamer to perform a specific action. Overwhelming grief at the loss of a loved one, and everlasting faithfulness to that loved one even after death, are sentiments that are thus highlighted in *Chaereas and Callirhoe* by quoting the passages from the *Iliad*.

In terms of the character, Chaereas, who, together with Callirhoe, is the embodiment of the idea of the viability of enduring romantic love in this romance, an important implication emerges as a result of the intertextual action with the *Iliad*. Without the presence of the figure, Achilles, as a backing, this character would hardly qualify as the hero of this romantic love story, that is, for the greater part of the story. Apart from his stunning looks and great passion for Callirhoe at the beginning, his behaviour is what one could call anti-heroic. After his disastrous jealous action, he is reduced to misery, tears and repeated suicidal contemplations. Pessimistically, he immediately interprets every event in the worst light, never having faith in Callirhoe's love for him. Like Patroclus to Achilles, Polycharmus is the closest friend to Chaereas, who, while protecting him against himself, tries to cheer him up. Although Polycharmus does not die in his stead, as Patroclus does for Achilles, he is the one who eventually spurs him into action. Like Achilles, Chaereas acts in a desire to revenge himself on the person he sees as being responsible for his loss, a loss he believes himself to have suffered. Like his Homeric counterpart he now proves himself to be a true heroic warrior. Like Achilles, he too, shows compassion to his defeated erstwhile enemy. In terms of his specific role in the romance he finally triumphs as the true husband of Callirhoe. The intermittent reminders of the Homeric hero throughout Chaereas' rather ignominious behaviour can be seen as

-serving the purpose of encouraging the reader nevertheless to have faith in him, implying that this behaviour does not reflect his true self, but rather that the extraordinary blows that he has had to suffer have reduced him to act in a way that is different to his normal self. His true self emerges once he has been fired into action.

As is the case in the Gospel of Luke, *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, as the host text that has made use of the older text, not only uses the latter to give stature to its own narrative, but it also interacts with it dialogically by divergence once the initial connection has been established. The romance text does not reflect the grandeur or seriousness of the Homeric epic. The tone is more familiar, the text is written in prose, and the narrative has a happy ending. A case could be made for a parodic use of some of the Homeric quotations. For example, when Chaereas covers his head with dust when he thinks that he has been betrayed by Callirhoe (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* I. 4, cf. *Iliad* 18. 22-24), the reaction comes across as exaggerated and melodramatic. His weepy, miserable behaviour before he comes into his own makes him a poor copy of Achilles. This divergence, however, can also be seen as drawing attention to the latter's 'un-heroic' behaviour and sentiments. In terms of the embodiment of the idea running through the romance, Chaereas only just passes the test. It is Callirhoe who is the stronger partner, making it possible for romantic love to triumph in the end. The fact that it is the woman who features prominently in this story, rather than the man, and that much of the narrative describes her experiences and feelings, is another divergence from the older epic. Achilles features as the protagonist, whereas Chaereas is depicted as secondary to Callirhoe. The treatment of love, as the central issue in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, parodically shows up the *Iliad's* treatment of it, where the hero's image in terms of military prowess is of central concern.

### *Conclusion*

This brief contemplation of *Chaereas and Callirhoe* in terms of its intertextual relationship with the Homeric canon has shown that there are aspects of this that can be compared to the Gospel of Luke, certainly on a superficial level. The constraints of this chapter do not allow for a deeper analysis of the effects on the discourse of this Romance text as a result of this intertextual use of the older text. However, parallels can be found in how the two texts from the Hellenistic era make use of the older canons in their respective belief systems. In each case the older text, as an accredited canonical text,

lends stature to the host text, acting as a subtext underlying a relatively simple story line. The older texts lend a great deal of their excitement and entertainment element to the newer texts. At the same time the presence of the older text acts as a point from which the new text can diverge to put forward its own discourse. By mentioning actual names in the old canon, the new text, by association, suggests figures in the older text as possible sources, both for characters and situations for itself. By divergence, at times parodic, the situations and characters in the new text create a dialogic interaction with the older text. This opens up a number of possibilities, such as the potential for humour. It can also serve as clarification, such as that there is an ongoing overall battle that underlies much of the dramatic tension. Furthermore, it shows that the new narrative will move into a new discourse. In the Gospel it is to show that salvation in the form of the Messiah will come about (and is already in the process of coming) in an unprecedented way, which will revolutionize the conceptions of the status quo. In the romance it is to put the human relations of true romantic love forward as the central concern. In both cases the emphasis on victory in military terms as found in the older canon is shifted from the centre to make way for other concerns.

## Chapter 4

### The Gospel of Luke as a Menippean Text

In discussing the role and impact of the phenomenon of carnival on literature, Bakhtin mentions early Christian texts within the context of the collective genre covering the large body of serio-comic writings of the Hellenistic era that he refers to as the Menippea.

Christian narrative literature (independently of the influence of carnivalized Menippea) was also subjected to direct carnivalization. It is enough to recall the scene of crowning and decrowning the 'King of the Jews' in the canonical gospels. But carnivalization is even more powerfully present in apocryphal Christian literature.

Thus ancient narrative literature (including that which is canonized) is also permeated by elements of the Menippea and carnivalization (Bakhtin 1984: 135).

Discussions of the canonical Gospels often assume that they share the same genre. A distinction is made, however, between the Gospel of John on the one hand, and the synoptic Gospels of Mark, Matthew and Luke on the other. The latter are often looked at together on account of similarities of content and structure, as well as their interdependence in terms of sources. Where a discussion concentrates solely on the Gospel of Luke, it often combines this text with Acts of the Apostles, the underlying assumption being that the two were written by the same author and constitute one work. This is based on a perceived sequential unity in the theological intention in the two texts, as well as on similarities in style.<sup>1</sup> In spite of this, however, scholars tend to regard Luke

---

<sup>1</sup> While Acts 1: 1-5 could be seen as a direct connection to the Gospel of Luke, it does not have to mean that Luke and Acts were necessarily written by the same author. The argument could be made that the author of Acts knew the Gospel and chose to write a sequel, which would then be enhanced by its connection to the older text. It would not be the first time that such a method has been employed. The beginning of the Gospel of Luke can be seen as having attached itself in such a way to books of the Hebrew Bible, as I have shown in the previous chapter of this thesis. Conversely, Acts could serve to privilege Luke above the other Gospels as the true Gospel, the combination of Luke-Acts serving as the link between the story of Jesus and the activities of the early church. See note 8 on p. 3 of this thesis for scholars who

and Acts as belonging to different genres.<sup>2</sup> In the canon, Luke is separated from Acts by the Gospel of John. Furthermore, in spite of the address to Theophilus in the prologue of both texts, there is a discrepancy in the story at the end of Luke and at the beginning of Acts.<sup>3</sup>

It is the aim of this chapter to concentrate specifically on the genre of the Gospel of Luke. While comparisons with the other three Gospels will be made in order to throw more light on it, this Gospel will be studied synchronically as a text in its own right. The first three chapters of this thesis have explored it in terms of Bakhtinian theory of chronotope, carnival and intertextuality. A comparative study of *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, a Greek Romance text, also associated generically with the Menippea by Bakhtin, has accompanied this exploration. Parallels between these two texts have come to light that point to a generic link within the Menippea. This chapter sets out to consider how these findings might impact on views currently held by biblical scholars concerning the genre of the Gospels.

### *Introduction*

Various surveys have been made of how scholars have viewed the genre of the Gospels.<sup>4</sup> After giving a brief general outline, my focus will be on Richard Burridge's identification of the canonical Gospels as Graeco-Roman biography or *bioi*.<sup>5</sup> I have chosen this particular view as a point of comparison, first, as it has gained popularity among modern scholars (Aune 1987: 22-3, Stanton 1992: 18), and secondly, because Burridge's systematic account of *bioi*, and the analysis of comparative textual examples leading to his inclusion of the Gospels in this genre, makes it possible to compare his conclusions with my own findings.

---

challenge the unity of Luke-Acts. Talbert (1977: 134), on the other hand, sees a combined Luke-Acts as a myth of origin for an early church. See also p. 2, note 6, and p. 3, note 8 of this thesis for Talbert, Parsons and Pervo on this issue.

<sup>2</sup> Richard Pervo suggests that while Luke is in line with other Gospels in terms of genre, Acts can be compared to a Greek Romance (Pervo 1987: 4). See also Tannehill (1986: xiii), Johnson (1992: 404), and Fitzmyer (1981: 8) on this issue.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Lk 24: 48, Acts 1: 4-11.

<sup>4</sup> I have relied mainly for my information on David Aune's *The New Testament and its Literary Environment* (1987), Richard Burridge's *What are the Gospels?* (1992), and Graham Stanton's *The Gospels and Jesus* (2002).

<sup>5</sup> Burridge points out that the word *biographia* does not appear until the fifth century CE (1992: 61). The description for this genre used from the Hellenistic age onwards was *bioi* or *vitae* (lives).

While scholars agree that the identification of the genre of a given text determines the way in which it is interpreted, the genre of the Gospels is still a point of contention, these texts having been variously defined and identified ever since the birth of Christianity. By the fifth century CE some fifty compositions had been labelled as *gospels* (Aune 1987: 18). Aune provides a brief summary of how the term *gospel* has been used and understood throughout the ages, beginning with the Apostle, Paul's, 'saving message of Jesus' (e.g. Rom 1: 16, Gal 2: 5, 1 Thess 3: 2) to finally arrive at his own conclusion that the Gospels of Mark, Matthew and John are ancient biographies. He excludes the Gospel of Luke from this classification because he sees it as the first part of Luke-Acts, which he views as historiography (Aune 1987: 17-43). Burridge has identified all four Gospels as ancient biographies in 1992.

Taking the name *good news* as a generic designation from the first sentence in the Gospel according to Mark, 'the beginning of the good news of Jesus Christ, the Son of God', the distinguishing feature that labels some Christian sacred writings as *gospels*,<sup>6</sup> in contradistinction to *acts*, *letters*, *sermons* and *apocalypses*, has been that the composition contains accounts of the words and/or actions of Jesus.<sup>7</sup> The canonical Gospels have been the main focus of attention in gospel genre criticism. Over the centuries they have been relied upon as the primary witnesses to the sayings and deeds of Jesus. Recently, however, scholars have paid increasing attention to the extra-canonical gospels of the apocrypha. No longer seen as 'lesser' writings, the latter are studied in an attempt to gain a greater understanding of the Jesus that features in the canonical Gospels.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>6</sup> 'Gospel' is the English translation of *euangelion* (Mk 1: 1), meaning good news (god-spel).

<sup>7</sup> The label in itself, however, has not been an absolute guarantee that the work presents this particular content, since authoritativeness in the eyes of a particular community seems also to have played a role in affixing the term 'gospel' to a particular text. *The Gospel of Truth*, a joyous proclamation of knowledge, and *The Gospel of Mani*, which describes Mani's alleged revelations and a call to be a world missionary, are such exceptions (Cameron 1983: 17).

<sup>8</sup> John Dominic Crossan (1998), in studying the Gospels as a means of reconstructing the historical Jesus, describes different ways of assessing the Gospel authors, and how this would affect a reading: 1. *Four witnesses giving legal testimony*, in which case the reconstruction of the historical Jesus would depend on those sections on which there is maximal consensus. 2. *Four scholars doing basic research*, in which case the latest account would be seen as the most historical. 3. *Four historians conducting oral interviews*, in which case all four versions would be seen as equally correct. 4. Crossan's own view is that the authors should be seen as *evangelists*, imparters of *good news*. *Good* implies somebody's point of view (subjectivity), presumably the Christian Jewish one, and *news* indicates that there needs to be a constant update. In Crossan's view, this means that Jesus is constantly being actualised for new times and contexts. Furthermore it means that there is a developing tradition, one that seems to swallow up its predecessors. In this view, the *Q* Gospel and Mark are absorbed into Matthew and Luke, while the Synoptics are absorbed into John (Crossan 1998: 101).

Aune also gives a description of the methods of historical criticism, form criticism, redaction criticism and literary criticism, approaches taken by scholars to identify the genre of the Gospels. Hypotheses resulting from these studies claim that the Gospels are historical documentations of the life of Jesus, kerygma (unique in its type (*sui generis*)), liturgy, or ancient biography (Aune 1987: 19-27).<sup>9</sup> Of these, the form-critical view, classifying the Gospels as *sui generis*, as represented by Karl Ludwig Schmidt, Rudolf Bultmann, Martin Dibelius and others, and redaction criticism that is based on it, have dominated the scene for the greater part of the twentieth century.<sup>10</sup>

### *The form-critical view of the gospel genre*

As the proponents of the *bioi* hypothesis react chiefly against the form-critical view of the Gospels, and as form criticism posed the first serious challenges to the interpretive framework as to whether or not the Gospels are historical records of the life of Jesus, this line needs to be set out here. In a reaction to historical criticism, the form critics shifted attention away from the search for Jesus to focus on the oral tradition that produced the Gospels. They approached the three synoptic Gospels (the focus of their attention) not as homogeneous compositions, the product of an author with a specific literary intention, but rather as collections of small units of oral tradition that had been handed down by a specific community, loosely put together into a written text to give the impression of a narrative. As such these texts were judged as *Kleinliteratur*, as opposed to *Hochliteratur* (a literary text produced by an author with a clear intent and design). The form critics set out to detach individual units from the framework of the Gospels to examine their form. In this way, they believed, the individual genres of the units would become recognizable, from which it would be possible to infer their pre-literary 'life-situation' or *Sitz im Leben*, within the Christian community. The evangelists were thus seen as collectors of the small units, rather than as authors of a finished text. Mark is seen as the first, as the creator of the gospel type. In adherence to the Two-Source Hypothesis, Matthew and Luke are seen as having used Mark as a model, while also drawing on material from a hypothetical

<sup>9</sup> See, amongst others, *The Gospels and Jesus* (Stanton 2002:13-36) for another example of a survey of Gospel scholarship, especially in the twentieth century.

<sup>10</sup> Scholars hold that form criticism began with the work of Hermann Gunkel's *The Legends of Genesis* (1901). Gunkel suggested that it was possible to penetrate behind the earliest-written source material in the Pentateuch to a pre-literary stage at which individual stories were transmitted by word of mouth (Robbins 1992: 838)

tradition, named Q, as well as from other traditions. No longer seen as biographies, produced by a single author, the Gospels are perceived as testimonies to the faith of primitive Christianity, the Easter faith of this community having influenced the manner in which the actions and sayings of Jesus are depicted (Rohde 1968: 5).

Rudolf Bultmann (1921), adhering to the Two-Source Hypothesis that promotes the priority of the Gospel of Mark, like Martin Dibelius and others, viewed the Gospels as *Kleinliteratur*, the final product of an oral tradition, rather than as creations of self-conscious authors. In *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition (The History of the Synoptic Tradition)*, he sets himself the task of rediscovering the origin and history of particular units in the synoptic Gospels, focusing attention on small sections. In his analysis he classifies the units into three sections: the sayings of Jesus, narrative material, and the editing of the traditional material. Seeking to throw light on the history of the tradition, he attempts to establish how the latter had moved from what he calls its fluid state to the fixed form in the written Gospels. He builds his method on the assumption that every literary category has a *Sitz im Leben*, such as the situation of worship, work, war and others (Bultmann 1968: 4). By establishing the form of a unit, discovering its individual genre, he sets out to reconstruct the communal situation that had given rise to it. Conversely, he believes that knowledge of the life of the community in which the tradition emerged can be used to render the form of the unit intelligible.<sup>11</sup> Bultmann proposes the use of three methods, which he calls ‘tools outside literary criticism.’ His first task is to establish the regularity in the manner in which the material in Mark is adapted by both Matthew and Luke. This, he surmises, would make it possible to recognize certain laws that govern the development of the traditional material, inferring that these laws would also have operated in the adaptation of earlier material by Mark and Q. Next, he sets out to identify the original form of a narrative unit, saying or parable, labelling it as primary material. He distinguishes these from what he sees as secondary additions by the evangelists, with a view to discovering the historical movement of the tradition. Thirdly, he proposes that possible analogies outside the tradition can be looked at in order to discover more about the form of the units and thus

---

<sup>11</sup> Dibelius, another proponent of the form-critical view, starts from the other end. He begins by enquiring into the life of what he terms the sphere of the unliterary people of the primitive Christian community, especially into the customs of their worship, seeking to reconstruct the synoptic tradition. The question he asks is which genres were possible and probable in the context of primitive Christian life, and conversely, whether certain categories in the Gospels reveal a relationship to particular modes of life and worship (Dibelius 1971: 7-8).

the history of the tradition. For this he turns to other genres that he sees as *Kleinliteratur*, texts that he also sees as collections of oral transmissions by a community, such as proverbs, anecdotes, folktales, fairy tales and folk songs.<sup>12</sup>

Having completed the analysis of the different units, Bultmann comes to the conclusion that the collection of the material of the tradition leading to its subsequent development to what was to become a Gospel arose out of the needs of what he calls the primitive Palestinian Church. This, in his view, was the original *Sitz im Leben*. In making this collection, the Church did not create new literary genres but took over established traditional forms, the material undergoing editing in the process of being handed down and written. The result was a combination of enumerations and summaries. At this stage the gospel type as such did not, as yet, exist (Bultmann 1968: 368).

The precipitating factor that led to the production of the Gospel of Mark, in Bultmann's view, are the historical events of what he calls the taking over of the Palestinian tradition by the Hellenistic Church. The new motives in the Hellenistic Church produced the shaping of the traditional material into a Gospel. Christian kerygma on Hellenistic soil is thus responsible for the creation of the Gospel of Mark, the latter having to serve as an illustration and expansion of it. The Christ that is preached in this kerygma is not the historical Jesus, but the Christ of the faith and cult. According to Bultmann, the Gospels of Matthew and Luke did not change or develop the type of the Gospel of Mark. Rather, they expanded it with additional mythical material. The Gospels, in his view, are expanded cult legends, the earthly life of Jesus that served as the starting point of the expanded kerygma having been brought into the divine plan of salvation (Bultmann 1968: 369-371).

Opposing the biography hypothesis, Bultmann perceives the unity in the Gospel of Mark to be based on the myth of the kerygma, not on the literary unity of a biography. He points to what he sees as the lack of specifically biographical material in the Gospels, such as Jesus' human personality, appearance and character, origin, education and development. Furthermore he points out the lack of cultivated techniques of composition necessary for grand literature. He does, however, concede that certain similarities may be

---

<sup>12</sup> This brief summary is based on the preliminary chapter 'The Materials and Task' (Bultmann 1968: 1-7).

found between the Gospels and memoirs and *Lives* of philosophers (seen by Burrige as *bioi*), in that the latter also gather together loose dialogues and episodes from the lives of important men, but he discounts a true connection on account of these writings lacking any link with myth and cult. Also, he sees these *Lives* as *Hochliteratur*, designed and produced by a specific author. He dismisses a connection between the Gospels and what he sees as other examples of lesser literature, such as, proverbs, anecdotes and fairy tales, even though some analogies may be found, such as a lack of a developed technique of composition, interest in chronology, factual connections, and psychological motivations. The Gospels differ from these other 'lesser' genres insofar as they are rooted in the cult, describing Jesus Christ as the Son of God and the Lord of the Church, not any other subject matter (Bultmann 1968: 371-372).

Bultmann concludes that the gospel form is unique. Analogies may be found when dealing with individual components of the tradition, but not with a Gospel as a whole. An original creation of Christianity, he sees these texts as having grown out of the Christ-myth and the Christ-cult of Hellenistic Christianity.

#### *Critical response to form criticism*

Later scholars questioned the form-critical shift of focus from the Gospel text as an organic whole to small units of tradition, maintaining that by focussing on the small units, the significance of the whole was in danger of being lost (Burrige 1992: 13). Aune, in favour of the ancient biography hypothesis, challenges the kerygma component of the form-critical view. He points out that there are discontinuities between the oral kerygma (existing only in written texts, such as those speeches that appear in the letters of Paul and in Acts)<sup>13</sup> and the Gospels in terms of form, content and function (Aune 1987: 24-5). Thirdly, the form critics' total rejection of the Gospels as biographies is seen as an overreaction, even though the insight that the tradition behind the Gospels reflects the theological convictions of the post-Easter period in the Christian community is seen as a valuable contribution. Theological convictions, it is argued, do not necessarily have to preclude an interest in the life of Jesus (Stanton 2002: 29).

---

<sup>13</sup> For example, Rom 1: 1-4, 1 Cor.15: 3-8, 1 Thess 1: 10, 2:8; Acts 2: 14-39, 3: 12-26, 10: 36-39a.

Charles Talbert (1977), challenges Bultmann on the question of *sui generis* by suggesting that the very criteria that the latter claims as factors that separate the Gospels from contemporary Graeco-Roman literature, do actually operate in that world, also in Graeco-Roman biography. While Bultmann argues that the Gospels have the Christ-myth as their unifying structure, Talbert argues that many *bioi* are also structured by a myth, a common one being the myth of the Immortals.<sup>14</sup> Talbert cites examples of the myth of the Immortals from legendary figures of Egyptian, Greek, Roman, and Jewish origin, like Osiris, Hercules, Aeneas, and Moses.<sup>15</sup> He then shows how that same myth was attached to some rulers and philosophers of the not-too-distant-past, as for example, Alexander the Great and Caesar Augustus. Examples cited by Talbert of *bioi* that are governed by this myth are the biography of Augustus by Suetonius, and Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana* (Talbert 1977: 32-33). Another myth cited by Talbert as appearing in Graeco-Roman literature, as well as in Hellenistic Judaism, which Christian writers would have been familiar with, is that of the Descending and Ascending Gods (Redeemer) (Talbert 1977: 77-8).<sup>16</sup>

Talbert thus shows that the phenomenon of a myth as the organising structure of a text is not unique to the Gospels. He goes on to show that the myth of the Immortals is also at the base of the Synoptic Gospels, while the Descending Ascending Redeemer myth can be traced in the Gospel of John (Talbert 1977: 38-43, 75-7). Addressing Bultmann's view that the Gospels were the product of a cult and had cultic functions, he states that this is also the case in certain didactic biographies of philosophers and rulers, comparing the cultic function to the social use of *Lives* within various groups in Graeco-Roman society (Talbert 77: 98-108).

---

<sup>14</sup> Talbert describes the Graeco-Roman myth of the Immortals (as opposed to the Eternals) in the following way. An Immortal is a deity that had originally been mortal. In some cases he has been engendered by a god. Usually they lead a life of extraordinary virtue. At the end of an Immortal's earthly career a transformation, or an Ascension occurs. He then obtains the same honours as the Eternals. Some evidence of his ascent is usually given. Either it is actually witnessed, or no trace of any physical remains is found (Talbert 1977: 26-8).

<sup>15</sup> Talbert is of the opinion that while rabbinic tradition states that Moses did not die, but ascended to Heaven, the native home for the view of Moses' bodily rapture was probably Hellenistic Judaism (Talbert 1977: 29).

<sup>16</sup> Although Talbert cites a few Graeco-Roman examples, like Vergil's description of the birth of 'the divine child' (Apollo's descent for redemptive purposes in the *Fourth Eclogue*, and Horace's *Odes* I. ii), his focus is mainly on Hellenistic Jewish mythology (Talbert 1977: 53-66).

Burridge's criticism of the form-critical approach hinges on the underlying distinction that is made between *Hochliteratur* and *Kleinliteratur*. He challenges Bultmann's view in terms of what he calls the 'eclipse of the author' that allows for no purpose or intention on the part of the evangelists. He claims that Bultmann himself does not succeed fully in proving this as he uses the word 'purpose' when describing the Marcan step in combining the kerygma with the narrative tradition about Jesus. Classing the Gospels as *Kleinliteratur*, as 'unliterary', also precludes all attempts to ask literary questions, in particular that of genre. Burridge questions whether such a clear divide actually existed between the various types of literature in the first century (Burridge 1992: 11).

Opposing the *sui generis* theory, Burridge challenges the notion that the Gospels cannot be discussed in the context of other first century writings on the perceived opinion that there is an absence of predetermined, shared literary aspirations. In his view, a proper comprehension of any text depends on comparing it with others. He suggests that the form critics had too little knowledge of the various genres, types and levels of first century Jewish and Graeco-Roman literature to fully perceive the Gospels in that literary environment. To the conclusion that no analogical enquiry in terms of genre was necessary on the grounds that the Gospels cannot be seen as a *genus*, but merely as by-products of the gathering of individual units within the tradition, he replies by pointing to studies of the Homeric tradition. The latter do not look only at the development of the different stories as individual units, but also at how the whole narrative was put together through deliberate selection. An analysis of their individual stories does not preclude a discussion of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in terms of their overall genre (Burridge 1992: 11-13).

Burridge finally points out that more recent studies in folklore have complicated the notion of an oral tradition developing in regular stages according to laws that can be calculated. The length of time needed for these laws, should they have existed, to operate in the case of the Old Testament and the Homeric traditions to reach the concrete texts was much greater than that taken by the Gospels (Burridge 1992: 13). He therefore implies that Bultmann's method in reconstructing the oral tradition by his analysis of the units may not yield accurate results. Furthermore, he is sceptical of the form-critical notion that assigns the development of a tradition to the community rather than to an individual author, contending that communities are usually passive in regard to their

tradition, while it is the active innovations of the story-teller that moves the tradition forward (Burridge 1992: 13-14).<sup>17</sup>

*Differences between form criticism and an approach based on Bakhtinian theory*

A Bakhtinian approach in reading a text differs from the approach taken by form criticism in that it views a text synchronically rather than diachronically. Amongst other factors, it also notes the different units in texts like the Gospels, but views this phenomenon from a different perspective to that of form criticism. The latter regards the units as various bits of material gathered from diverse sources, loosely fixed into a text by an editorial framework. A Bakhtinian approach would see them having been selected deliberately from existing texts (or from live rituals, like carnival), representing various contending voices in the overall narrative design of the new text. Having taken on a new role within the text that has appropriated them for its own use, these voices interact with each other, the voice of the author, other texts, and the current socio-political environment. Thus, while a Bakhtinian study would look at the genres of the origin of different units to discover the different voices (seeing genre as a discourse in itself), it would do so in the light of how this affects the host text. The genre of the appropriated texts would be seen as an aspect of the dialogic interaction. The form-critical view, on the other hand, looks at the units to discover the tradition behind them rather than how they function within the overall text of which they are part. It does not make allowance for the possibility that the new text may be interacting dialogically with an older text via the appropriated unit.

---

<sup>17</sup> Robbins points out the contributions of form criticism to NT studies. 1. It has led to an acceptance of the limitations within historical research. 2. It shows an unwillingness to include extrinsic data about the authors into the intrinsic data of a document. 3. It shows an intrinsic interest in forms of speech and narrative. 4. It has searched for a dynamic model to analyse transmission and adaptation of linguistic formulations. 5. It shows an interest in the social aspects of literature. Weaknesses pointed out by Robbins are the following. 1. Instead of using data that have been collected and analysed by specialists in oral literature, the form critics used a scribal method that had been developed for text and source criticism. 2. Form criticism displayed an absence of detailed work in contemporary literature written in Greek, which would show the dynamic relationship between written and oral composition in Mediterranean society. This gives the impression that early Christians did not use oral speech in conventional situations in which other people spoke in the Mediterranean world. The major situations envisioned have been Baptism, eucharist, catechism, and preaching, leaving out challenge-riposte, argument, performance of caricatures, and storytelling. 3. The form critics presupposed that the passion stories existed as a uniform narrative within a few years after Jesus' death. This prevented a form-critical analysis of units recounting Jesus' arrest, trial, death and burial (Robbins 1992: 842-3).

It is surprising that the form critics, using the absence or presence of the self-conscious voice of an author as a criterion, should relegate the Gospel of Luke (as one of the synoptic Gospels) to *Kleinliteratur*. The voice of the author stating his intentions in a manner that is similar to historiographical writings is clearly present in the prologue of this Gospel.<sup>18</sup> Furthermore, the investigations in the previous chapters of this thesis seem to confirm the assumption of a self-conscious author. The chapter concerning the intertextual use by Luke of texts from the Hebrew Bible shows that the beginning of the Gospel narrative is carefully grafted to the older canon by associating the annunciations of the births of John and Jesus with miraculous birth annunciations in various books of the older canon, interacting discursively with these (Chapter 3). In the same annunciation stories, on an implicit, covert level, Luke interacts with Isaiah 6, discursively strengthening Angel Gabriel's message by implying that the annunciation of the birth of Jesus, while connected to previous annunciations, differs from them, being the most significant of them all. This chapter also shows how Luke actively interacts with, among others, the Book of Zechariah, regarding the testing of Jesus in his identity as the Son of God and the Messiah in the overall battle between good and evil. This could hardly have come about by a chance combination of kerygma and collected stories. Secondly, the investigation of carnival elements in Luke (Chapter 2) has shown that the Gospel is permeated by this phenomenon, linking it to the practice of carnival in Graeco-Roman times, as well as to other older and contemporary carnivalized texts. This militates against any possible notion that the Gospel is monologic, exclusively locked into church proclamation. Lastly, the chapter on the chronotope of Luke (Chapter 1) has shown a clear pattern of the time-space arrangement in this text. Comparable with that of the Greek Romance text, it is constitutive of the structure and discourse of the text, almost certainly the product of authorial design.

### *Redaction Criticism*

In contrast to form criticism, redaction criticism, although it follows on and builds on the latter, allows for more activity on the part of the evangelists. Instead of mere collectors and scribes, the latter are seen as editors or redactors who have consciously selected units or *pericopae* of certain traditions, putting them together and adding their own

---

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Herodotus, *The Histories*, Bk 1. 1, and Thucydides, *History of the Peloponnesian War*, Bk 1. 1.

contributions with a specific goal in mind. They are now seen as author-editors. Whereas form criticism had raised questions about the history of the forms, concentrating on the individual units, redaction criticism focuses its attention on a Gospel as a whole text, and on how the material has been edited. The evangelists are seen as arranging the traditional material with a specific theological object in mind that represents the view of a definite group and trend in primitive Christianity. They are thus seen as theologians, interpreters of received tradition. Redaction criticism enquires into the motives for the composition by the individual evangelists, focussing their attention on the framework of the story of Jesus. Hans Conzelmann, Willi Marxen and Günther Borkmann played key roles in the emergence of redaction-critical analysis (Rohde 1968: 14-21).<sup>19</sup> Although redaction criticism is at one with form criticism in terms of the kerygmatic origin and unique genre of the Gospels, the fact that it is preoccupied with the evangelists and their theological intention has been seen by later scholars as having opened the door to renewed questions concerning authorship. This eventually led to the challenging of the form critics' notion of the 'unliterary' nature of the Gospels, which in turn inevitably has led to new enquiries into genre (Burridge 1992: 13).<sup>20</sup>

#### *Renewed interest in the Gospels as biographies*

In the 1960s the form-critical dismissal of the Gospels as biographies of Jesus began to be challenged. Moses Hadas and Morton Smith<sup>21</sup> likened the Gospel of Luke to Porphyry's *Pythagoras*, Philo's *Moses*, and Philostratus' *Apollonius of Tyana*, describing these works as aretalogies, an ancient type of biographical writing ... a formal account of the remarkable career of an impressive teacher that was used as a basis for moral instruction' (Burridge 1992: 17). The perceived problem with this classification is that

---

<sup>19</sup> Conzelmann (1954) argues that the author of Luke superimposed a *salvation-history* scheme over the oral traditions in an attempt to solve the problem of the delay of the Parousia (Stein 1992: 647).

<sup>20</sup> Stein sees a disadvantage in redaction criticism in the fact that its aim is limited to the understanding of the unique contribution that each evangelist makes to the Gospel tradition. In his view this detracts from seeing the unity of the Gospels as a group and their overall theological message (Stein 1992: 649). Stein also lists what he sees to be the insights brought by redaction criticism. 1. It has shown that the evangelists were not only gatherers of material, but also interpreters. This meant that each Gospel should be read as a whole. 2. It focuses on the meaning of the text, concerned with the final canonical product. 3. Redaction criticism leads to certain hermeneutical insights by means of comparing the text *with* its source text. 4. Redaction criticism has demonstrated that the redactional work of Matthew and Luke can be understood if they have both made use of Mark (Stein 1992: 649-650).

<sup>21</sup> Moses Hadas and Morton Smith, *Heroes and Gods: Spiritual Biographies in Antiquity* (1965).

there is no proof that this particular genre was in existence at the time of the writing of the Gospels, there being no actual known examples (Burridge 1992: 18).

Renewed interest in reading the Gospels as biographies gained ground in the 1970s. Emphasis was put on the difference between ancient and modern models of biography. Detractors of the biographical hypothesis, like Bultmann, were seen to have assumed that the two were the same, mistakenly judging the Gospels by criteria pertaining to modern perceptions of the genre. The form and redaction critics had insisted that some of the main features of biographical writings, such as, precise chronology, details of the personal appearance of Jesus, the development of his personality, and the attempt to locate him in the historical context of his own day, were missing in the Gospels. Instead, as recent proponents of the biography hypothesis have argued, the Gospels should be read in the light of actual ancient biographical works of the Graeco-Roman world, rather than contemporary understandings of biographical genre (Stanton 2002: 16, Burridge 1992: 84-85).

Talbert advocates a reclassification of Graeco-Roman biography into five types. He classifies the Gospels according to these. He identifies Mark and John as Type B biographies, written to defend against a misunderstanding of the saviour, functioning as a myth of origins for an early Christian community. He identifies Luke-Acts as a Type D biography, written so that the life of the founder is followed by a narrative of his successors and selected other disciples, to indicate where the true tradition lay (in the evangelist's day). However, it also contains elements of the Type B to prevent a misunderstanding as to who Jesus is. Matthew is identified as a Type E biography, written to present the career of Jesus as a legitimisation of his teaching legislation, as well as a hermeneutical clue to its meaning. It too contains elements of Type B, and is thus also a fusion of two functional types (Talbert 1977: 133-135).<sup>22</sup>

Burridge emphasizes, however, that while the form-critical view has now been seriously challenged, there is still no widespread support for any one alternative theory. Interest in the biographical hypothesis has been on the increase, but has not been properly subjected

---

<sup>22</sup> Reiser views the Gospel of Luke as situated between the Hellenistic Greek and the Hellenistic Jewish traditions, describing this Gospel as a Hellenistic biography in the guise of an Old Testament narrative (Klubies 2003:202). Klubies also refers to Radl, who compares the Gospel of Luke to the Hellenistic biographies of philosophers, particularly those of Plutarch (Klubies 2003:201).

to a genre-critical examination (Burridge 1992: 24). He sees two fundamental weaknesses in all the classifications of the gospel genre thus far. First, there has been an absence of a satisfactory literary theory of genre that should underpin studies of this kind. The second difficulty, in his opinion, is that too little knowledge of Jewish and Graeco-Roman literature contemporaneous with the Gospels is displayed as the various hypotheses are put forward. He ascribes these deficiencies to the inevitable interdisciplinary nature of the field as such. A satisfactory investigation would have to involve three major disciplinary areas: gospel studies, literary theory and the literature of the Jewish and Graeco-Roman world (Burridge 1987: 24-5). Of interest to this thesis is that while Burridge cites and comments on many critical writings dealing with these three major areas, he does not engage with, or even mention, Bakhtinian theory. Like many other biblical scholars, he assumes that the Synoptics share the same genre, and describes them collectively. He then gives separate attention to the Gospel of John, but comes to the conclusion that it should be seen as belonging to the same genre as the other three.

*Theory of genre, according to Burridge*<sup>23</sup>

In Burridge's view, the theory of genre had not developed much beyond classical Aristotelean concepts until the twentieth century. Classical theory divided poetry into broad genres, each having its own rules and appropriate features. These genres exercised a prescriptive control on the writer and on the reader in terms of interpretation and evaluation. In practice, however, literary texts often did not follow these rules precisely. During the twentieth century the pendulum swung in the opposite direction to a descriptive approach that in its extreme form allowed every text to be a genre of its own. Burridge follows the line that advocates a middle ground between these two poles. In this view, modern descriptivism does not give enough guidance to the proper understanding of a text, while classical prescriptivism is unsatisfactory as it is difficult to follow in actual practice. Instead, genre should be conceived as a regulative set of conventions that occupies the middle ground. Setting up a cluster of expectations, it functions as a contract between writer and reader. This is only possible if the reader understands the generic language of the writer. By picking up preliminary signals of a particular genre in a text, such as, the title and subtitle, the metre, words in the preliminary sentences, names, the

<sup>23</sup> Burridge draws on Alastair Fowler (1982), E D Hirsch, Jr. (1967), Heather Dubrow (1982), René Wellek and Austin Warren (1982), Northrop Frye (1957), and Jonathan Culler (1975) for his account of genre.

reader is guided in his expectations to read the text in a particular way. As the text progresses, the expectations are either confirmed or not, in which case the reader is forced to readjust his initial assessment of the genre, which raises new expectations, some of which may, again, not be met, leading to another readjustment. As this process progresses, it will eventually lead to an understanding of the genre, and thus the meaning of the text as a whole (Burridge 1992: 26-32).

Burridge stresses that genres are not only flexible, but that they also change into new genres depending on the context in which they have to function. In this innovative process, genres move between totally familiar, boring patterns on the one hand, and completely new, incommunicable patterns on the other. New genres often come into being by mixing two or more genres together. Furthermore, the use of labels may change over time. He sees this mobility of genre as a reason for the difficulties facing modern scholars in identifying the genre of texts written in other eras, as in the case of the Gospels. What would have been natural to a first century reader in terms of knowing the evangelists' generic language, the contract functioning on a subconscious level, has to be acquired consciously by the modern reader. This can be done by a careful examination of other texts of the literary environment in which the Gospels appeared, noting clusters of similar features, as well as a study of what the awareness of genre was in the ancient world. However, he advocates some caution when reading theoretical statements by the ancients. Grammarians and rhetoricians may have written these after the texts in question were written. He also warns against taking statements made by authors in the prefaces of their work too literally, as they do not always reflect what is actually practiced in the texts themselves. He advocates that all theory should be tested against actual writings (Burridge 1992: 65, 69).

### *Mode, genre and sub-genre*

In Burridge's view, one reason why the Gospels have been identified with a variety of genres is that no distinction has been made between mode, genre, and sub-genre. Drawing on Fowler, he sees *genre* on the central level, that is, a group of texts about which there is general agreement in terms of historical origins and shared features of form and content, while still allowing for variety and change. Operating on a broader level there is *mode*. For example, a tragedy belongs to a genre with specific conventions

that set up particular expectations. However, things may occur in a tragic *mode* in texts of other genres without there being the conventions of tragedy. *Mode* does not imply a particular form or structure, only a selection of the genre's features. At the other end of the spectrum, operating on a narrower level than *genre*, there is *sub-genre*, a sub-division of genre that is identified according to specific details like subject-matter or motifs (Burrige 1992: 41, 53). This would explain why some *bioi* differ from others in some respects. The many different genres proposed for the Gospels may be mistakenly based on *modal* rather than *generic* descriptions. On the other hand, the Gospels could be identified as belonging to a *sub-genre* of *bios*.

Burrige points out that Graeco-Roman biography was not strongly delineated by the ancients, nor was there a clear literary theory as to its genre. Again, he suggests caution in reading what authors of *bioi* say in the prefaces of their texts, citing Plutarch's introduction to his *Alexander* as an example of such a preface in which the theoretical statements do not hold for all his *Lives*, not for the genre *per se* (Burrige 1992: 63-65). Underlying Burrige's assessment of *bios* is the opinion that it is extremely flexible, borrowing from a number of neighbouring genres, such as historiography, encomium, moral philosophy, political beliefs and polemic, religious or philosophical teaching, story, novel and entertainment (Burrige 1992: 66). In the case of Plutarch's *Lives*, for example, history and encomium are the two genres that most overlap with the *bios* genre, although moral philosophy also plays a major part due to the author's interest in character and emulation. Burrige points out that these overlaps often take place simultaneously, the boundaries between *bios* and these other genres being flexible.

After surveying Greek, Hellenistic and Roman biography, Burrige concludes that 'biography is a type of writing which occurs naturally among groups of people who have formed around a certain charismatic teacher or leader, seeking to follow after him' (Burrige 1992: 80). He concludes further that a major purpose and function of *bioi* is didactic or philosophical polemic and conflict. Sub-genres of *bioi* may be defined in terms of content, as for example, political versus philosophical *bioi*, or in terms of structure, that is, chronological versus topical *bioi*, or in terms of the influences of neighbouring genres, like historical versus encomiastic *bioi*. He perceives the genre *bios* as having existed over a period that roughly began with Isocrates' *Evagoras* (370 BCE), and ended with Philostratus' *Apollonius of Tyana* (c. 220 CE). Placing both these

examples firmly into this genre, he sees a generic development over the span of this period, judging the *Evagoras* still to be closely linked to the historical, rhetorical and philosophical genres, while seeing *Apollonius of Tyana* as moving in the direction of the novel and hagiography (Burridge 1992: 189).

### *Burridge's model for bioi*

In order to establish the genre of Graeco-Roman biography to see whether the Gospels can reasonably be classified as such, Burridge has set up a model for an analysis of a selection of ten works that he has identified as *bioi* (five from before the time of the Gospels and five contemporaneous with, or after) in terms of a set of shared features that can be seen as a family resemblance, setting up particular expectations. His model consists of four aspects: *opening features*, such as the title, opening words and a prologue; *the subject*; *external features*, which include the mode of representation, metre, size, structure or sequence and scale, as well literary units, sources and methods of characterization; and *internal features*, such as the setting, topics, style, tone, mood, attitude, values; all of which convey the content. The content is then considered in terms of what it reveals about the text's function within its social setting and occasion, as well as the author's purpose (Burridge 1992: 111-126). In examining his examples in the light of these features, Burridge stresses that, as the genre of *bios* is flexible, not all examples display all the features. What he hopes to establish is a basic family resemblance, which he can then apply to the Gospels.

### *Opening features*

Burridge notes that the first signal that his Graeco-Roman examples are *bioi* is that the subject's name appears in the title. In some cases it is combined with the word *bios* or *vita* in the Latin texts.<sup>24</sup> In the opening formulae there is often, but not always, a prologue. Whatever the case, the subject's name usually appears within the first couple of sentences of the work (Burridge 1992: 133-134, 161-162). Comparing this with the Synoptic Gospels, he notes that the situation regarding the titles of the latter (which do

<sup>24</sup> *Evagoras* (Isocrates), *Agesilaus* (Xenophon), *Euripides* (Satyrus), *Atticus* (Nepos), *Moses* (Philo), *Agricola* (Tacitus), *Cato the Younger* (Plutarch), *Divus Augustus* (Suetonius), *Demonax* (Lucian), *Apollonius of Tyana* (Philostratus). Of these *Euripides*, *Moses* and *Demonax* have the word *bios* in the title, whilst *Agricola* has *vita*.

not contain the name *Jesus*) is rather complex, but that they, nevertheless, 'suggest that the books were seen as a literary group together, possibly with a connection with *bios*' (Burrige 1992: 193). He notes that Luke begins with a preface that can be paralleled with those of *Moses* by Philo, and *Demonax* by Lucian. He notes the debate over the extent of Mark's opening, but if it is just one sentence, then it can be compared to *Agesilaus* and some of Plutarch's other *Lives* (for example, *Timoleon* I). The fact that Matthew begins with a genealogy is in itself an indication of *bios*, in his view, on account of the latter's interest in the *genos* of the subject. Furthermore, both Mark and Matthew begin with the subject's name, while Luke mentions it later at the start of the main narrative (Burrige 1992: 195).

### *The subject*

The subject figures as the dominant focus in a *bios*. Burrige claims this on the basis of the result of a syntactical analysis of his examples in which he has counted how often the subject's name appears, and how many of the verbs pertain to him. Comparing the resulting figures of his examples with texts by Homer and Herodotus, he concludes that in forms of literature other than *bios* the subjects of the verbs are wide and varied (Burrige 1992: 134-135, 162-163).<sup>25</sup> In his analysis of the Gospels he notes a similar result to that of his Graeco-Roman examples, confirming that Jesus, and not some other issue, is the main focus of these texts (Burrige 1992: 196).

The space allocated to the different stages of the subject's life in *bioi* is not even-handed. Certain parts take up large sections of the text, while others may be covered in a cursory manner, or simply be left out. The death of the subject and its consequences (*sic*) is often allocated a large space. In his examples Burrige notes the variety of space allocation among them.<sup>26</sup> What emerges is that the authors of these examples order and allocate the

<sup>25</sup> Interestingly, Burrige refers to examples from historiography and epic, omitting, amongst others, the genre of the Greek Romance.

<sup>26</sup> *Evagoras* is in eight parts of roughly equal lengths. In the *Agesilaus* one major campaign occupies more than one third of the work. In *Atticus* half the work is taken up with the life of the subject while the other half is an account of the part he played in the last years of the Republic. In *Moses* there is a similar twofold pattern. Book I describes the subject's life in the manner of a king, while Book II looks at him topically as Lawgiver, Priest and Prophet. In the *Agricola*, Tacitus gives the subject's final campaign more space than the narrative of the six preceding years, regarding the battle as the climax of the career. Plutarch gives a large space to his subject's last meal, death and funeral in *Cato Minor*. In Lucian's *Demonax* most of the space is given to anecdotes and sayings. Philostratus gives two thirds of the text to travels and dialogues in

space of their text as they wish, elaborating freely on those aspects of the subject's life, be it chronological or topical, that the author rates as the most significant. Comparing this with the Synoptic Gospels, he notes a similar result. Matthew and Luke devote large sections to Jesus' ministry and the journey to Jerusalem, while over fifteen percent of their text is taken up by the events of the Last Supper, Trial, Passion and Resurrection. Mark allocates over nineteen percent to the Last Supper, Passion and Resurrection, while also assigning large sections to ministry and the journey to Jerusalem. BurrIDGE compares the significance of the death of Jesus to the evangelists with the significance of Agricola's last battle to Tacitus (BurrIDGE 1992: 197-199).

### *External features*

*Bioi* are works mostly in prose narrative and of medium length;<sup>27</sup> their structure is a bare chronological framework of birth/arrival and death with topical material inserted; the scale is always limited to the subject; a mixture of literary units, notably anecdotes, stories, speeches and sayings, selected from a wide range of oral and written sources, displays the subject's character indirectly through words and deeds rather than by direct analysis (BurrIDGE 1992: 144-145).

This is what BurrIDGE concludes after an examination of the five examples he puts forward as *bioi* that predate the Gospels. He points out exceptions, which he sees as indicative of the flexibility of the genre. Thus the mode of representation of the *Evagoras* is that of a speech. The *Euripides* is written in the form of a dialogue as opposed to continuous prose. In terms of length, *Moses* exceeds the limit of medium length with its approximately 32,000 words. The latter also diverges from the other examples in terms of scale, which is broader, recounting important events and customs of the Jews. However, BurrIDGE emphasizes that these issues were still tied into the life of the subject (BurrIDGE 1992: 141).

---

*Apollonius of Tyana*, while a quarter is taken up with the subject's later events, death, appearances and honours. BurrIDGE also points out that in Suetonius' *The Twelve Caesars* the material is arranged topically, there being no attempt to provide an even-handed chronological account (BurrIDGE 1992: 135-137, 164-167).

<sup>27</sup> According to BurrIDGE medium length is from 5,000 to 25,000 words (1992: 169).

Having examined the texts that he has selected as *bioi* that appeared contemporaneously with or after the Gospels, BurrIDGE notes that the pattern is similar to the older ones. They are written in continuous prose, mostly in chronological sequence. There are a couple of exceptions. The works of Suetonius have their material ordered topically, rather than chronologically. The continuous prose narrative of *Apollonius of Tyana* contains blocks of formal dialogue rather like those of philosophical works. In terms of size the latter is also an exception with its 82,000 words, while *Demonax* is shorter than medium length with its approximate 3,000 words. In terms of chronological and topical arrangement of the material BurrIDGE concludes that *bioi* of statesmen or generals<sup>28</sup> tend to be more chronological, while philosophical or literary *bioi*<sup>29</sup> are likely to be topically arranged. In terms of scale, the exception is again *Apollonius of Tyana*, which includes geographical, historical and ethnographical background at various points. As far as the literary units of stories and anecdotes are concerned, BurrIDGE notes that those in his examples are formed from a similar, but wide range of written and oral sources, such as oral family tradition, personal memory, memoirs, letters, archives and scripture. Some of these are carefully composed, while others are loosely connected. All serve to portray the subject in a particular light (BurrIDGE 1992: 142-3, 173-4).

Turning to the Synoptic Gospels for a comparison, BurrIDGE makes the following points:

... 'the mode of representation of the synoptic gospels is prose narrative of a fairly continuous nature, like historiography and *bioi*' (BurrIDGE 1992: 199).

A slight qualification of this is that Mark's primitive Greek may have the occasional oral cadence, and that, as a whole, they all feature some dialogue and exhibit some rhetorical, oral and proclamatory features.

Like most *bioi*, all three synoptic Gospels are of medium length.

... 'The gospels themselves all restrict their scale to the person of Jesus in a manner typical of *bioi* literature' (BurrIDGE 1992: 201).

<sup>28</sup> *Evagoras, Agesilaus, Atticus, Agricola and Cato Minor* (BurrIDGE 1992: 171).

<sup>29</sup> *Demonax and Apollonius of Tyana*.

... 'The combination of stories, sayings and speeches found in the synoptic gospels is very similar to the basic literary units used by *bioi*' (Burridge 1992: 204).

... 'The freedom to select and edit sources to produce the desired picture of the subject is another feature shared by both the gospels and Graeco-Roman *bioi*' (Burridge 1992: 205).

... 'The gospels so-called 'lack of character development' can no longer be used as an argument against their being *bioi*' (Burridge 1992: 206).

Addressing the modern dismissal of the Gospels as biographies, Burridge points out that *bioi* present the character of the subject through deeds and words, rather than by direct character analysis.

#### *Internal features*

In spite of his view of the development of the *bios* genre over the centuries, Burridge sees the following pattern (with some exceptions) of internal features both in his earlier and later examples. The *geographical setting* of the texts range over the whole ancient world, but are all chosen in terms of where the subject is active. A number of typical biographical *topics* recur throughout these works. These include the subject's ancestry, birth, great deeds, virtues, death and consequences (sic). Various *styles and atmospheres* dominate *bioi*. Most of them are highbrow and serious, but some are lighter tending towards the popular.<sup>30</sup> The *quality of characterization* is good on the whole, although it tends towards stereotype. The *social setting* within which these texts operated was usually among the educated and ruling classes, although Burridge believes that there are hints in some of the texts that a wider audience was sought.<sup>31</sup> *Authorial intentions* are many: encomiastic, exemplary, informative, entertaining, to preserve memory, didactic,

<sup>30</sup> Satyrus' *Euripides* and Lucian's *Demonax*.

<sup>31</sup> Burridge points to *Moses*, which is intended to inform those ignorant of that character. He believes that the *Euripides* reveals a social environment interested in stories about important people, which would imply an element of the popular in the setting (Burridge 1992: 149). In his later examples he sees the *Demonax* in a popular setting, as well as the works of Suetonius, and *Apollonius of Tyana* on account of the latter's informative purpose (Burridge 1992: 185).

apologetic and polemic. Two or more of these usually feature simultaneously (Burridge 1992: 145-152).

Comparing this pattern with the internal features of the synoptic Gospels, Burridge notes that the geographical setting of the latter, although not covering the expanse of the ancient world, is also varied, the settings always being determined by Jesus' activity. The topics include those of *bioi*, that is, ancestry, birth, boyhood and education, great deeds, virtues, death and consequences.<sup>32</sup> In terms of style he notes that the Gospels are written in *koine* Greek, which is different from both classical Attic and that of much contemporary literature. Matthew and Luke are seen as improving on Mark's style, Luke displaying a greater command of Greek constructions, as well as a wide vocabulary, both from the Septuagint and from contemporary settings. Burridge does not see the Gospels' use of the *koine* Greek as peculiar to themselves, however, pointing to how Plutarch also avoided Attic literary archaizing, as well as to the popular nature of Satyrus' and Lucian's writings. In terms of atmosphere, Burridge sees the serious and respectful atmosphere in the Gospels as consistent with that of *bioi*, like Tacitus' *Agricola* and Philo's *Moses* (Burridge 1992: 211). The quality of characterization in the Gospels can be seen to be in line with those of *bioi*. Each evangelist paints his particular portrait of Jesus, selecting what he needs from the sources for their picture. There is a tendency towards stereotype, though more of the 'real' character emerges from the stories that recount deeds and sayings.<sup>33</sup>

Testing the authorial intention of the synoptic Gospels in terms of the range pertaining to his *bioi* model, Burridge comes to the following conclusions. The intention is not *encomiastic*, in his view. Instead, he sees elements of the *exemplary*. The *informative*

<sup>32</sup> See Robbin's Seminar Paper (SBL 1981), in which he compares what he refers to as the *topos* of inoffensive self-praise on the part of the protagonists, Moses (Josephus' *Antiquities*), Jesus (Gospel of Luke), and Alexander (Plutarch's *Alexander*). Robbins concludes that while in terms of this *topos* there are parallels in all three of these texts, there are similarities in particular between the Gospel of Luke and the *Alexander* relating to the participation of divine powers in the conception of the protagonist. He demonstrates that both texts contain an event initiated by the son as a youth in which he praises himself at the expense of his parental father. Secondly, he states that the protagonist announces his programme in a public debut in a form that includes self-praise. The third parallel is when receiving excessive praise, the protagonist resists these laudatory statements with corrective remarks to those who praise him. Noting that the Gospel shares significant features with Graeco-Roman literature like Plutarch's *Parallel Lives*, Robbins suggests that Luke takes a decisive step beyond the *topoi* of Israelite and Jewish literature in the portrayal of the protagonist as a divinely generated son (Robbins 1981: 293-306).

<sup>33</sup> Burridge suggests that the fact that millions of people try to live their lives to this day according to how the protagonist of the Gospels would like them to live is an indication that the 'real' character does come through in these texts (Burridge 1992: 212).

purpose plays a role, as well as that of *preserving memory*. There is little *entertainment value* although he does concede that, considering the quality of the prose in the preface, Luke had some literary aspirations. He then points to Acts for a greater entertainment element. Burridge sees a major *didactical* purpose in the Gospels, an aim he sees as common in philosophical and religious *bioi*. He points to Luke's declaration to help Theophilus to know the truth about which he had been instructed (Lk1: 1-4). He sees the *apologetic* and *polemic* purpose as that most common in *bioi*. The Gospels are no exception. Mark is seen as struggling against a false view of Jesus as a miracle/wonder worker.<sup>34</sup> Matthew is seen to convince, instruct and refute against the backdrop of the struggle of the 'Gentile-oriented church.'<sup>35</sup> Luke is again referred to in combination with Acts, the combined work constituting an apologetic in the Jewish/Gentile debate or as an apologetic for Christianity to a wider Roman audience.<sup>36</sup> Burridge concludes: ... 'This congruence of aims between the synoptic gospels and *bioi* is another indication of a shared genre' (Burridge 1992: 216).<sup>37</sup>

Burridge's overall conclusion is that there is a high degree of correlation between the generic features of Graeco-Roman *bioi* and those of the synoptic Gospels. They can thus be seen as forming a sub-genre within the overall genre (Burridge 1992: 218-9).

#### *Reservations about Burridge's model*

Burridge has identified *bios* as a flexible genre that has neighbouring genres overlapping with it. In a diagram he shows *bios* in the centre, surrounded by its neighbouring genres: history, moral philosophy, religious and philosophical teaching (dialogue and discourse), encomium, story and novel (interest and entertainment), political beliefs (polemic). He sees the boundaries between *bios* and each of these to be flexible. Thus he has made provision for features in a given text that either deviate from the norm of his model of *bios*, or are simply missing. These deviations are then seen as exceptions that do not

<sup>34</sup> Burridge cites T J Weeden (1968: 145-58, and 1971: 64-77). Talbert sees Mark as a myth of origin for the Christian movement (1977: 133-5).

<sup>35</sup> Burridge takes on the views of Bilezikian (1977), Moule (1981) and Hill (NCBC, p. 44). Talbert views Matthew's description of the career of Jesus as a legitimisation of his teaching-legislation, a clue to its meaning, and as a way to protect the true image of the Church's Lord (Talbert 1977: 134).

<sup>36</sup> He also points to the fact that Luke-Acts has been seen to have been used as an apologetic for Paul at his trial (Burridge 1992: 216).

<sup>37</sup> For a discussion of the quest for the origins of the Gospels see Burton.L. Mack (1988: 3-24).

affect the text's generic identification of *bios*, unless there are so many of them that another genre identification has to be sought. One could argue here that, theoretically, one or other of Burridge's Graeco-Roman examples of *bios* could equally be seen as belonging to one of the neighbouring genres that are seen as overlapping with *bios*, the latter then being deemed the neighbouring genre that overlaps with it.<sup>38</sup> Any deviations in the text from the genre that has thus been moved into the centre could, in turn, be seen as exceptions that do not affect the basic generic identification.

A second reservation concerning Burridge's model is that by focussing on the features that are shared by his chosen examples a consideration of other features that may differ considerably from text to text is excluded. Were these features to be considered they would have an impact on how the text in question was viewed and interpreted in terms of genre. An example of this would be the manner in which supernatural occurrences were depicted.

Thirdly, can differences be given equal weight? Some may be more significant in terms of determining genre than others. So, for example, if one is to look at how Shakespeare's works are classified, one finds that those dramas that end in the death of the protagonists are termed tragedies, while those with a happy ending are identified as comedies, even though there is laughter and sadness throughout the story in both kinds.

Lastly, Burridge's model gives an account of Graeco-Roman biography covering a long period, placing the Gospels roughly in the middle of this period. Although this account is useful in terms of an overall view of how Burridge perceives the genre of *bios*, there is a problem in comparing the Gospels with texts that appeared considerably later in order to prove that they are *bioi*. While corresponding features may be found, this may be due to the fact that a later work like *Apollonius of Tyana* may have used the Gospels as a model.

### *The Gospel of Luke in terms of Burridge's model*

---

<sup>38</sup> For example, the *Agricola* by Tacitus, which could be seen as an encomium overlapped by the genres of history, biography and rhetoric. See Burridge (1992: 155-156, n. 5) for other opinions.

Applying Burridge's model of the genre of *bios* to the Gospel of Luke specifically (not grouped with the Synoptics, or combined with Acts) shows that the latter complies with the majority of the criteria identified by Burridge. The text is of medium length, written in narrative prose with some dialogues in it. It contains a mixture of literary units, like anecdotes, parables, sayings and discourses, which could be seen as the topical material inserted in an overall chronological framework. The scale is limited to the subject's life. Jesus' character is conveyed indirectly through his words and deeds. Topics include ancestry, birth, a boyhood anecdote that prefigures the protagonist's adult life, great deeds, virtues (emerging through stories), and a great deal about Jesus' death and its consequences. Jesus is vindicated as a righteous man immediately after his death by the centurion (Lk 23: 47).

### *Differences*

The first difference in the Gospel of Luke in terms of Burridge's criteria for *bioi* lies in the opening. Neither the name *Jesus*, nor the word *bios* or *vita*, appears in either the title or the opening paragraph. In other words, the reader does not get that particular generic signal at the beginning of the text. The text however does state the intention of the author at the beginning, which is not that of writing a *bios*, but, rather, to write down an orderly account of the 'events that have been fulfilled among us' (Lk 1: 1) for the addressee, Theophilus. The actual name *Jesus* is unobtrusively slipped into the story at the time of the Angel Gabriel's annunciation to Mary (Lk 1: 31). Beginning with a character called Zechariah, the narrative commences within a framework of an address.

A second difference is that the bare chronological structure of birth and death does not encompass the story of Jesus in Luke, as it encompasses that of the subject in Burridge's *bioi*. Instead, it is followed by a Resurrection and an Ascension. These momentous events can hardly be equated to the 'consequences of death' (such as a public funeral, honours, a statue) in Burridge's model. The latter does mention the reported Ascension of Augustus and the reported appearances of Apollonius of Tyana to his followers, but only in a cursory manner. He does not record any such occurrences in his early Graeco-Roman

examples. The emphasis is on the death itself, on the manner of burial, and on subsequently bestowed honours (Burridge 1992: 146-7, 178-180).<sup>39</sup>

A third difference, which Burridge mentions but tends to underplay, ascribing it to the flexibility of the *bios*-genre, is that of style and social setting. He points out that *bioi* were not *limited* to one formal style and level,<sup>40</sup> and even surmises that there may have been popular ones in circulation that were not preserved for posterity. The closest match with the Greek *koine* in Luke is Burridge's assessment of Plutarch's style. Furthermore, the protagonist in the Gospel is clearly not of the same social class as his counterparts in Burridge's Graeco-Roman examples of *bioi*,<sup>41</sup> who are patently historical figures of high social rank. Exceptions are Lucian's *Demonax* (a philosopher, the author's teacher) and Philostratus' *Apollonius of Tyana* (of whose existence no secure contemporary evidence has survived),<sup>42</sup> but these works appeared some time after the Gospels, and may have been modelled on them. They are also the works that Burridge sees as having popular tendencies, describing *Apollonius of Tyana* as a *bios* that tends towards the genres of the romance and hagiography,<sup>43</sup> using a 'style that befits popular narrative', while he notes a

---

<sup>39</sup> Talbert sees the Myth of the Immortals as underlying the Gospel of Luke, which would make provision for an Ascension and for appearances by the person who has passed over (the Immortal) to his disciples (Talbert 1977: 26-43). Talbert takes the view that Luke is a biography, and cites three *bioi* that he sees as having made use of the Myth of the Immortals: *The Alexander Romance* by Pseudo-Callisthenes (c. 140-340) (other scholars view this as Romance (Reardon 1989: 5)), the biography of Augustus by Suetonius, and Philostratus' *Life of Apollonius of Tyana*. Alexander was reported to have gone to Heaven as a star, carried by an eagle. An ex-praetor had taken an oath that he had seen the form of Augustus on his way up to Heaven. Apollonius was reported to have disappeared from the temple of Athena in response to a chorus that was heard singing 'Hasten thou from earth, hasten thou to Heaven, hasten' (Talbert 1977: 32-33). One can note here that the supernatural occurrence of Ascension in the three mentioned cases are not even close to what happens in the Gospel of Luke. In the latter Jesus dies in full view of witnesses. His death is accompanied by modifications of nature. He is buried. After his Resurrection he lives for some time among his disciples, he eats (which the Immortals never do once they have passed over) broiled fish (Lk 24: 42-3), and he takes his disciples to the place from which he ascends into Heaven, promising a future return. In the case of the three examples mentioned by Talbert, there is room for doubt as to the veracity of the report.

<sup>40</sup> Burridge describes Isocrates and Xenophon as writing in a 'high literary manner using formal rhetorical style' and Nepos and Philo as 'capable of high style and rhetorical forms', but writing for a wider audience in their *bioi* (Burridge 1992: 147). He identifies Plutarch's Greek as a 'rather' literary *koine*, drawing upon the vocabulary of historiography, rhetoric and moral philosophy. He rates Lucian's writing as 'rhetorical... on popular level' and Suetonius' as 'the businesslike style of the ancient scholar' (quoting Wallace-Hadrill) (Burridge 1992: 181).

<sup>41</sup> Evagoras (the murdered father of the king of Cyprus, Nicocles), Agesilaus (King of Sparta), Euripides (a well-known tragedian), Atticus (a Roman knight), Agricola (Roman senator, commander of the XXth legion in Britain), Cato Minor (politician in the last decades of the Roman Republic), the Caesars (Emperors of Rome), Demonax (philosopher with Cynical tendencies from Cyprus under whom Lucian studied) and Apollonius of Tyana (travelling teacher and religious reformer).

<sup>42</sup> See the introduction of Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius* (Bowersock 1970: 9).

<sup>43</sup> Reardon views hagiography as a successor of the Greek Romance (Reardon 1989: 12).

comic element in *Demonax* (Burridge 1992, 181). One might question whether these works are, in fact, *bioi*.<sup>44</sup>

*An experiment: Burridge's model for bioi applied to an example of the Greek Romance*

In identifying the genre of the Gospels as *bios*, Burridge describes the latter as a genre that had been in existence in the Graeco-Roman world during a period that stretched from a couple of centuries before the appearance of the Gospels to a couple of centuries after that time. He stresses that this genre does not stand in isolation, and depicts it as being surrounded by a number of neighbouring genres that overlap with it. Regarding the Gospels in the light of his model, he notes some differences, but does not rate these significant enough to exclude these texts from the genre. Further differences have come to light when the *bios* model was applied specifically to the Gospel of Luke. According to Burridge's reasoning, which makes allowance for differences because of the flexibility of the genre, this too should not be significant enough to exclude this Gospel from the *bios* genre.

A case can be made for reassessing whether the differences between the Gospel of Luke and Burridge's *bios* model are significant enough to consider another genre. To do this, it is of interest to see what happens when the criteria of Burridge's model are applied to an example of one of the neighbouring genres of *bios*. I have chosen the Greek Romance, *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, for this purpose because the previous chapters of this thesis have shown similarities between this text and the Gospel of Luke when the two texts were looked at comparatively along Bakhtinian lines of chronotope, carnivalesque and intertextuality.<sup>45</sup> What follows is an application of Burridge's *bios* model to *Chaereas and Callirhoe*.

*Opening features*

---

<sup>44</sup> Reardon, for example, associates *Apollonius of Tyana* with what he calls 'fringe novels' (Reardon 1989: 3).

<sup>45</sup> See Chapter 1(p. 3) of this thesis for the dating of the Greek Romance by classicists. See also Reardon (1989: 5-6).

As in the model, the title of the narrative contains the names of the protagonists.<sup>46</sup> Furthermore, the name *Callirhoe* appears in the third sentence.<sup>47</sup> The name *Chaereas* appears a couple of sentences later. Having introduced himself briefly in the first sentence of the text, the author, in this case, signals the genre of romance in the second sentence when he announces his intention to tell the story of a *love affair* (*Chaereas and Callirhoe*: I.1).

### *Subject*

Although no analysis has been made of the verb's subjects (as Burridge has done on his Graeco-Roman examples of *bioi*), the story focuses exclusively on the fate, the experiences, the thoughts, and the actions of the protagonists in this romance. Any description of the activities or thoughts of other characters are in the context of how this would relate to the protagonists.<sup>48</sup> Overwhelmingly, most of the space is allocated to them, as is the case in the *bios* model.

### *External features*

In line with Burridge's model for *bios*, *Chaereas and Callirhoe* is of *medium length*, written in *narrative prose*. It contains a combination of various *literary units* within it, the forms being taken from existing genres and sources. Examples are quotations from epic (Homer),<sup>49</sup> speeches (rhetorical genre), the letter,<sup>50</sup> and the soliloquy.<sup>51</sup> In terms of structure, one could say that, like *bioi*, it has a *chronological framework*. The protagonists' background (both come from families of high rank)<sup>52</sup> is briefly mentioned. The end differs from *bioi*, however, closing with a happy ending that will last forever,

<sup>46</sup> As I have noted in note 19 (p. 27), Reardon suggests that the original title may have been *Callirhoe* (Reardon 1989: 18).

<sup>47</sup> Although Chaereas and Callirhoe are jointly the protagonists of this love story, Callirhoe emerges as the real protagonist, more space by far being allocated to her. Also the story ends with the sentence: 'That is my story about Callirhoe' (*Chaereas and Callirhoe* VIII: 8).

<sup>48</sup> Egger notes that Callirhoe is the focus of the plot. It revolves around her and is driven by it. Even when she is absent, the thoughts and actions of the other characters are directed towards her (Egger 1994: 36).

<sup>49</sup> As for example, *Chaereas and Callirhoe* I. 1 (cf *Iliad* 18.22-24), and *Chaereas and Callirhoe* II. 3 (cf *Odyssey* 17.485-87).

<sup>50</sup> *Chaereas and Callirhoe* VIII. 4.

<sup>51</sup> *Chaereas and Callirhoe* II. 9. As is the case in the Gospel of Luke, which contains episodes and sayings that appear in other gospel texts, so *Chaereas and Callirhoe* contains episodes, motifs and genres that also appear in other romance texts.

<sup>52</sup> Callirhoe is the daughter of Hermocrates, the Syracusan general (the ruler of Syracuse) that defeated the Athenians, while Chaereas is the son of Ariston 'second only to Hermocrates in Syracuse' (I. 1).

instead of the death and its consequences of the protagonist in the *bios* (both protagonists did experience 'near-deaths' during the narrative).<sup>53</sup> As in the *bios* model, the chronological line is repeatedly interrupted by topical material, in this case often in the form of adventures that the protagonists undergo. *Scale* and *focus* of the text is determined by the protagonists, as is the case in the *bios* model.

### *Internal features*

Like in the *bios* model, the *geographical setting* in *Chaereas and Callirhoe* is the Mediterranean world, in this case spanning from Syracuse to Babylon, a number of sea voyages being made. But, as in Burridge's model, it is limited to the movements of the protagonists. Apart from ancestry and virtues (*topoi* that are common both to the *bios* model and to this romance), one can say that there are differences on the points of *birth*, *great deeds* and *death*. There is nothing remarkable mentioned about the birth of Chaereas and Callirhoe (although there is in later Greek Romances).<sup>54</sup> Instead of great deeds, one can talk of adventures in the romance. Concerning death, the protagonists survive to live happily ever after.

*Style and level* of this romance would fit broadly into Burridge's model, although it is not that of the majority in the latter's selection of texts. Reardon describes the language as straightforward literary *koine* (Reardon 1989: 20). In terms of *atmosphere* (created by tone, mood, attitude and values in the *bios*-model), one can say that, in line with the adventures, there is a sense of suspense and sensationalism. Entertainment features prominently. However, in terms of *attitude and values*, the virtue (in the sense of faithfulness) of the protagonists and general virtue of the society in which they move is of paramount importance. The *quality of characterization* can be termed stereotypical, the beauty and the virtue of the protagonists being emphasized from the start, while their deeds and words serve to convey their character throughout the narrative. Concerning the *social setting and occasion*, the romance genre seems to have been popular, judging by the number of the extant texts (Reardon 1989: 12).

<sup>53</sup> . I. 5-7, IV. 2-3. Between them, these episodes display the motifs of crucifixion and the empty tomb.

<sup>54</sup> *Daphnis and Chloe* by Longus, dated 200 (Reardon 1989: 5) and *An Ethiopian Story* by Heliodorus, dated third or late fourth century CE (Reardon 1989: 5).

A conclusive *authorial intention and purpose* cannot be stated concerning this story, but, taking Burridge's criteria, one could say that the *encomiastic* element is present in *Chaereas and Callirhoe* in the scenes when the crowds worship Callirhoe for her beauty (as, for example, in Book III. 3). This cannot be seen as a primary authorial purpose, the protagonists not being historical characters, but rather as an enhancement of the sensational atmosphere of the story. The implication in these scenes is that beauty is synonymous with virtue. As has been mentioned above, the *entertainment* element is prominent by virtue of the adventures that create an ever-increasing sense of suspense, and by the protagonists (especially Callirhoe) being attractive figures for the readers/listeners to identify themselves with. The reader is given access to the most intimate thoughts and feelings of the characters, thoughts and feelings that can be seen as archetypal in nature. One cannot speak of an intention of *preserving memory* in the case of fictional characters. However, because a pair of lovers is archetypal, a fictional rendering may have the effect of fixing them in the communal memory of the readers, who may then compare them to other pairs, be they fictional or historical. The *didactic* purpose features prominently in so far as the story emphasizes that faithfulness to the beloved throughout all hardships and temptations is of paramount importance, and is rewarded in the end. Contemplating the possibility of an *apologetic* or *polemical* purpose one might say that the story is defending the view that true romantic love can outlast all hardships, and can end in eternal happiness for the lovers.

#### *Implication of the results of the application of the bios model on Chaereas and Callirhoe*

Following Burridge's reasoning, which makes allowance for some deviation on account of the flexibility of the *bios* genre, this application of the model to the Greek Romance, *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, would imply that the latter is a *bios* portraying the lives of a pair of lovers, or, alternatively, of Callirhoe as the main protagonist.<sup>55</sup> The overwhelming number of corresponding features should safely place this work in the *bios* genre, the few differences not being a reason for disqualification. These differences can be summed up as follows. First, the word *bios* does not appear in the opening features, even though the names of the protagonists do. Secondly, the text ends with everlasting happiness for the

---

<sup>55</sup>See the last sentence of *Chaereas and Callirhoe* VIII: 8: 'That is my story about Callirhoe'. Classicists have suggested that the female partner in these romances may have been originally viewed as the protagonist. This could be seen as one of the many carnivalistic inversions that this genre displays. None of Burridge's examples of *bioi* features a woman protagonist.

protagonists, who, after many struggles, are back in the fold of their home community. This is to be contrasted with the ending of *bioi*, which end with the subject's death and consequences. Thirdly, in place of what Burridge lists as *deeds of the subject* in *bioi*, we have the adventures and vicissitudes undergone by the protagonists in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*. This is not a great difference, however. What matters, whether adventures in Romance or deeds in *bioi*, is that they display actions that are indicative of character. Other differences (that also feature in a minority of works included in the *bios* genre by Burridge) are the popular style and social level of the work.

According to Burridge's view of the flexibility of the genre of *bios*, these differences should thus not exclude *Chaereas and Callirhoe* from this genre. The Gospel of Luke, which is included by Burridge, differs from the model in terms of these very same criteria, namely, the opening, the ending and the popular style and setting. What emerges from this exercise is that Burridge's model for *bioi* is broad enough to accommodate both the genres of *bios* and the Greek Romance (as the latter features in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*), the latter differing from the model no more than does the Gospel of Luke.

Apart from pointing towards a generic resemblance (in terms of Burridge's particular model) between ancient biography and the Greek Romance, and thus also a resemblance between the Gospel of Luke and the Greek Romance, this application has shown that a model asking a different set of questions must be sought in order to identify the differences between ancient biography and the Greek Romance. This would give an indication as to where the Gospel of Luke stands: whether with *bios*, Romance, or neither.

#### *Differences between bioi and the Greek Romance*

A fundamental difference between *bioi* and the Greek Romance, apparent without deeper investigation, is that *bioi* are seen as giving an account of an historical person, even if there is some manipulation and elaborative invention. The protagonist is a recognisable historical character of a certain time and place, usually highly placed in society. The Greek Romance, on the other hand, is recognized as being fictional (the protagonists being invented archetypal figures), even though certain historical characters are mentioned, and the narrative is often anchored in historical time and space (often

anachronistically).<sup>56</sup> A second, related difference is the role of the supernatural in the narrative. While *bioi* assert verisimilitude in terms of the historicity of the stories, the supernatural playing a minor role in terms of signs and omens, as for example, at birth, the supernatural world is a prominent player in the stories of the Greek Romance, verisimilitude playing a lesser part.

Bakhtin has used the Greek Romance to demonstrate his theory of the chronotope. Seeing the Romance as the forerunner of what was to become the European novel, he demonstrates how the chronotopic arrangement of a text is indicative of its discourse, its dialogic possibilities, and its genre. In his view, the chronotopic arrangement is inextricably bound to a number of other characteristics, such as the depiction of character, supernatural intervention and a set of recurring motifs. One can say that part of his demonstration of the chronotope constitutes a model of what he calls the *adventure novel of ordeal*, the texts that classicists refer to as the Greek Novel, *Chaereas and Callirhoe* being one of these.<sup>57</sup> Like Burridge's model, Bakhtin's model can be seen as a cluster of features that can be applied to a particular text in establishing whether there is a family resemblance or not. Chapter 1 of this thesis applied Bakhtin's model to *Chaereas and Callirhoe* and has found that the latter complies with it. The exploration went on from there to apply the same model to the Gospel of Luke and found that it also complies with it. This implies that *Chaereas and Callirhoe* and the Gospel of Luke share a cluster of features according to Bakhtin's model and could thus be seen as having a family resemblance.

It has been shown above that the Gospel of Luke also complies with Burridge's model of *bios*, except for a few differences, and has thus been classed as belonging to that genre. Similarly, *Chaereas and Callirhoe* complies with Burridge's model, also with a few exceptions. This would imply that *Chaereas and Callirhoe* is a *bios* according to this model, and thus belongs to the same genre as the Gospel of Luke. As this line of

---

<sup>56</sup> This is the case in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*. Reardon (1989: 1) describes the Greek Romances as ... 'narrative fiction in prose – imaginative, created literature, sufficiently similar to what we call novels to justify the use of the term here'. Burridge notes a difficulty in defining ancient biography definitively, preferring the term 'Lives' (*bioi*), but he quotes Momigliano: 'An account of the life of a man from birth to death is what I call biography', as well as well as the *Oxford English Dictionary*: 'The history of the lives of individual men, as a branch of literature' (Burridge 1992: 62-63).

<sup>57</sup> Heliodorus, *The Aethiopica*, Achilles Tatius, *Leucippe and Clitophon*, Chariton, *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, Xenophon of Ephesus, *An Ephesian Story*, Longus, *Daphnis and Chloe*. Both Bakhtin (1981: 86-87) and Reardon (1989: 50) classify these five as belonging to this particular genre.

argument would place *bios* and the Greek Romance within the same generic category, rather than neighbouring but differing genres, a comparison between Burridge's model of *bios* and Bakhtin's model of the *adventure novel of ordeal* may be useful in discovering a distinction between the two.

*A comparison between Bakhtin's chronotopic assessment of the adventure novel of ordeal and Burridge's model of bios*

At first glance a comparison of Bakhtin's account of the Greek Romance and Burridge's account of ancient biography seems problematic. Not only do these two models refer to two different genres, but they also approach a text differently. Burridge regards a text from the outside, applying a model that consists of what he sees as a cluster of features typical of the *bios* genre to see whether it fits. Bakhtin, on the other hand, goes to the centre, not of the subject, or of the text as it presents itself on the surface, but of the narrative strategy governing it, asking the question: How is the time-space arrangement (chronotope) organized in the text in question, and what implication does this have in terms of discourse and genre? Nevertheless, there are similarities between the two models that can serve as a starting point of comparison. Both take a synchronic approach to their texts, as opposed to the diachronic approach employed by form and redaction criticism. They have both been applied to the Gospel of Luke, with the conclusion that the latter complies with both, given a few differences.<sup>58</sup> Both models address the phenomenon of various units of differing genres within the overall chronological framework of the narrative.

*Time*

Bakhtin identifies two types of time in action in the *adventure novel of ordeal*: *biographical time* and *adventure time*. The first type, that is, *biographical time*, operates at the beginning of the narrative when the lovers meet and fall in love, and at the end when everything works out happily ever after. Between these two points he sees an hiatus that is filled with the second type of time, the type that he terms *adventure time*, which forms the bulk of the many episodes in the story. What distinguishes these two types of

---

<sup>58</sup> See Burridge, *What are the Gospel* (1992) and Chapter 1 of this thesis.

time from one another is that in *adventure time* each episode or adventure works according to its own time logic and is not concerned with considerations that rule biographical time. Were one to add up the sum of the time of the adventures, the protagonists would no longer be young at the point when everlasting conjugal bliss commences. At the second point of biographical time, that is, at the end of the story, the protagonists of these stories appear untouched by the ordeals they have had to withstand, and untouched by time. In terms of narrative strategy this means that between these two instances of biographical time any number of ordeals or adventures can be inserted, and in any order. Introduced by markers like ‘suddenly’ or ‘just at that time’ each adventure is its own unit governed by its own laws. This kind of time arrangements facilitates the intervention of chance or other deities, as for example, Aphrodite and Tyche.

One could tentatively say that this observation of biographical and adventure time in the *adventure novel of ordeal* can be seen to correspond with Burridge’s observation of the breaks within the chronological storyline in *bioi* for other topical or narrative material to be inserted, and for the unequal allocation of space in *bioi* for the different stages of the protagonists’ lives. A difference between the two views on what at first appears to be a similar phenomenon in terms of time arrangement is that Burridge does not elaborate on the aspect of time. He is content simply to see *bioi* as functioning within a chronological framework. Another difference is that in viewing the Romance as operating in biographical time, interrupted by adventure time, Bakhtin assumes the artistic construction of the story, in which verisimilitude is not essential, allowing for the invention of supernatural intervention. Although Burridge sees a polemical purpose in *bioi*, and thus a careful selection and construction of the material, allocating more space to those sections of his subject’s life that enhance that purpose, his model presupposes a chronological biographical progression of the story, even if somewhat unevenly. The subjects in his examples would presumably age in the course of the narrative as they move towards death. Verisimilitude would not be ignored.

It has been shown in Chapter 1 of this thesis that the time arrangement in the Gospel of Luke can be compared with what is described by Bakhtin in the *adventure novel of ordeal*. Jesus enters this world under the shadow of the Holy Spirit, beginning the journey of his mission. The narrative functions briefly according to *biographical time* at the beginning (Luke 1: 5-10), with *adventure time* setting in at the point when the Angel

Gabriel appears to Zechariah in the temple (signalling the beginning of the divine intervention), the narrative functioning in accordance with it until Luke 24: 36, when *biographical time* is resumed at the point when Jesus leaves this world by his Ascension to be reunited with his heavenly father (Lk 24: 36-53). The episodes,<sup>59</sup> which form the bulk of the story in the hiatus between these two points of biographical time, work according to their own time logic, thus functioning according to *adventure time*.<sup>60</sup> Like the heroes of the Romance, Jesus shows no physical evidence of the time that has passed, and of the suffering he has experienced.<sup>61</sup> Each episode is a unit of its own, often introduced by markers like 'after this' (Lk 10: 1, 8: 1, 5: 27), 'at that time' (Lk 13: 1, 13: 31), 'just then' (Lk 8: 41), and others.<sup>62</sup> Supernatural beings intervene freely in the narrative.

### *Space*

The second component of the chronotope, which cannot be extricated from time, is that of space. Bakhtin describes the representation of space in the *adventure novel of ordeal* as *abstract alien space*. A certain type of space is required so that adventure-time can function. The countries and various seas featuring in this kind of novel are familiar (the Eastern Mediterranean world), but Bakhtin nevertheless describes the space that features in this type of story as *abstract space*. Its link with adventure time is technical, presented as it is needed for each adventure. The alien quality of this type of space is necessary in order that chance or other outside forces may have their free run. Any closer connection

---

<sup>59</sup> Many of the episodes also appear in other gospel texts, sometimes in a different order, or with variations. The Gospel of Luke could thus be seen to be in a dialogic relationship with the other Gospels (whatever the interdependence may be in terms of sources). This can be compared to a similar phenomenon in various texts of the Greek Romance, which contain similar adventure episodes with variations and in different order.

<sup>60</sup> The fact that Luke 2: 1-2, and Luke 3: 1-3 sets the story of Luke in historical time, mentioning historical people, does not mean that those sections cannot function according to adventure time. Looked at from the perspective of Bakhtin's concept of adventure time, the historical setting could be seen as a literary device, brought in to suit the purpose of the episodes. *Chaereas and Callirhoe* makes use of historical data in that way. Hermocrates is based on an historical figure, and the Syracusan victory over Athens in the past is based on an historical event. The dates do not quite work out, but here too the historical data are made to fit the purposes of the story. Interestingly, scholars cannot establish the year of Jesus' birth definitively from the account in Luke, as there is a discrepancy concerning the figures of Quirinius and Herod in relation to the census (Leaney 1993: 113).

<sup>61</sup> The signs on his hands (Luke 24: 39) can be seen to be there for verification purposes.

<sup>62</sup> This loose connection between various episodes would presumably be what was seen by form-critical scholars as the casual gathering of different units of traditional material. In Burridge's model the different units feature as the inserted topical (or narrative) material within the bare chronological framework of birth and death.

between the hero and the space in which he finds himself, or any organic link between time and space, would bring with it its own laws and thus limit the random movement of non-human forces as the initiators of the adventures.

Burridge describes the same expansive space of the ancient Mediterranean world when discussing the scale of *bioi*. His view can be said to be similar to that of Bakhtin in so far as he links the scale of the texts to the movement of the subject (Burridge 1992: 120, 141, 171, 202, 227). The subject determines the spaces of the narrative. However, although Burridge allows for a selective use of space to further the purpose of the life portrayed, he nevertheless assumes the historicity of his subject's movement within it, limiting the author's strategy to a judicious selection. Bakhtin, on the other hand, sees the use of space not as a selection of historical spaces, but as an invention using recognisable geographical and historical landscapes. The discursive purpose of the space in which episodes take place is more important than matters of historicity and verisimilitude. The randomness of the spaces in the numerous episodes of the *adventure novel of ordeal* accommodates the use of supernatural intervention that plays such a great part in this type of text.

One can say here that historicity versus fiction lies at the heart of the different ways in which the use of space is viewed by Burridge and Bakhtin. Seeing *bioi* within the constraints of history explains Burridge's limited emphasis on the discursive function of space in these texts. Bakhtin, on the other hand, sees the *adventure novel of ordeal*, like other genres within the Menippea, as released from the constraints of historicity and verisimilitude, free to use whatever space it needs for the discursive purpose at hand. Burridge simply describes the aspect of space in *bioi*, while Bakhtin views it as an active discursive element, as part of the narrative strategy of the text as a whole.

At first glance the space in the Gospel of Luke differs from both the *adventure novel of ordeal* as described by Bakhtin and from Burridge's *bios* model. The wide expanse of the Mediterranean world is replaced by the confined space of the land of Palestine. Burridge, however, does not see this as a stumbling block in classing the Gospels as *bioi*. What matters, in his view, is that the scale focuses on the subject, Jesus (Burridge 1992: 202, 227). The smaller scale also does not pose a problem in terms of Bakhtin's model of the *adventure novel of ordeal*, as the phenomenon of space arranged technically to serve each

episode can be traced also in this text. Like the protagonists in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, Jesus is constantly on the move. While Chaereas moves to lessen the distance between himself and Callirhoe, Jesus moves to reach the people to whom he must proclaim his message.<sup>63</sup> He crosses provincial borders as opposed to national ones. Although he does not cross a sea as vast as the Mediterranean, he crosses the Sea of Galilee on several occasions (not in a ship, but in a small boat) and effects a miraculous escape from a potential shipwreck (Lk 8: 22-25). While Callirhoe crosses the Euphrates, entering a foreign land where her chastity will be put under threat by the Persian King, Jesus crosses the Jordan, going into the wilderness where his integrity is threatened by the Devil. At a certain point he moves towards Jerusalem in order to complete his mission.

It has been shown in Chapter 1 that the spaces used in the Gospel are of discursive significance, presenting the divergence from the tradition as represented by the Hebrew Bible while rooting itself in it. Jesus' movements and the location of the episodes are representative of the discourse concerning proximity and distance between Jesus and the religious establishment that features in this narrative. An example of this is the fact that the annunciation of John occurs inside the Temple, while the annunciation of Jesus takes place outside Jerusalem. Furthermore, supernatural occurrences, like the appearances of the Angel Gabriel at the two annunciations, the miraculous conception of Jesus, the voice from Heaven at Jesus' Baptism, the meeting of Jesus with the Devil in the desert, the miraculous actions of Jesus, the appearances of demons, the Transfiguration, the darkness over the land just before Jesus' death, as well as his Resurrection and Ascension, are easily accommodated in the chronotopic arrangement of Bakhtin's model of the *adventure novel of ordeal*. Burrige's description of *bios* does not make provision for the discursive potential of the use of space or for the involvement of the supernatural world in the narrative.

### *Characterization*

Bakhtin sees a particular type of representation of the *image of man* (sic) in this kind of chronotopic arrangement. He describes the heroes in the Greek Romance as essentially

---

<sup>63</sup> Even though one cannot speak of two lovers in the Gospel of Luke, there is an implication of a love relationship between Jesus, as the representative of God, and God's people. Interestingly, the Christian Church sometimes refers to itself as the Bride of Christ.

private characters, who act like public figures when required to do so. The hero delivers speeches, like the public man of the rhetorical and historical genres. The speeches are a public account of the private details of his love life, of his exploits and adventures. Finally, legal procedures sum up all these exploits and provide a judicial affirmation of the hero's identity, as well as the lovers' chastity and fidelity to one another. This public action, however, stands in contradiction to the purely private content of the story, and, manifesting itself as external, formalistic and conventional, can be seen to be in line with the abstract nature of adventure time and alien space in this type of chronotope.

The hero moving in adventure time in alien-abstract space is essentially *unchanging*. Instead of character development, the narrative recounts how these heroes have to overcome a number of ordeals to test whether they remain true to their inherent identity. Bakhtin associates this type of character with folklore, in which the indestructibility of the human being is depicted, as he/she struggles with nature and inhuman forces to preserve his or her identity in even the direst of circumstances (Bakhtin 1981: 105).

Burridge's emphasis in judging character representation in the Gospels is on showing that it is in line with Graeco-Roman literature as such, especially with *bioi*, while it is different to the characterization of modern biography. Concentrating on ancient biography, he makes a distinction between the *method* and the *quality* of characterization. In terms of *method* he notes that the character is portrayed through anecdotes that recount deeds and sayings rather than by direct description, while the *quality* refers to the careful selection of character traits from the sources, highlighting some and omitting others, to paint a particular portrait of the subject. He concludes that the characterization in *bioi* is largely stereotypical, but, in line with the flexibility of the genre, there is some variation. He sees a certain individuality of character conveyed by the quality of characterization, as can be seen in the differing portraits of Jesus in the four canonical Gospels (Burridge 1992: 143-144, 148-149, 175-176, 182-183, 205-206, 211-112, 229-230, 233-234).<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup> Burridge describes the Jesus in Mark as enigmatic and secretive, the Jesus in Matthew as Jewish, as the new Moses in continuity with Israel, the Jesus in Luke as 'the man for others', and the Jesus in John as a less realistic portrait than the others (on account of the emphasis on his divine identity), although he is keen to point out some human qualities (Burridge 1992: 211-212, 233-234).

Both models respond to what might be seen as similar phenomena in both the genres in question. Burridge calls it stereotypical, while Bakhtin, assuming that the characters represent archetypes, notes that they are unchanging. The difference between the two views is that Bakhtin sees his characters as struggling against unbelievable odds to maintain the integrity of their character in reaching their goal, while Burridge gives a more static account of his characters. The attack by evil forces on the characters in Bakhtin's model constitutes a test, which is a test of the idea running through the text as a whole, whereas Burridge sees the subject of his model, who is a historical character in historical time and space, as being either eulogized or vilified.

In Chapter 1 of this thesis it has been shown that the characters in *Chaereas and Callirhoe* comply with the characterization in Bakhtin's model. The same has been found in the case of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke. Jesus' actions can be seen primarily in the light of a response to and as part of the intervention of supernatural forces in this world. On a secondary level he responds to the actions of the people to whom he has come to proclaim his message. The emphasis rests on *who* he is rather than on what character traits he possesses. As with the protagonists in the *adventure novel of ordeal*, he is shown to be extraordinary from the very beginning. In *Chaereas and Callirhoe* the qualities of the protagonists are unusual beauty, nobility, courage, chastity and faithfulness. The Gospel shows Jesus as being extraordinary by virtue of the events surrounding his birth, the prophecies that are uttered about him, and the display of childhood wisdom beyond his years. His projection of absolute virtue, his performance of miracles, his teaching, and the extraordinary circumstances of his Resurrection and Ascension, which inspire admiration, awe, fear and love in the crowds, are manifestations of the god-like being whose imminent birth the Angel Gabriel announces to Mary.<sup>65</sup> His character does not change or develop with each ordeal. It is simply confirmed. His trial, passion and death would cause the reader to hold his or her breath in fear, as it would seem that he is, after all, not the Son of God and the embodiment of

---

<sup>65</sup> A corresponding phenomenon can be noted in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*. Callirhoe is treated by the narrator as a god-like being. In contrast to Chaereas, who is likened to extraordinary humans, to heroes, she is repeatedly likened to the goddess Aphrodite in terms of absolute beauty, and even to Artemis in terms of chastity. Wherever she goes she is worshipped by the crowds, by men and women alike. Like Jesus, she is buried, to then rise again from the tomb, the difference being in degree. Jesus dies, while Callirhoe *appears* to have died. Jesus is resurrected, while Callirhoe is rescued from the tomb. Jesus then goes a step further to ascend into Heaven, while Callirhoe then embarks on her journey to a foreign land.

the coming Kingdom of God. The Resurrection and Ascension would then prove that he is. His passion and death can be seen as the direst test of all, reaching beyond the confines of this world. In overcoming it, his divine identity is proven beyond all doubt.

Comparing characterization in the two models, the difference between the results of the two approaches does not seem very big to begin with. Bakhtin notes that the protagonists in the Romance are unchanging in character (suggesting their link to the archetypes of folklore), while Burridge concedes that the characterization of the subjects in *bioi* tends to be stereotypical, but that certain individual traits are conveyed by careful redaction of the sources. He views the stereotypical characterization as part of the aim to show the subject in an exemplary light. The difference between the two approaches lies in the role that is assigned to this kind of characterization, a role that shows a distinction between the two genres. Burridge simply observes the phenomenon and makes comparisons, while Bakhtin sees it as inseparable from the chronotopic arrangement of *the adventure novel of ordeal*. A character that moves in adventure time through alien-abstract space can no more show individual traits than he or she can have ties to specific places or cultures. The characters in the Romance are fictitious archetypal figures that display archetypal thoughts and feelings. They are not tied to any one place or time. Times and spaces are artificially created for the adventures that serve to test them. The characters in Burridge's model, on the other hand, being prominent, historical figures, moving in historical time, *are* tied to specific places and to the specific culture within which they have to function. So, while there may be some modification in their character traits, either to enhance or to vilify them, they cannot be fictitious archetypes that actively have to prove their identity.

A second difference between Burridge's and Bakhtin's assessment in terms of characterization is that Bakhtin sees these unchanging heroes as essentially private characters who at times appear as public personages when they address a crowd with all the rhetorical skills that they need. The integrity of their character is finally verified in a public trial. This is not excluded in Burridge's model, but it is not spelt out, the emphasis being on those sections of the subject's life that are of interest to the public eye. When the lovers in *Chaereas and Callirhoe* have come back home at the end of the story, there is a public trial and verification of their integrity. In the Gospel of Luke, Jesus is essentially a private character, not holding any position in the worldly or priestly

establishment of his time. The reader sees him at private moments, as when he prays on the Mount of Olives (Lk 22: 41-44). At first glance, his trial is deceptive, in so far as he is publicly condemned rather than verified by both the priestly and secular authorities, suggesting that he is an impostor. However, taking into account that the priestly and secular powers are presented in this Gospel as being in the service of the kingdom of Satan, it becomes clear that the fact that Jesus is condemned by these establishments verifies his identity as the Son of God. His identity remains intact in terms of the values of the Kingdom of God that he preaches.<sup>66</sup> In Burridge's model for *bioi* the public trial of the subject's character does not feature. Although anecdotes of the subject's deeds and sayings reveal his character, the element of testing and verification does not come to the fore.

### *Motifs*

The trial is a prominent *motif* in Bakhtin's model of the *adventure novel of ordeal*, being the culmination of the many incidents of the *motif of meeting*. Bakhtin associates a particular body of motifs in this type of text. Shared by a number of romances, these motifs are not new, having been taken from other genres. So, for example, one would find the motif of first meetings with the flare up of passion that results in intense despair in Hellenistic love poetry. Storms, shipwrecks, wars and abductions are to be found in ancient epic. Recognition or non-recognition feature in ancient tragedy, while public speeches and religious and philosophical discussions make up rhetorical genres. Descriptive motifs had already been developed by Herodotus in his *Histories*.<sup>67</sup> As these motifs enter the chronotope of adventure-time and alien space, they are subsumed by it and assume a new character and function (Bakhtin 1981: 89, 97). Other motifs that are also shared by *Chaereas and Callirhoe* and other romances, as well as by the Gospel of Luke, are the empty tomb, crucifixion, restoration from the tomb, miraculous escape, prophecy, the crowd as witness, wrongful accusation, and loss and betrayal. In *Chaereas and Callirhoe* the protagonists are in constant movement from one place to another until they are re-united, while Jesus, in the Gospel, is in constant movement as he fulfills the will of his heavenly father to whom he finally returns. While the protagonists of the

<sup>66</sup> This has been discussed in detail in Chapter 3 of this thesis.

<sup>67</sup> One could add the genre of New Comedy to the list of genres in which many of the motifs of the Greek Romance can be found.

Romance have to survive the machinations of inimical forces that scheme to keep them apart, the protagonist of the Gospel has to contend with evil forces that conspire against him in the completion of his mission.

Burridge, like Bakhtin, associates certain groups of motifs with specific genres (Burridge 1991: 122-123). In his model he lists the motifs found in *bioi* in the section of external features under *topics*. These include ancestry, birth, education, teachers, character traits and habits, virtues, and, most importantly, deeds (which form the bulk of the narrative), and death and consequences (Burridge 1992: 145-6). He traces these in the examples he has chosen from earlier and later *bioi*, as well as in the Gospels. In terms of *birth* and *boyhood*, he notes that these feature in Matthew and Luke, but not in Mark and John. He also notes that virtues are not described as such in the Gospels, but that they become evident through the narrative as a whole.

What emerges here is that Burridge observes the biographical episodes of the subject, which he counts as a cluster of motifs typical of *bioi*, and does not go beyond this to elaborate and comment on the content in these broader categories. Bakhtin identifies a set of motifs, also constituting a cluster, in the *adventure novel of ordeal* that has nothing to do with the chronological progression of the protagonists' lives. One can say that this is in line with the chronotopic arrangement of this kind of text, in which the separate adventures can take place in different order, the text containing any number of these motifs, depending on what is needed. A distinction between the Romance and *bios* can be recognised by their motifs in terms of the sources they are ascribed to by the two models. Bakhtin mentions genres as sources that represent inventions, such as Hellenistic love poetry, epic, tragedy, philosophical discussions and rhetorical genres.<sup>68</sup> Burridge, on the other hand, mentions sources such as scripture, eyewitnesses, oral and written sources,<sup>69</sup> personal memory, historiography, memoirs, letters, imperial archives, all of which claim to be historical accounts.

The chronotopic motif of meeting is fundamental to the plot in both the Romance and the Gospel of Luke. Bakhtin sees it as a powerful discursive component. In *Chaereas*

<sup>68</sup> Bakhtin also mentions historiography, but only in terms of geographical descriptions.

<sup>69</sup> Burridge does mention the works of Euripides and poetry as sources, but only in connection with the *Euripides* by Satyrus (Burridge 1992: 142-143).

and *Callirhoe* one could say that the whole plot hinges on meeting, non-meeting and almost-meeting. Chapter 1 of this thesis has shown how the locations where the meetings take place are indicative, not only of power relations, but also of the conditions in which the protagonists find themselves. While the historical-geographical context of the Gospel of Luke is that of a Roman province, we are presented with meetings that transcend the realistic sphere, such as the Angel Gabriel with Zechariah and Mary, the Devil with Jesus, Jesus with Moses and Elijah (characters from other writings), the disciples with the angels at the grave, and Jesus' meeting with the two disciples on the road to Emmaus.

Not surprisingly, the main difference between Burridge's and Bakhtin's models lies in the fundamental difference between the two genres they discuss, namely, a claim to historicity versus an unabashed use of invention. Because Burridge gives an account of a genre he believes claims historicity, his analysis does not look further than what is possible within the realm of biography and verisimilitude. The narrative in *bioi* is described by him as proceeding chronologically, interrupted at times by descriptions of topical material. Although the space used is wide-ranging, it complies with the historical realities of the time. Character depiction may not be too realistic, but rather stereotypical to suit the polemical purpose at hand, but there would be an assertion of historical veracity. The sources that inform these writings are historically based. The motifs mentioned by Burridge are confined to biographical givens.

Opposed to this is Bakhtin's model that assumes the artistically invented and constructed base of the Greek Romance. He does not look for verisimilitude, or for an historical base. The text is not limited by history or legend. It can freely make use of any invention to suit its discursive purpose. The chronotopic arrangement of biographical and adventure time in abstract alien space not only facilitates the use of invention, but is also a powerful discursive tool as it moves the narrative forward. Characters are seen as archetypes that live out an archetypal situation, having to prove their integrity as they struggle with their ordeals. The motifs are not tied to the biography of the characters. Sources for the Romance are genres that present inventions, rather than historical descriptions.

While Burridge sees some *bioi* as having a polemical purpose, the concentration is on the subject, limiting the presentation of the polemic to either a eulogy or a vilification of the figure presented. Bakhtin, on the other hand, sees the subjects in Menippean writings, in this case, the Greek Romance, as being an embodiment of an idea that is tested throughout the narrative. The testing element features prominently in this model whereas it does not feature in Burridge's model, in which dire experiences by the protagonist, such as Jesus' passion, would be seen descriptively, rather than discursively. Nor does the supernatural intervention feature, the reason being that it would be difficult to accommodate this in terms of verisimilitude.

Looking at the Gospel of Luke in the light of these two models, one can say that while the biographical motifs of the text fit into Burridge's model to a large extent, the difference of the happy ending must be taken seriously, as it is indicative of a different genre, and can be compared with the ending of the Greek Romance. What must also be taken seriously is that there are other versions of the basic story of the Gospel, as there are other romances that tell stories similar to *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, using the same motifs, which also appear in the Gospel of Luke. The third aspect that distances the Gospel of Luke from Burridge's model is the chronotopic arrangement that easily accommodates the many supernatural occurrences for which there is no provision in a biographical storyline that has to adhere to verisimilitude.

### *Carnival*

A prominent feature in the Gospel that does not feature in Burridge's model of *βίος* is that of the carnivalesque. This, too, may have to do with history versus fiction. Whether in the physical festival of carnival or in a carnivalized text, a carnivalistic inversion is essentially an invention of a parodic or utopian version of whatever it is that is being challenged.

Bakhtin sees the festival of carnival as a multi-voiced communal act. In a 'time out' situation in terms of social hierarchy, that which inspires fear, be it the deity, worldly authority or death, is acted out parodically in numerous ways as a way of living with it. It lies on the border between fiction and reality. In a spirit of affirmative laughter, prevailing concepts of these forces are challenged, forcing them to renew themselves and

move on with time. It symbolizes a joyful affirmation of the relativity, of the shift of all things. At least double-voiced carnival is an essentially dialogic gesture as it carries both the challenge and that which is challenged within itself. It symbolizes the inevitable cycle of life, death and renewal. The group of actions associated with carnival are seen by Bakhtin as a symbolic language that crosses all hierarchical and national barriers. His interest lies in how this powerful language manifests itself in literary texts, viewing them as having been carnivalized as they contain the carnival gesture within them in various forms and at various levels. He sees this to be the result of either the direct influence of carnival itself, or of other already carnivalized texts, or both.

Bakhtin sees a carnivalistic sense of the world at the core of Menippean texts, under which he classes both the Greek Romance and early Christian writings.<sup>70</sup> Another carnivalized genre, in his view (that is of relevance to the Gospel of Luke), is the Socratic Dialogue. He sees the latter as informed by a dialogic sense of truth, in so far as two or more voices attempt to reach a truth in dialogue with each other. The two tools employed are *syncrisis* and *anacrisis*, the former using juxtaposition to test a particular idea, while the latter challenges the word by the word. This is mostly the case in the Socratic Dialogue. In the Menippea the idea is tested through the protagonist, who is its embodiment, moving within the framework of a narrative that has been constructed to suit that purpose. A great deal of *syncrisis* is made use of in this type of text as concepts are placed in juxtaposition.

Chapter 2 of this thesis has traced the carnival element in both the Gospel of Luke and in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*. The carnival gesture features in both of them, more so in the Gospel, which can be assessed as a thoroughly carnivalized text. Both have the cycle of birth, life, death, and rebirth, accompanied by celebration, running throughout the narrative as a subtext. In *Chaereas and Callirhoe* the pattern is that of wedding, funeral,

---

<sup>70</sup> Emerson's quote of Philip Holland on Bakhtin's position on the *spoudogeloios* is useful here (Bakhtin 1984: 106-107, n. b): ... 'the seriocomic genres are united not only from within but from without, through their common opposition to the serious genres ... The serious genres, in Bakhtin's terms, are monologic, i.e. they presuppose (or impose) an integrated and stable universe of discourse. The seriocomic genres, by contrast, are dialogical: they deny the possibility, or more precisely, the experience of integration. As tragedy and epic enclose, Menippean forms open up, anatomise. The serious forms comprehend man; the Menippean forms are based on man's inability to know and contain his fate. To any vision of a completed system of truth, the Menippea suggests some element outside the system. Seriocomic forms present a challenge, open or covert, to literary and intellectual orthodoxy, a challenge that is reflected not only in their philosophic content but also in their structure and language' (Holland 1979: 36-37).

wedding, funeral, suspense of waiting for a wedding, fear of possible death, deliverance from fear of death, reinstatement of the original wedding, universal utopian reconciliation, and a happy ending. In the Gospel, the protagonist embodies this cycle: Jesus is announced before his birth, he is born and reaches adulthood, he fulfils his mission, he dies, is buried, is resurrected and ascends to his father in Heaven. Tied to this pattern is the sense of utopia, an alternative to the stark realities of the life in a Roman province in the first century. What we see here is the implicit use of *syncretism*, the juxtapositioning of the Kingdom of God with the kingdoms of this world. The central carnival image of the mock crowning and de-crowning of the carnival king is the link between the two kingdoms, the metaphysical and the worldly, Jesus being de-crowned in terms of this world and crowned in terms of the Kingdom of God. In a lesser way crownings and de-crownings occur both in the storyline and in images throughout the text. In fact there are three kingdoms at play here: the Kingdom of God (utopian version), the worldly kingdoms as represented in the Gospel (parodic version, under the domain of the Devil), and the implied historical kingdoms with which this text is in dialogue (the other voice which is contained within the utopian and the parodic versions).

Renewal versus stasis is at the heart of carnival, and this is also at the heart of the Kingdom of God versus the parodied kingdoms of this world in the Gospel of Luke. The Kingdom of God, embodied by the person of Jesus, represents the shift, the movement forward to dislodge the imprisoning rigidity and stasis of this world. Not tied to the rules of verisimilitude, the concept of this kingdom is put in the spotlight, and is tested from all angles. The image that is created is that of two worlds in dialogue and in collision, each throwing light on the other.

On a deeper level, this battle of the kingdoms represents the archetypal battle between good and evil. Although metaphysical, it is fought out in this world with the impact on its people. The constant mixing of metaphysical, religious concepts with practical, quotidian matters (a carnivalistic characteristic) familiarizes the metaphysical conceptualisation, literarily bringing it down to earth, making it accessible to all the people as opposed to only a small elite group. In line with the spirit of carnival, the Kingdom of God is represented in the light of unexpected reversals, equalization and carnivalistic inversion, be it in Jesus' exemplary behaviour, his teaching by sayings or in the parables. There is a

potential for humour to be found in the scenes of hierarchical inversions, usually accompanied by scandal, but one cannot speak of an obvious, openly played out humour. It is the progression of this metaphysical battle with its highs and lows that is responsible for the tension in the Gospel of Luke, each victory being cause for celebration. The celebratory meal (another carnival image) is an important motif in this text.

### *Intertextuality*

The battle between the Kingdom of God and the forces that oppose it, which underlies the Gospel of Luke, is not announced openly at the beginning of this narrative. Nor does one find it described by the narrator. Instead, it becomes apparent through the subtext, increasing in volume as the narrative progresses, finally bursting through the surface shortly before Jesus' entry into Jerusalem. Even then there is no show of arms in the conventional form, the reason being that Jesus as the representative of the Kingdom of God does not meet Satan and the authorities of the kingdoms of this world on their terms.<sup>71</sup> Chapter 3 of this thesis has shown that a multiple intertextual use of various books of the Hebrew Bible can be found in the Gospel of Luke. A focus on the use of the Book of Zechariah has shown how this text features as a source, as a validation, and as a point of divergence in the Gospel text. It also functions to create an awareness of the underlying battle between the two kingdoms. The name *Zechariah* (the Lord remembers) at the beginning of Luke draws attention to the HB book of the same name, the subject of which is Yahweh's restoration of his people to himself, thus signalling a proclamation of the resumption of God's saving action to his people. This carries an implicit message that there is a battle in progress, which is then underpinned by the images in the Song of Zechariah and the Song of Mary. Secondly, the Book of Zechariah underpins the idea of the battle in the scene in the desert between Jesus and the Devil by its scene between Satan and Joshua, bringing an awareness that although Jesus faces Satan directly, seemingly alone, he represents the Kingdom of God and its forces. The same scene in Zechariah underpins the trial scenes in the Gospel, exposing its carnivalistic inversion, as it seems that the forces Satan have gained the upper hand. The battle has thus reached a desperate stage. Before that, we see Jesus riding into Jerusalem on a donkey. Without a

---

<sup>71</sup> This in contradistinction of what happens in, amongst others, the Book of Zechariah, where the Lord is seen as showing his power in terms of either helping or causing a defeat of enemy forces in military terms (e.g. Zech 6: 9, 9: 1-8, 14: 1-3).

consciousness of the same image in the second part of the Book of Zechariah, in which its peacefulness stands in stark contrast to the violence surrounding it, it would not have the significance in terms of dealing a blow to the enemy forces. The same can be said for the apocalyptic sayings of Jesus (extraordinarily violent considering his peaceful, healing demeanour throughout the narrative) towards the end of the Gospel (Lk 21: 5-28, 23: 28-31). These are underpinned by similar images towards the end of the Book of Zechariah, running up to the Day of the Lord, the day when Yahweh, himself, will come down in person as the divine warrior to make momentous changes (Zech 9: 14-17, 14: 1-5). The Gospel of Luke shows the divine warrior using a new guise and a new *modus operandi* in saving his people, a carnivalistic inversion of the image in Zechariah.

The battle is one aspect that is transmitted by the intertextual relation between the Gospel of Luke and the Book of Zechariah. There are other intertextual relations, also with other Books of the Hebrew Bible, an important one being the careful legitimisation of the miraculous birth of Jesus, which has been described in Chapter 3 of this thesis. The same chapter has also shown how *Chaereas and Callirhoe* is in an intertextual relationship with Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.

Turning to Burridge's model of *bios*, one finds that it makes provision for intertextuality under the heading *sources*. As has been mentioned above, most of the sources listed are based on historicity. However, Burridge mentions Scripture in the case of Philo's *Moses* (Burridge 1992: 142). He also sees the Gospels as being, among other things, sources for each other. The difference between his account of the sources and what has been found as a result of a study along Bakhtinian lines is that Burridge simply notes the sources, but does not go deeper to see how they interact with the text that makes use of them. Bakhtin, on the other hand, views intertextuality as an active dialogic relationship. A text can interact with another in various ways and on various levels. So, for example, the scene featuring Satan, the angel and Joshua in Zechariah is used in the Gospel of Luke as a source (for the characters of Jesus and Satan, and for a trial situation), as a way of creating an awareness of the cosmic battle and the existence of the divine council, and as a point from which to diverge in terms of discourse.

### *Conclusion*

I started this chapter by giving a brief account of how modern scholarship has viewed the genre of the Gospels. I have focussed on the approaches of form criticism, redaction criticism and the new interest in Gospels as ancient biography. I have then selected Richard Burridge's model of *βίος*, on the basis of which the Gospels are classed as such, for closer scrutiny.

In rejecting the genre of biography for the Gospels, the form critics (Bultmann and others) put forward two objections. Biography, they contended, gives more information about the subject of the text in the form of looks and character than what is found in the Gospels. Secondly, these critics classed the three Synoptic Gospels as *Kleinliteratur* (as opposed to *Hochliteratur*), that is to say, as texts that are not the product of an authorial design. Separating what they identified as the different units in the Gospels from editorial material, they investigated the genre of these units in an attempt to reconstruct the original *Sitz im Leben* (life situation) that gave rise to them. Their aim was to discover how the tradition (the various sayings of, and stories about Jesus) developed into the Gospels as we know them. Their conclusion was that the *Sitz im Leben* of the units was the primitive Christian community, and that the units (stories and sayings) were gathered and handed down as collections to serve Palestinian Christianity. With the birth of Hellenistic Christianity the units were combined with the proclamation of the Church to become the Gospel of Mark. The Jesus in the Gospel is not the historical Jesus, but the Jesus of the cult. Matthew and Luke did not create new types of texts, but using Mark and Q as their source, added some elaborations, using Mark as their model. The evangelists were not seen as authors, only as gatherers of stories, which they put loosely together with the kerygma of the early Church. Although the genre of the different units can be identified with other genres (such as collections of folk tales), in this view the genre of the Gospels as a whole text is seen as unique, *sui generis*.

Redaction criticism followed along the line of form criticism in terms of viewing the Gospels as *Kleinliteratur*, in surmising that primitive Christianity was the original *Sitz im Leben* and in regarding them as *sui generis*. It differs from form criticism in so far as it credits the evangelists with a greater role, seeing them as conscious editors (redactors) with a theological agenda. The focus in this approach was not so much on the individual units but on the editorial framework that contains them.

Later scholars questioned the line taken by form and redaction critics. Once again, biography as a genre for the Gospels became a popular view. The notion of *Hochliteratur* and *Kleinliteratur* that decided whether a text had an author or not, or an authorial design, was criticized. Also, the concern was voiced that by concentrating on the individual units, the meaning of the whole may be lost. Doubt was cast on the methodology of the form critics as a way of identifying the development of the tradition effectively. Furthermore, it was argued that it was a mistake to read the Gospels in the light of modern conceptions of biography. Rather, they should be read comparatively with other ancient biography texts.

Richard Burridge, a prominent proponent of the ancient biography hypothesis, and a strong critic of the form-critical view, has chosen ten ancient texts that he judges to be *vitae* (or *bioi*, as he prefers to call them), as examples. Identifying clusters of features that these examples have in common he identifies them as having a family resemblance. From this he has constructed a model of these clusters of features, which he then applied, first to the Synoptic Gospels, and then to the Gospel of John, concluding that all four Gospels are *bioi*.

My concern with the model is fourfold. First, Burridge stresses the flexibility of the *bios* genre, seeing it as situated between a number of neighbouring genres that overlap with it. Any divergence in his example texts is thus provided for, the divergence not being seen as a reason for exclusion from the *bios* genre. One could argue here that the overlapping genre could just as well be placed at the centre for a particular text, with *bios* as a neighbouring genre that overlaps with it, the few divergences not being seen as a reason for exclusion. My second concern is that Burridge's model does not make provision for features that, if considered, would have an impact on how the text is viewed in terms of genre. The two prominent examples in the Gospel of Luke would be the role of the supernatural and the carnivalistic inversions. Thirdly, when allowing for divergences when assigning a particular genre to a text, there would surely be different weighting for different divergences. So, for example, the difference between the ending in Luke and that of *bioi* would be more important than, say, a divergence in terms of length. Fourthly, Burridge uses texts as examples for his model that were written well after the Gospels. These may have used the Gospels as models. Any similarity cannot really be used to prove that the latter are *bioi*.

My next step was to apply Burridge's model to the Gospel of Luke (as opposed to taking the three Synoptics together), to find that in line with Burridge's findings it complies with the model, given a few differences. The differences are in the opening, the ending, and in the popular setting.<sup>72</sup> Following on from there, I experimentally applied Burridge's model to the Greek Romance text, *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, Romance being one of the many genres bordering on *bios* in Burridge's model.<sup>73</sup> I found this text also complies with it, given a few differences that concern the opening and the ending. I concluded from this that Burridge's model is broad enough to accommodate both *bios* (as it is described by him) and the Greek Romance text, *Chaereas and Callirhoe*. This would imply that the Greek Romance and *bios* share the same genre.

In an attempt to identify the distinction between these two genres, and considering that my first three chapters showed similarities between a romance text and the Gospel of Luke, while Burridge classes the Gospels as *bioi* according to his model, I compared Bakhtin's model<sup>74</sup> for the Greek Romance (*the adventure novel of ordeal*) with Burridge's model for *bioi*. I found that both models approached their respective texts synchronically, as opposed to by the diachronic approach of form and redaction criticism. They both respond to the phenomenon of smaller units within an encompassing narrative in their respective genres, a phenomenon that also appears in the Gospel of Luke. Burridge sees these units as topical insertions in a chronological framework, whereas Bakhtin interprets them as functioning according to *adventure time* in a hiatus between two instances of *biographical time*. In terms of the space arrangement both models see the scale of the Mediterranean world as the setting, and both limit the scale to the movement of the protagonists. The difference is that Bakhtin sees the space in the episodes of the *adventure novel of ordeal* as abstract, alien space presented as needed to accommodate the functioning of adventure time, while Burridge simply notes that the chronological time in *bioi* is rather unevenly distributed. He does not comment on the nature of the space in *bioi*, presumably assuming that the spaces of

<sup>72</sup> Burridge does note a more popular setting in his later examples of *bioi*, like Lucian's *Demonax*.

<sup>73</sup> I had used *Chaereas and Callirhoe* as a comparative text in my first three chapters, and found similarities between it and the Gospel of Luke in terms of Bakhtin's theory of chronotope, carnival and intertextuality.

<sup>74</sup> Bakhtin's aim was to demonstrate his theory of a particular chronotope on the *adventure novel of ordeal*. This is discussed in Chapter 1 of this thesis. As he sees the chronotope inextricably linked to other features such as characterization, the testing of an idea, and a set of motifs (in short, a cluster of features), I have used his account as a model that can be applied to the texts in question.

the different episodes are historical, informed by the various sources used. In Bakhtinian terms this chronotopic arrangement is integral to narrative strategy. It is in itself discursive and indicative of a particular genre. It is integral to a genre that makes free use of invention in order to test an idea (embodied by the protagonist) that runs through the narrative. The chronotopic arrangement of biographical and adventure time functioning in *abstract alien space* allows for free intervention by supernatural beings, as well as the inclusion of any number of episodes as the protagonists show no signs of aging at the second point of biographical time at the end of the story.

The fundamental difference underlying the two models hinges on historicity versus fiction, which is borne out by their differing views on the arrangement of time and space in the examples of their respective genres. Burridge's model is tied to the rules of historicity and verisimilitude while Bakhtin's is released from these constraints, seeing its texts as free to make use of invention in order to expose the protagonist to a particular ordeal. The same difference underlies the different kind of characterization in the two models. Bakhtin's characters are archetypal and unchanging, while Burridge's tend to be stereotypical, the redactional selection of certain features given by the sources giving the character some individuality. Bakhtin's characters fight an archetypal battle to maintain the integrity of their character throughout the ordeals. Essentially private characters, their integrity is usually affirmed at a public trial, during which they display the rhetorical ability of a public person. Burridge's characters, on the other hand, are public historical figures of high rank that are either eulogized or vilified as they move through historical time and space towards death, of which a great deal is made. Bakhtin's characters move in *abstract alien space* through adventure time, experiencing a couple of near-deaths, to live happily ever after in marital bliss once they are back in biographical time. To the cluster of abstract alien space, biographical-adventure time, and a particular type of characterization, Bakhtin associates a particular set of motifs with this type of text, such as the sudden mutual flaring up of romantic love, recognition and non-recognition, adventures and shipwrecks, which, having been taken from other genres, become new within the overall design of the Romance text. Burridge's model does not say much about motifs, other than listing the biographical progression of the subject's life. While Bakhtin sees the texts of his models using other genres that use invention as sources, such as epic, tragedy and Hellenistic love poetry, Burridge lists

sources for his texts that are historically based, such as memoirs, archives historical writings, oral sources of eyewitnesses.

The comparison of Bakhtin's model of the *adventure novel of ordeal* with Burridge's model for *bioi* would thus confirm what classicists say anyway, namely, that the Greek Romance is fiction while ancient biography is an historical genre. In this chapter I have sought to show that Burridge classes the Gospels as *bioi*, allowing for a few differences on account of the flexibility of the genre. Further, that in terms of its chronotopic arrangement, its characterization and the motifs that feature in it, the Gospel of Luke complies to a large extent with Bakhtin's model of the *adventure novel of ordeal*. This means that the differences between the Gospel of Luke and the Greek Romance and the Gospel of Luke and Burridge's model for *bioi* must be examined more closely.

The obvious difference between the Gospel of Luke and *Chaereas and Callirhoe* is that it has one protagonist instead of two lovers struggling against many odds to be re-united. It does not profess to tell a love story at the beginning of its narrative. Instead of supernatural figures selected from the Greek pantheon, the supernatural beings in the Gospel belong to the worldview of the Hebrew Bible. The Gospel of Luke cannot be said to be what classicists call the Greek Novel, referred to by Bakhtin as the *adventure novel of ordeal*.

The differences between the Gospel of Luke and Burridge's model are also significant. The opening does not contain the name of the subject of the story, and it does not profess to give an account of anyone's life. The end of the narrative does not coincide with the death of the subject and its consequences. Instead, death is followed by a Resurrection and an Ascension with a promise of a future return. If one adds the differences in terms of the chronotopic arrangement that allows for supernatural occurrences, the characterization, and the motifs, all of which comply with Bakhtin's model of the Romance, then the identification of the Gospel of Luke as a *bios* must seriously be put into question.

Building on the form of the chronotope in the Gospel of Luke, which has been shown to comply with that of the Greek Romance, and which is indicative of an artistic construction allowing for the use of invention, this chapter has gone on to use the

findings of Chapter 2 of this thesis in which Gospel was explored in terms of Bakhtin's theory of carnival. Carnival implies that invention as a parodic or utopian version of the official norm is created. Essentially double-voiced, it acts as a leaven to move and invert static structures that are inimical to life. The Gospel of Luke was found to be shot through with carnivalisms, Jesus embodying the central carnival image of the carnival king. Embodying the celebrated carnival cycle of birth, death, and renewal, Jesus is crowned, de-crowned and crowned again throughout the narrative. The end is a promise for the future, leaving it, carnival-like, open. The carnivalistic nature of the Gospel of Luke is underpinned by the use of, amongst others, the Book of Zechariah, which acts as a source of the images that have become carnivalized in the Gospel. Interacting dialogically with the Gospel, the Book of Zechariah also serves to dramatize the underlying battle between good and evil, giving the Gospel its dramatic tension in its subtext as it stands in contrast to the relatively peaceful storyline, as well as serving as a point of divergence for the discourse of the Gospel. Chapter 3 of this thesis has shown how the narrative in *Chaereas and Callirhoe* has also made use of an older canon, that of Homer.

This chapter has not come to any final conclusion as to the genre of the Gospel of Luke. With the help of Bakhtinian theory it has sought to re-think the currently popular view of it being (even) a sub-genre of ancient biography. I have found Burridge's model for *bioi* too broad to make a distinction between ancient biography and the Greek Romance, and too narrow to accommodate the significant features of the carnivalesque, supernatural intervention, and the intertextual engagement with an older canon that are integral to the Gospel of Luke.

I cannot take the line of the form and redaction critics on account of their classing of the Gospels as *Kleinliteratur*, on account of their diachronic approach, and on account of their viewing the making of the Gospels as an isolated phenomenon, as Church kerygma with no link with neighbouring genres. What links the approach of these critics to this investigation is that they respond to the various units within the overall narrative. Like Burridge, they assign the source of the separate stories to an historical base (the primitive Christian community). Their view that the evangelists constructed the editorial material to suit their theological agenda is not so far removed from Bakhtin's view of the free use of invention to suit the purpose of testing the idea in the Greek Romance.

Lastly, although the Gospel of Luke cannot be called a Greek Romance on account of the defining feature (two lovers) of that genre, this investigation using Bakhtinian theory has shown many similarities in terms of form, characterization and motifs between the two genres. Above all it has shown evidence of a deliberate construction that is full of dialogisms and, like the genre of the Greek Romance, is free to make use of inventions that are not tied to the rules of verisimilitude. It can be seen as carnivalized text in Bakhtinian terms, a text that fits into the group of writings known as the Menippea.

## Chapter 5

### Conclusion

This thesis does not claim to have made an exhaustive exploration of the Gospel of Luke using Bakhtinian theory. Rather, it is a beginning, an initial opening for other studies, which, in turn, will have the chance to go more comprehensively into the various possibilities that have opened up. While the name Bakhtin appears with increasing frequency in works by biblical scholars, I have not come across any analysis that has used this theory in its various aspects focussing exclusively on the narrative of the Gospel of Luke.

Basic to Bakhtin's theory is the preoccupation with the dialogic nature of human relations as it is contained in language, and how this is artistically expressed in literature. All the aspects of his theory, whether the form of the chronotope, the movement of the carnivalesque, intertextual relations within itself, with other texts or with its socio-political context, hinge on his understanding of dialogism. He views texts generically according to this factor, and although he sees language to be intrinsically dialogic, he distinguishes between dialogic texts and (relatively) monologic texts. The classical genres of antiquity are seen by him as monologic, controlled by the authoritarian voice of the author, while the parodying-travesty genres of the Menippea, genres that were not necessarily viewed as 'high' literature in antiquity, are rated by him as dialogic. The distinctive feature of these genres is that they are based on a carnivalistic view of the world, and that they explore philosophical ideas of life and death according to a dialogic sense of the truth. Bakhtin counts both the Greek Romance and early Christian texts amongst the writings of the Menippea.

The focus of this thesis has been on the genre of the Gospel of Luke, and whether this text can be seen to be dialogic in the Bakhtinian sense. As it was produced during the era of Hellenism (an era rated by Bakhtin as conducive to dialogism on account of the coexistence of various cultures in the Graeco-Roman world, political upheavals, and the practice of carnival), and as it belongs to a group of writings concerning a matter that appeared on the fringe of society, one can assume that an exploration in terms of Bakhtin's principle of dialogism is well worth the attempt. Seen throughout the ages as

an authoritative text within the canon of the Christian Bible, often quoted and interpreted within the doctrine of the Church, it has also, together with the other three canonical Gospels, been read and generically identified from various angles by biblical scholars. This thesis has explored it from the perspective of Bakhtinian theory.

In terms of methodology I began by establishing that the Gospel of Luke complies in broad terms with three criteria that Bakhtin associates with the Menippean and the Socratic Dialogue that he aligns closely with it. First, the text is written as a prose narrative containing other genres within it, including dialogue and verse. Secondly, the subject matter concerns a current issue (as opposed to a heroic or mythological past). The Gospel concerns itself with the birth of a new religious movement within the constraints of the rule of the Roman Empire. Thirdly, the Gospel does not follow the literary convention of established classical literature. It freely mixes genres, and portrays simple, everyday people, who are neither members of the ruling Roman establishment nor members of the religious establishment of the setting of the story, in a serious light (as opposed to portraying them as comic figures, which would be in line with classical texts).

My next step was to choose a comparative text from a prose genre that scholars have tentatively dated as approximately contemporaneous with the Gospel in the Graeco-Roman world. The choice fell on Chariton's *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, believed to be the earliest extant text of the Greek Romance genre. My reason for choosing this text is that Bakhtin and classicists identify it as representative of what the latter call the Ancient, or Greek, Novel and what Bakhtin refers to as the *adventure novel of ideal*, which he uses to demonstrate his theory of the chronotope. As in the case of the Gospel, the subject matter of this text concerns a current issue (whether romantic love can withstand all obstacles to end in happily-ever-after marriage). Secondly, it does not abide by classical literary convention regarding the mixing of literary genres and in its character portrayal. It contains other genres within the prose narrative. Other parallels between these two texts are the employment of the literary *koine*, and that they co-exist with other romances and Gospels that recount similar stories.

I went on to select three aspects of Bakhtin's theory of dialogism, discussed and re-discussed by him in various works. These three are the aspects of *chronotope*, *carnavalesque*, and *intertextuality*. Devoting a chapter to each of them, I began by

discussing Bakhtin's theory, to then explore both the Gospel and *Chaereas and Callirhoe* from the perspective of each of these aspects. The aim was to see whether they could be read in terms of this theory, how they appeared in terms of what Bakhtin would rate as a dialogic text, and what implications this would have in assessing the genre and hence the discourse of the Gospel of Luke.

### *Chronotope*

Bakhtin, in analysing the chronotope of a text, describes it in terms of what can be called a cluster of features: time, space, characterization and motifs, all of which are interlinked. Seeing the chronotope as being determinative of genre, he describes the types of texts that function according to particular chronotopes. The *adventure novel of ordeal* is described as functioning according to a combination of *biographical* time and *adventure* time in *abstract-alien* space. The character of the heroes in this type of text is *unchanging*. Linked to this chronotope is a particular cluster of motifs, of which the motif of *meeting* is the most important.

Chapter 1 of this thesis, in examining the two texts in terms of this particular chronotope, showed, first, that *Chaereas and Callirhoe* fits Bakhtin's description of the *adventure novel of ordeal*. An examination of the Gospel of Luke showed that it complies with the same chronotope. This can be seen as a pointer in the direction of the Romance in considering the genre of the Gospel. Other implications become apparent when following this line of thought. First, it would suggest that the Gospel narrative is deliberately constructed, thus undermining the view taken by form critics that the Gospel of Luke, as one of the Synoptics, is *Kleinliteratur*, a collection of gathered stories that have been loosely put together. Secondly, the element of the supernatural in the Gospel can be looked at in the light of a narrative that works according to *adventure time*, in which there is nothing unusual about this kind of intervention. The implication is that there is a free use of invention, which would be in line with Bakhtin's view of Menippean texts. A third area of interest lies in the characterization of Jesus, which, in line with narratives of the *adventure novel of ordeal*, can be seen to show an ideal and unchanging character who overcomes the ordeals that test the integrity of his identity as he moves through the narrative.

*The kingdoms in terms the chronotope*

The comparative use of *Chaereas and Callirhoe* serves to illuminate a central concern in the Gospel of Luke. The idea of different kingdoms is adumbrated by an investigation of the chronotope. Looking at the worldly kingdoms of Syracuse and Persia in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, the one ideal, the other less so, making use of *syncrisis*, directs attention to the nature and role of the concept of kingdom in the Gospel in which two metaphysical kingdoms are engaged in a battle between good and evil. This is not apparent at the beginning of the text. Instead, the reader sees representatives of the Kingdom of God in an exciting and colourful set of events, not aware that this is a view of the camp of one side of the battle that lies ahead. The presence of the other kingdom is hinted at to begin with in some of the sayings, only coming into full view in the scene in the desert when Jesus is tempted by the Devil. Having once surfaced, the battle returns to just below the surface. An awareness of its presence having been created, it is apparent throughout the narrative, manifesting itself in the people who oppose Jesus. It erupts fully at Jesus' Trial and Passion.

What is striking is that there is no show of arms in the conventional form. This has to do with the nature of the Kingdom of God in the form of Jesus. He is not represented as engaging with the opposite kingdom on the latter's terms. His weapons are unmilitary, in line with the unprecedented (carnivalistic) discourse that is projected by this text, which challenges prevailing worldly concepts of power. One could venture to say that the superior might of the Kingdom of God is shown simply by presenting Jesus centre stage, while the kingdom of Satan is kept at bay under the surface for most of the narrative. Evil forces are also at play in *Chaereas and Callirhoe* and, as in the Gospel, they are overcome in the end. In the Romance, however, the evil forces are openly shown on the surface of the narrative, often comically. In the Gospel the coming Kingdom of God, embodied and propagated by Jesus, is the central concern. In contradistinction to the Romance, in which the lovers precariously move forward at the mercy of competing forces, Jesus is part of the forces of the Kingdom of God.

*Chronotope as discourse*

In noting the places in which the various episodes take place in the Gospel, a discursive line becomes apparent. Grounding itself firmly in the Temple and thus in the tradition and worldview of the Hebrew Bible, the discourse, embodied by Jesus, moves out of this establishment as it presents itself at the time of the setting of the Gospel. Similarly, in Galilee, Jesus is linked to the synagogue, to then move increasingly out onto the road for his teaching. He is recognised by the voice from Heaven in the Jordan River and on a mountain, both locations having strong associations with important episodes in the Hebrew Bible, but being outside the spaces controlled by the religious establishment of Jesus' own era. The discourse of the Kingdom of God as embodied by Jesus first roots itself in the tradition of the Hebrew Bible and the religious establishment in Jerusalem in the first century, to then diverge from it. Finally, the original tradition is challenged on its own ground (in the Temple), as the discourse of the Kingdom of God prepares itself to be disseminated among the nations.

Like the lovers in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, the protagonist of the Gospel is constantly on the move. In itself, this is a discursive element, a central concern in the Gospel being movement versus stasis. The chronotope of the Gospel carries within itself an ongoing dialogue between what is represented by the Temple (stasis) and the road (movement). While the Temple and the traditional religion of Judaism is recognized as central, the discourse of the Kingdom of God propagates movement, prophesying that the Temple and its establishment will no longer be the location of the meeting between God and his people; that it will be destroyed, and that a more mobile location, the word, which can be disseminated to ends of the earth, beginning with the disciples, will become the meeting place of God's people. Comparing Jesus' movement with that of the lovers in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, one could consider that he, like them, moves to reach the object of his love (God's people). The difference is that while this is an end in itself on this earth for the lovers in the Romance, Jesus moves back to his father in Heaven once his mission is completed. However, even this is not final. A future coming is promised.

### *The carnivalesque*

Chapter 2 of this thesis has explored the element of the carnivalesque in both the Gospel and *Chaereas and Callirhoe*. Both texts were found to be shot through with elements of the carnivalesque, though the Gospel more so than the Romance. A central image, that of

the celebratory meal, as well as the basic movement of carnival (life, death and rebirth), which Bakhtin also associates with a movement of crowning and de-crowning, features in both texts. Public functions, alternating weddings with funerals, bear out this movement in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*. In the Gospel the protagonist actually embodies the carnival movement of life, death and rebirth, acting as a force that disturbs and inverts static institutions, thus exposing aspects that normally remain hidden. The central image of carnival, that is, the mock crowning of the carnival king, with the subsequent de-crowning, is actually physically played out in this text.

Bakhtin refers to the activities of carnival as creating a double of the real world (usually parodic, sometimes utopian), often poking fun at objects that usually inspire fear, be it a deity, death, or worldly authority, in order to force these objects to change themselves. It is noteworthy that Jesus, as the carnival king, relativizes even death as he moves from life to death to resurrection (new life) to ascension (affirmation of eternal life). The operative word in creating a double is *creating*, as it implies the use of invention and construction.

Two scenes in the Gospel of Luke can be regarded in the light of a parodic double of authoritarian structures of the period. The first one is Jesus' entry into Jerusalem on a donkey, which can be seen as a carnivalistic rendering of the triumphal procession of the victorious generals on their return to Rome. The second scene is the Trial of Jesus that constitutes a travesty of court procedure under Graeco-Roman law. Carried out in different places, very little of it is displayed before the people. There is no criminal charge, the question being one of identity, and there are no speeches of prosecution and defence. Jesus replies by saying nothing or by repeating what the interlocutor has said. The judge (Pontius Pilate) states that Jesus is innocent, but sends him off to be put to death.

Looking comparatively at the major trial in *Chaereas and Callirhoe* in Babylon, one finds that the latter is also a carnivalistic rendering of the norm. At first glance it all seems to go according to due procedure. The trial is conducted in one place, in front of many people. There are prosecution and defence speeches. Nevertheless, it collapses unresolved. What this trial shares with the one in the Gospel is that it is held on a pretext. In the Gospel the religious establishment tries to get rid of Jesus, claiming concern for religious law. In the Romance everyone, including the Persian King, wants to lay eyes on

Callirhoe and enjoy the sensationalism of the spectacle while claiming concern for matrimonial law.

*The kingdoms in terms of the carnivalesque*

Keeping in mind the concept of the carnivalistic double, it is of interest to revisit the concept of the kingdoms that emerged as a result of studying the chronotope. It has been mentioned above that two kingdoms are presented in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, the one ideal, the other less so. In carnivalistic terms these can be seen as doubles of the real world, a parodic version and a utopian one. The Persian court and its king is depicted in a parodic light while Syracuse and its ruler, Hermocrates, is shown as a carnivalistic utopia. While these two kingdoms interact dialogically with each other in the narrative, they also interact with the real world in which the text has to function, which is the Roman Empire. This can be seen as the primary kingdom that has given rise to the two carnivalistic versions, the kingdom that is contained in them as the other voice, the dialogic interaction with it being the primary discursive activity in the text. Not only does the text create a longing for the utopia of happily-ever-after love, but it also implies an ideal version of the Greek world versus a parodic version of the greater, more powerful Roman Empire.

The Gospel of Luke presents the same phenomenon. Both the Kingdom of God and the kingdom of Satan are carnivalistic doubles of the kingdom of this world, that is, the real world as it shows itself in Palestine under Roman rule in the first century CE. This is the other voice, which gives rise to the presentation of a utopian version, creating hope, and a parodic version that opposes it. As the two carnivalistically created kingdoms are locked in battle in the narrative, both interact discursively with the kingdom of the real world. Dramatically, the Kingdom of God is not static. In the form of Jesus, who embodies the carnival movement, it presents the inevitability of change, revealing the stasis of existing power structures, the looming reality of their destruction, while reaching into the future with hope on a different level.

The different kingdoms are also apparent in the parables that have been analysed in Chapter 2 in terms of the carnivalesque.<sup>1</sup> In the *Good Samaritan* the members of the 'in'-group, the religious establishment, are shown in a parodic light, while the outsider, the Samaritan is shown in an ideal light. The unstated real world with which the parodic and the ideal versions interact, and of which they are carnivalistic doubles, is the third voice, the reader or listener being presented with a choice between abiding with the status quo (stasis), or taking the risk of seeing things anew and moving forward. The bias is in favour of the latter, which is at the core of the Gospel as a whole. The same mechanism can be traced in *Lazarus*, this story actually promising reward or punishment beyond death. As in the main narrative, death is relativized. The kingdoms appear also in the *Lost Son*, the younger son moving between them, embodying the carnival movement. First these kingdoms are presented physically, rather like in *Chaereas and Callirhoe* (homeland versus foreign land), but as the narrative progresses it emerges that the kingdoms representing an attitude (stasis versus movement) are at the core of the parable. Again, the bias is on the latter, the attitude of the elder brother being shown as loveless and inimical to life.

### *Characterization*

Carnival reality, in Bakhtin's view, is inverted reality of the real world (with which it interacts) during a time sanctioned for this use, a 'time out'. On the other hand, even during times when carnival proper is not in action, the carnivalesque, in the form of figures, like the clown, the rogue and the fool, or carnivalized literature, can create a sense of 'time out', can still disturb and revolutionize static, authoritarian structures on a number of levels. Looking at the characterization of Jesus in terms of the carnivalesque, an aspect can be added to the ideal, unchanging character that emerged as a result of the chronotopic study of the Gospel. Jesus shows characteristics of the carnival clown in terms of his constant appearance with, and amongst the people, never afraid of telling the truth. He travels around like the carnival rogue, moving from place to place, not tying himself down to any fixed abode or earthly commitments. He lives like a fool, never working for his own gain. All three characteristics are combined in how he answers his interlocutors at his trial. This is in line with the element of inversion embodied by him as

---

<sup>1</sup> *The Good Samaritan* (Lk 10: 25-37), *The Rich Man and the Beggar*, *Lazarus* (Lk 16: 19-31), *The Lost Son* (Lk 15: 1-32).

the carnival king, who, in carnival proper, is usually a beggar.<sup>2</sup> However, the presentation of Jesus in the Gospel in the role of the carnival king can be seen as a further inversion of the carnival inversion. Unlike the role of the beggar that is raised to its opposite, the king, and then subsequently de-crowned, reverting to the beggar, Jesus, the Messiah, lowers himself to the role of beggar, is then physically mock-crowned (after a number of crownings and de-crownings), de-crowned (put to death), and then re-crowned (resurrected) by divine means, and raised on high (ascends into Heaven).

Characteristically all these movements are accompanied by scandal, evidencing the revolutionary nature of his outwardly peaceful action, which purports nothing less than the destruction of the existing kingdoms of this earth (presented as dominated by the kingdom of Satan), in order that the Kingdom of God can take its rightful place, expanding itself to the ends of the earth and beyond in terms of time and space, re-uniting God with all his people.

### *Intertextuality*

Bakhtin argues that the voice of another can be found in a text in terms of *locus*, *form* and *degree*. In Chapter 3 of this thesis I explored the Gospel and *Chaereas and Callirhoe* along those lines. I found that in both cases the new text interacts liberally with the major older canon of the culture in which it is set. The Gospel of Luke has made decisive use of the books of the Hebrew Bible, while *Chaereas and Callirhoe* frequently quotes passages from Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. In each case one can say that the voice of the older text in the new text is *located* in the expected response of the prospective reader, depending on the latter's knowledge of that text. The *form* of the appropriated text varies. In many of the instances in *Chaereas and Callirhoe* actual quotations from the Homeric text appear in their verse form, always for the purpose of comparison. Over and above that it features in the form of situational comparisons, Callirhoe being implicitly compared to Helen of Troy, and Chaereas more explicitly to Achilles. The concept of the two kingdoms is underpinned in the Romance by the association with the older epic. The intertextual use is not limited, however, to lending splendour to this Romance. The latter

---

<sup>2</sup> One can note here that Chaereas and Callirhoe were people of high standing in their homeland. In the foreign land, in which they are faced with most of their ordeals (the bulk of the story), they occupy the status of beggars or slaves, totally dependent on the good will of the foreign masters. They were raised to their original status once they returned home. This can be compared with Jesus' godly status at the beginning and the end of the Gospel.

also interacts comically with the older canon, carnivalistically poking fun at the heroic nature of the older narrative. Thus, for example, we see the Persian King turning restlessly in his bed on account of his illicit desire for Callirhoe in the words that Homer used to describe Achilles' grief after Patroclus' death. As a whole, the Romance brings down the grand scale of the epic to a domestic level replacing the heroism of war with the heroism of romantic love. The war hero is replaced by a love-sick lover, carnivalistically exposing the behaviour of the Homeric figures. One could say that this fits into Bakhtin's view of the parodying-travesty nature of a Menippean text. In terms of *degree* one can say that the Homeric text features in a high degree in *Chaereas and Callirhoe*.

The voices of the Hebrew Bible that feature in the Gospel of Luke are so many that a selection has had to be made in discussing them. In order to demonstrate the multiplicity of the strands that connect this Gospel to the older canon, the two stories of the annunciation, first of the conception John the Baptist, and then of Jesus were read closely in the light of intertextuality. The connection with the miraculous conception stories in various books of the Hebrew Bible was established, showing that they serve to legitimise the Gospel story of the annunciation of John, which, in turn, legitimises the annunciation of Jesus. The Gospel stories give the impression that they follow on directly from the narrative presented in the Hebrew canon. The annunciation of Jesus shows a divergence from the Hebrew Bible pattern, having first rooted itself in that pattern. Furthermore, the Gospel discursively makes use of the Book of Isaiah on a deeper level, connecting the Annunciations of John and Jesus to each other in a dialogic relationship. The Gospel story interacts dialogically with Isaiah, using it as a source to lend grandeur to its own relatively simple presentation. Conversely, the annunciation of John could be seen as a parody of the Isaiah scene. At the same time the latter informs the reader by association of the presence of God and his mighty forces. The annunciation of Jesus, different in a number of ways, is shown to be unprecedented, heralding a new era.

### *The battle*

Chapter 3 then goes on to investigate one strand of the Gospel's intertextual use of the Hebrew Bible, namely the Book of Zechariah. Regarding this book as one of the sub-texts of the Gospel of Luke (as a voice, in Bakhtinian terms) clarifies a number of issues concerning the discourse of the Gospel. There can be no more doubt as to fierceness of

the battle between God and the forces that oppose him, the Book of Zechariah featuring Yahweh as the divine warrior who will finally return to dwell among his people in the reinstated Jerusalem Temple to rule over all the nations of the earth. The association having been made between the Gospel and the older prophet by the name *Zechariah* (the Lord has remembered) at the beginning of the Gospel text, the reader can then trace a number of instances of this intertextual factor throughout the text.

The word *anatole* (the same word that appears in the Septuagint translation of the Hebrew *zumah* (Branch) in the Book of Zechariah) appears at the end of the Song of Zechariah in the Gospel in terms of salvation, supporting the Angel Gabriel's annunciation that identifies Jesus as the Messiah (Lk 1: 78). The meaning of *zumah* (vegetation, growth) suggests that it may have been used as a source for the concept of the Kingdom of God in the Gospel.<sup>3</sup> The trial scene in Zechariah appears in a new form in the Gospel in the desert scene, clearly demonstrating the difference of genre between the two texts. In the older text the trial is shown in the form of a vision experienced by the prophet, in line with verisimilitude, while it features without the covering frame of a vision in the Gospel, signalling a free use of invention. The two characters, Satan and Jesus (Joshua), are greatly expanded in the Gospel. From a human agent (Joshua) who says nothing as he is ritually purified and instated as the priest of the rebuilt Temple, Jesus features as the Messiah, the Son of God, and as the embodiment of the Kingdom in the God. He answers the Devil without mediation, engaging directly with him, the implication being that he is part of God himself. Instead of being passively purified, he passes a test. The Devil is raised from silent challenger within the divine council in Zechariah to the opposing force. Having a kingdom of his own at his disposal in the Gospel, he features as another deity.

The desert scene brings the underlying battle to the surface (even though it looks like a peaceful encounter), the associated scene in Zechariah creating an awareness of the divine council, and the fact that Jesus is standing trial as the agent of the divine plan; that he has to pass the test of who he is in terms of what was prophesied by the Angel Gabriel. The Trial of Jesus (Luke 23:1-25), a further step in the testing process, demonstrates the carnivalistic nature of the Gospel when it is associated with the trial scene in Zechariah.

---

<sup>3</sup> The question of the *Branch* is discussed in Chapter 3 of this thesis (pp. 129-131).

It presents the Zecharian scene in an inverted form. However, the Gospel gives this inversion another turn in the form of the resurrection. Not only does the trial scene in the Gospel make use of the older text as a source, but it also interacts dialogically with it, showing up the autocratic nature of the power structures of the forces of Yahweh, the other side of the coin of the forces of Satan as shown in the trial.

Underpinned by the Book of Zechariah, the battle becomes increasingly evident in the Gospel. Jesus' triumphant entry into Jerusalem on the donkey is an enactment of the prophesy in Zechariah, dealing the forces of Satan a significant blow. On the other hand, the fact that this scene appears between scenes of violence in the older text indicates that the battle is not won, but that the worst is still to come. Responding to the wailing women on the way to the cross, Jesus uses similar language and imagery that appears in the final section of the Book of Zechariah.

*A comparison of the findings of this thesis with current views of the genre of the Gospels*

In Chapter 4 of this thesis I began by giving attention to the direction taken by form criticism and redaction criticism. A key contribution of form criticism can be seen in its demonstration that the Gospels are constructed from small units of tradition that have been shaped into a continuous narrative. My conclusion (as a result of my Bakhtinian investigation) is also that the Gospel of Luke is a constructed text, consisting of various smaller units within an overall narrative. Where it differs from form criticism is in the latter's identification of the Gospels as *sui generis*, and as *Kleinliteratur*, a loose combination of church proclamation and collected stories, lacking a conscious design by an author. To begin with, the Gospel of Luke clearly presents the voice of the author or narrator announcing a purpose in the prologue. A chronotopic study has shown that this text complies with the form of the Greek Romance in terms of Bakhtin's theory, evidence of a deliberate design by the author. Furthermore, if this narrative is read exclusively as church proclamation, the sense of the carnivalesque, that is, the double-voicedness and the numerous inversions are lost. The full implication of the dialogic nature of the relations between the Gospel and the texts from the Hebrew Bible would also not be apparent.

In answer to the identification of the genre of the Gospels as *sui generis* (which isolates them from other Graeco-Roman literature), one can say that the chronotopic study has shown that the genre of Luke is close to that of the Greek Romance. Its carnivalesque element relates it to other parodying genres of the era, like Menippean satire.

Furthermore, its interaction with the myth of the Immortals in Luke 24: 38-43 suggests the likelihood of interaction with other surrounding myths. The investigation in terms of intertextuality has shown a conscious link with the Books of the Hebrew Bible, similar to that of *Chaereas and Callirhoe* with the Homeric epics.

Following on from form criticism, redaction criticism credits the evangelists with greater authorship in selecting the stories and in the way they are put together as a gospel narrative according to theological considerations. This is a step closer to the findings of this thesis in terms of the deliberately constructed nature of the Gospel. It does not, however come far enough in terms of considering the use of invention. Like form criticism it does not take the carnivalesque into account, nor does it relate the Gospels to other texts of the Graeco-Roman period, also regarding them as *sui generis*.

The main emphasis of Chapter 4 rests on engaging with the view that the Gospels are ancient biographies. In contrast to form and redaction criticism, the proponents of ancient biography do relate the Gospels to other texts in their Graeco-Roman environment. Furthermore, they assume a deliberate design by an author. The difference between this understanding and the findings of my thesis hinges on the question of historicity. Reading the Gospels as ancient biographies presupposes that the author is bound by the rules of historicity and verisimilitude. Even though there is some leeway for the manipulation of historical facts and for the elaboration of some of the characteristics of the protagonist, the use of free invention is seriously curtailed. In terms of presenting anything supernatural, *bioi* are limited to isolated reports of a strange happening.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Talbert's view that the Myth of the Immortals underlies the Gospel of Luke makes provision for an appearance by an Immortal to his followers after his passing over. What is different about the case of the Immortals as described by Talbert and the Gospel story is that formers' ascension happens at the time death, while Jesus lives with his disciples for some time after his resurrection. The Myth of the Immortals does seem to exist in this Gospel on an intertextual level (this thesis has only examined one of many intertextual relations in the Gospel of Luke). When Jesus asks for broiled fish to prove that he is not a ghost (Lk 24: 38-43), he may be interacting with the notion that the Immortals appear after death to their followers. However, he diverges from the Myth by eating the fish, showing that his case is entirely different. Similarly his conception probably interacts with the same Myth, featuring exceptional humans that are engendered by a god. The Myth of the Immortals can be seen as one of a number of voices

Further, even though a number of possible purposes for ancient biographies are listed, the main discourse is limited to recounting the life of a person of high rank, often to praise him, emphasizing the importance of the deeds performed by him, and sometimes the opposite, to vilify him.

In applying Burridge's model to the Gospel of Luke, it was found that while Luke complies with it more or less, important features in this text were either underplayed or simply not accounted for. No mention is made of the heavily represented supernatural element. The Bakhtinian study of the chronotope of the Gospel, on the other hand, shows the high incidence of the supernatural to be part of the cluster of elements that appear in an *adventure novel of ordeal*.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, Burridge's model assumes a serious straightforward text. It does not account for the double-voiced element carnivalesque, which would radically change the reading of the text. The description of the subject's life and death, as in an ancient biography, may fit the Gospel on the surface, but it does not account for the Resurrection and the Ascension. It underplays the radical nature of the discourse of the Gospel that emerges when Jesus' life, death and resurrection are seen in the light of an embodiment of the carnival movement of life, death and rebirth, signifying the inevitability of change and therefore the relativity of worldly concepts of power and authority.

While Burridge's model recognizes that other types of texts form part of ancient biography texts, it does so only in terms of sources, not taking account the dialogic interaction between the texts. The investigation of this relationship between the Gospel and the Hebrew Bible has shown how the former uses the older text as a source for situations and characters, as well as using the older texts as sub-texts that reinforce and

---

appropriated by the Gospel, showing another aspect of its dialogicity. Thus the conception of Jesus simultaneously interacts with the Hebrew Bible and the Graeco-Roman myth, making use of both for its own discourse. It would imply that the text is intended for readers of both cultures.

<sup>5</sup> Although Plutarch's *Alexander* is not one of the works that make up Burridge's model, the birth of Alexander invites a comparison with that of Jesus in the Gospel. There is a fundamental difference, however. In Plutarch's work the supernatural occurrences are always qualified either by happening in a dream, or by being introduced by phrases like "it is said", "others say", "Eratosthenes says", and "others again say". Never does the narrator actually say that these things actually happened (Plutarch 1910: 463-464). In Luke, on the other hand, the supernatural occurrences are described as having actually happened. They are not qualified by either the framework of a dream or by hearsay.

challenge the new text. Simultaneously the new text carnivalistically sheds light on the older texts.

Perhaps the greatest factor that is lost in a reading of the Gospel as an ancient biography is the dynamic of the ongoing battle between good and evil that underlies it, the battle that represents the primary discourse in a dialogic form. It is responsible for the dramatic tension and excitement in the text. Menippean-like, the protagonist of the text embodies concept of the Kingdom of God, his testing being the testing of this concept. The Kingdom of God overcomes the forces of Satan in an unprecedented *modus operandi*, a carnivalistic inversion of not only the prevailing concepts of power, but also of those found in the Hebrew Bible. The Gospel shows the divine warrior of Hebrew Scripture (who promises to come to save his people) in a new guise in the form of Jesus.

### *Conclusion*

Using a Bakhtinian analysis this thesis has demonstrated that the Gospel of Luke shares a number of genre characteristics with Romance-literature from the Graeco-Roman period. It has furthermore demonstrated that the longstanding tendency to read this text as a *bios*, or an historical account, underestimates the complexities of what the writer of this text has done as a self-conscious author. Using the biblical paradigm of Yahweh's intervention in the affairs of his people, the Gospel propagates a new way of life for a suffering people who are incapacitated by the oppression of an imperial power as well by their own religious establishment. At the same time the text carries within itself the opposite of this new way of life, namely a death-like stasis, the two poles interacting dialogically with each other.

The Romance-like form as a way of conveying this discourse to the reader opens up possibilities that are closed to genres tied to historicity and kerygma. To begin with one can see it as a popular genre likely to reach a wider readership. This is supported by the use of the Greek *koine* and in the way the text engages dialogically with both the Jewish canon and Graeco-Roman culture (also embodied by the actual form of the Romance). The intricate engagement with texts of the Hebrew Bible implies that the author of Luke had (amongst others) a readership in mind that was intimately acquainted with Hebrew Scripture.

The Romance genre, as a fictional genre, creates the space of 'time out' associated with carnival, enabling an unimpeded exploration of the main idea under scrutiny in a text. It can also propagate a message that would be politically dangerous to disseminate via an historical genre. Thirdly, it can make use of the genre of historiography as a literary device in the setting of the narrative, which would make it seem more 'real' to the reader. Creating a carnivalistic double of the real world, authoritarian structures are exposed by parodic and utopian versions in an attempt to dislodge them. The Gospel presents these versions interacting with each other as well as with the real world of its readers. The carnival movement of life, death and rebirth embodied by Jesus underpins the radical nature of the discourse of the Gospel in its demonstration of the relativity of the things that cause fear, such as earthly authority, concepts of God and even death. Heralding a new era, one in which gentleness and compassion are rated as more powerful than military might, the Gospel projects the inevitability of the demise of existing worldly power structures. These will inevitably be replaced by the coming Kingdom of God that will spread to the ends of the earth. The God of Israel as the God of all people appears in a new compassionate light. The physical Temple in Jerusalem will be replaced by the Word (as spread by Jesus' disciples) as a meeting place between God and his people.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### The Bible

*New Revised Standard Version*

1989 Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.

*The Precise Parallel New Testament*

1995 New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

*The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English*

1997 Sir Lancelot C.L. Brenton (ed). USA: Hendrickson Publishers (originally published by Samuel Bagster and Sons, Ltd., London, 1851).

*The Holy Scriptures: Hebrew and English (King James Bible)*

(no date) *The Society for Distributing Hebrew Scriptures.*  
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

*The Jerusalem Bible*

1966 London: Darton, Longman & Todd and Doubleday.

### Primary

Achilles Tatius

1989 *Leucippe and Clitophon.* Reardon, B P, *Collected Ancient Greek Novels.* London/California: University of California Press.

Antonius Diogenes

1989 *The Wonders beyond Thule,* translated by Gerald N. Sandy. Reardon, B P, *Collected Ancient Greek Novels.* London/California: University of California Press.

Apulejus

1960 *Der Goldene Esel,* translated by August Rode. Rüdiger, Horst (ed.). Zürich: Manesse Verlag.

Aristotle

1953 *Poetics.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich

1968 *Rabelais and his World,* translated by Helene Iswolsky. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London: M.I.T. Press.

1971 *Iz zapisej 1970-1971 godov (Extracts from notes from the years 1970-1971).*

## Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich

- 1976 Problema teksta v lingvistike, filologii i drugikh gumanitarnykh naukakh, Opyt filosofskogo analiza (The problem of text in linguistics, philology, and the other human sciences) In *Voprosy literatury* 10 (1976)... Written 1959-1961.
- 1981 *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* (Epic and the Novel, From the Prehistory of Novelistic Discourse, Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel, Discourse in the Novel), translated by Caryl Emerson and Michel Holquist (ed.) Austin: University of Texas Press.
- 1984 *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, translated by Caryl Emerson (ed.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

## Chariton

- 1989 *Chaereas and Callirhoe*, translated by B P Reardon. *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. Reardon, BP (ed.). Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

## Heliodorus

- 1989 *An Ethiopian Story*, translated by J R Morgan. In *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. Reardon, B P (ed.). Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

## Herodotus

- 1908 *Historiae*, Carolus Hude (ed.). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 1954 *Herodotus: The Histories*, translated by Aubrey de Selincourt. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

## Homer

- 1997 *The Iliad*, translated by Stanley Lombardo. Indianapolis/Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company
- 2000 *The Odyssey*, translated by Stanley Lombardo. Indianapolis/Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company.

## Isocrates

- 2000 *Evagoras*. In *Isocrates*, with an English translation by David C Mirhady and Yun Lee Too. Austin: University of Texas Press.

## Josephus

- 1959 *The Jewish War*, translated by G A Williamson. Middlesex: Penguin.

- Longus  
1989 *Daphnis and Chloe*, translated by Christopher Gill. Reardon. *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. Reardon, B P (ed.). Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Lucian  
1913 *Demonax*. In *Lucian*, with an English translation by A M Harmon, Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann.
- Nepos, Cornelius  
1989 *Cornelius Nepos: A Selection, including the Lives of Cato and Atticus*. Horsfall, Nicholas (ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Petronius  
2000 *Satyricon*, translated by Sarah Ruden. Indianapolis/Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company.
- Philo  
1950 *The Life of Moses*. In *Philo*, with an English translation by F H Colson, Loeb Classical library. London: Heinemann.
- Philostratus  
1970 *Life of Apollonius*, translated by C P Jones. Bowersock, G W (ed. and trans.). Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin.
- Plutarch  
1919 *Alexander*. In *Plutarch's Lives*, Dryden Edition, Vol.2. London: J M Dent&Sons.
- 1919 *Cato the Younger*. In *Plutarch's Lives*, with an English translation by Bernadotte Perrin, Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann.
- Pseudo-Callisthenes  
1969 *The Romance of Alexander the Great*, translated from the Armenian version by Albert Mugrdich Wolohojian. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Satyrus  
1912 *Life of Euripides, P.Oxy. No. 1176*. In *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri IX*, Arthur S. Hunt (ed.), London, Egypt Exploration Fund Graeco-Roman branch, pp. 124-82.
- Sophocles  
1982 *Oedipus Rex*. Dawe, R D (ed.). Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Suetonius  
1957 *The Twelve Caesars*, translated by Robert Graves. Grant, Michael (Revised and Introd.). Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin.
- 1982 *Divus Augustus*. Carter, John M (ed.). Bristol: Classical Press.
- Tacitus  
1964 *The Histories*, translated by Kenneth Wellesly, Radice, Betty (ed.). Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin.
- 1970 *The Agricola and the Germania*, translated by H Mattingly. Handford, S A (revised edition). Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Thucydides  
1919 *Thucydides: History of the Peloponnesian War, Books 1 and 2*, with an English translation by C Foster Smith. London and New York: G P Putnam's Sons.
- 1998 *History of the Peloponnesian War*, translated by Walter Blanco. Blanco, Walter and Roberts, Jennifer Tolbert (eds.). New York and London: W W Norton & Company.
- Williams, Howard (ed. and trans.)  
1900 *Lucian's Dialogues, namely The Dialogues of the Gods, of the Sea-Gods, and of the Dead; Zeus the Tragedian, the Ferry-Boat etc.* London: George and Sons.
- Xenophon  
1925 *Scripta Minora*, with an English translation by E C Marchant, Loeb Classical Library. London: Heinemann.
- Xenophon of Ephesus  
1989 *An Ephesian Tale*, translated by Graham Anderson. In *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. Reardon, B P (ed.). London/California: University of California Press.
- Secondary**
- Achtemeier, Paul J  
1975 The Lucan Perspective on the Miracles of Jesus: A Preliminary Sketch, in *JBL*, Vol. 94, pp. 547-562.

- Amaral, Leila  
2003  
The Awakening of Wizards: Carnival in Rio de Janeiro and New Age Aesthetics, in *Learning from Other Faiths*, Haering, Hermann, Soskice, Martin, Janet Wilfred, Felix (eds.), 2003/4, pp. 112-122.
- Anderson, Graham  
1982  
*Eros Sophistes: Ancient Novelists at Play*. Chico, USA: Scholars Press.
- 1984  
*Ancient Fiction: The Novel in the Graeco-Roman World*. Totowa, New Jersey: Barnes and Noble Books.
- Anderson, Paul  
1996  
*The Christology of the Fourth Gospel: Its Unity and Disunity in the Light of John 6*. Tübingen: J C B Mohr.
- Auerbach, Erich  
1953  
*Mimesis*, translated by Willard R Trask. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Aune, David E  
1987  
*The New Testament in its Literary Environment*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- Baslez, M-F  
1992  
De l'histoire au roman: la Perse de Chariton. In *Le monde du roman grec*. Baslez, M-F, Hoffman, P, and Trédé, (eds.), 1992, pp.199-212.
- Barthes, Roland  
1977a  
From Work to Text. In *Image Music Text*. Heath, Stephen (ed.). New York: Hill and Wang.
- 1977b  
The Struggle with the Angel. In *Image Music Text*. Heath, Stephen (ed.). New York: Hill and Wang.
- 1981  
Theory of the Text. In *Untying the Text. A Poststructuralist Reader*. Young, Robert (ed.). Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Bauer, Dale M  
1991  
*Feminism, Bakhtin, and the Dialogic*. Albany: State University of New York.
- Berger, K  
1972  
*Die Gesetzauslegung Jesu*. Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- Black, M C  
1990  
The Rejected and Slain Messiah who is Coming with his Angels: The Messianic Exegesis of Zechariah 9-14 in the Passion Narratives. PhD dissertation, Emory University.

- Bocharov, Sergey  
1994  
Conversations with Bakhtin, translated by V Liapunov and S Blackwell. In *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, Vol. 109, pp.1009-24.
- Boda, Mark J  
2003  
Majoring on the Minors: Recent research on Haggai and Zechariah. In *Currents in Biblical Research*, Vol. 2. 1, October 2003, pp. 33-68.
- Bonetskaia, Natal'ia  
1998  
Bakhtin's Aesthetics as a Logic of Form, in *The Contexts of Bakhtin: Philosophy, Authorship, Aesthetics*. Shepherd, D (ed.), pp. 83-94. Amsterdam: Harwood.
- Bornkamm, Guenther  
1948  
Die Sturmstillung im Matthaesevangelium. *Wort und Dienst, Jahrbuch der Theologischen Schule Bethel* NF 1, 1948, pp. 49-54: ET. In *Tradition and Interpretation in Matthew*.
- 1954  
Matthaeus als Interpret der Herrenworte. *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 79, 1954, cols. 341-346. Leipzig/Berlin.
- Brawley, Robert L  
1995  
Resistance to the Carnivalization of Jesus: Scripture in the Lucan Passion Narrative. In *Semeia*, No 69-70, pp. 33-60.
- Bruce, F F  
1960-61  
The Book of Zechariah and the Passion Narrative. In *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 43, pp. 167-190.
- Bultmann, Rudolf  
1968  
*The History of the Synoptic Tradition*, translated by John Marsh. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Burridge, Richard A  
1992  
*What are the Gospels? A Comparison with Graeco-Roman Biography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1997a  
Biography. In *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C. – A.D. 400*. Porter, Stanley E (ed.). Leiden, New York, Cologne: Brill.
- 1997b  
The Gospels and Acts. In *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C. – A.D. 400*. Porter, Stanley E(ed.). Leiden, New York, Cologne: Brill.

- Cameron, Ron  
1982  
Introduction to *The Other Gospels: Non-Canonical Gospel Texts*. Cameron, Ron (ed.). Guildford, Surrey: Lutterworth Press.
- Clark, Katerina and Holquist, Michael  
1984  
*Mikhail Bakhtin*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Coates, Ruth  
1998  
*Christianity in Bakhtin: God and the Exiled Author*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Conzelmann, Hans  
1960  
*The Theology of St. Luke*, translated by G Buswell. London: Faber and Faber.
- Craddock, Fred B  
1990  
*Luke: Interpretation*. Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press.
- Craig, Kenneth M, Jr.  
1993  
*A poetics of Jonah: Art in the Service of Ideology*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press.
- 1994  
Rhetorical Aspects of Questions Answered with Silence in 1 Samuel 14: 37 and 28: 6. In *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 56: 221-39.
- 1995  
*Reading Esther: A case for the Literary Carnavalesque*. Louisville, Westminster: John Knox.
- Crossan, John Dominic  
1998  
*The Birth of Christianity: Discovering What Happened in the Years Immediately After the Execution of Jesus*. San Francisco: HarperCollins.
- Culler, Jonathan  
1975  
*Structuralist Poetics: Structuralism, Linguistics and the Study of Literature*. London: Routledge and Keegan Paul.
- Decock, Paul B  
2002  
The Breaking of Bread in Luke 24. ,In *Neotestamentica: Journal of the New Testament Society of South Africa*, Vol. 36 (1-2), pp. 39-55.
- Danow, D K  
1991  
*The Thought of Mikhail Bakhtin: From Word to Culture*. New York: St Martin's.

- Dentith, Simon  
1995 *Bakhtinian Thought: An Introductory Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Dibelius, Martin  
1971 *From Tradition to Gospel*, translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. Cambridge and London: James Clarke & Co. Ltd.  
1956 *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, translated by M Ling and P Schubert. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Dodd, C H  
1952 *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology*. London: Nisbet.
- Downey, Patrick  
2001 *Serious Comedy. The Philosophical and Theological Significance of Tragic and Comic Writing in the Western Tradition*. Lanham MD: Lexington Books.
- Driver, S R, Plummer, A, Briggs, C A  
1912 *The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Dubrow, Heather  
1982 *Genre*. The Critical Idiom Series 42. London: Methuen.
- Duling, Dennis C  
1992 Kingdom of God, Kingdom of Heaven. In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*, Vol. 4. Freedman, David Noel, Herion, Gary A, Graf, David, F, Pleins, John David, Beck, Astrid B (eds.). New York, London, Toronto, Sydney and Auckland: Doubleday.
- Egger, Brigitte  
1994 Looking at Chariton's Callirhoe. In *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*. Morgan, J R, Stoneman, Richard (eds.), pp. 31-48. London and New York: Routledge.
- Emerson, Caryl  
1996 Keeping the Self Intact During the Culture Wars: A Centennial Essay for Mikhail Bakhtin. In *New Literary History*, Vol. 27, pp.107- 26.  
1997 *The First Hundred Years of Mikhail Bakhtin*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

- Evans, C A  
1997  
Aspects of Exile and Restoration in the Proclamation of Jesus and the Gospels. In *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish and Christian Conceptions*. Scott, J M (ed.). *Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism* 56, pp. 299-328. Leiden: E J Brill.
- Falconer, Rachel  
1997a  
Introduction, in *Face to Face: Bakhtin in Russia and the West*, Adlam, C, et al (eds.), pp.23-41. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- 1997b  
Bakhtin and the Epic Chronotope, in *Face to Face: Bakhtin in Russia and the West*, Adlam, C, et al (eds.), pp. 254-272. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Feldman, Louis H  
1987  
Editors preface to *Josephus, Judaism and Christianity*. Feldman, Louis, H Hata, Gohei (eds.). Detroit, Michigan: Wayne State University Press.
- Fentress-Williams, Judith  
1999  
'What has happened to the Son of Kish?': A Dialogic Reading of the Saul Narrative in 1 Samuel. PhD dissertation. Yale University.
- Fisch, Harold  
1998  
*New Stories for Old: Biblical Patters in the Novel*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A, S J  
1993  
Luke, The Gospel According to...In *The Oxford Companion to the Bible*. Metzger, Bruce M, Coogan, Michael D (eds.). New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Foley, Michael P  
2003  
Comedy, Tragedy, and the Truth. In *The Journal of Theological Studies*, Hooker, M D, Gould, Graham (eds.), Vol. 54, Part 2, October 2003, pp. 601-613.
- Freise, Matthias  
1997  
After the Expulsion of the Author: Bakhtin as an Answer to Poststructuralism. In *Face to Face: Bakhtin in Russia and the West*. Adlam C et al., (eds.), pp.131-141. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

- Fowler, Alastair  
1982 *Kinds of Literature: An Introduction to the Theory of Genre and Modes.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Frye, Northrop  
1957 *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays.* Princeton: University Press.
- 1976 *The Secular Scripture: A Study of the Structure of Romance.* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Gale, Karen  
1998 Pursuing Polyphony: Tracing Character Construction(s) in Genesis 29-35 and *The Handmaid's Tale*. Master's Thesis, Graduate Theological Union.
- Garcia-Treto, Francisco O  
1992 The Fall of the House: A Carnavalesque Reading of 2 Kings 9 and 10, in *Reading between Texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible.* Fewell, D N (ed.), pp. 153-171. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.
- Gitay, Yehoshua  
1996 Theories of Literature and the Question of (Hebrew) Biblical Theology: A Prolegomenon. In *Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament*, Vol. 10, 1, 1996, pp. 61-68.
- Green, Barbara  
2000 *Mikhail Bakhtin and Biblical Scholarship: An Introduction.* Atlanta, Georgia: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Green, Joel B  
1995 *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gunkel, Hermann  
1964 *The Legends of Genesis.* New York
- Guthrie, D, Motyer, J A, Stibbs, A M, Wiseman, D J  
1970 *The New Bible Commentary Revised.* London: Inter-Varsity Press
- Hata, Gohei  
1987 Preface to *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity*, Feldman, Louis, H, Hata, Gohei (eds.). Detroit, Michigan: Wayne State University Press.

- Haegg, Tomas  
1971 *Narrative Technique in Ancient Greek Romances.*  
Stockholm: Svenska Institutet i Athen.
- 1983 *The Novel in Antiquity.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Hadas, Moses and Smith, Morton  
1965 *Heroes and Gods: Spiritual Biographies in Antiquity.*  
London: Routledge & Keegan Paul.
- Hernández, Lara C  
1990 Rhetorical Aspects of Chariton of Aphrodisias, in *GIF*,  
Vol. 42, pp. 267-274.
- Hanson, Paul D  
1975 *The Dawn of Apocalyptic.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Hirsch, ED, Jr  
1967 *Validity in Interpretation.* Yale: University Press.
- Holquist, Michael  
1981 Introduction to Bakhtin, Mikhail Mikhailovich, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* translated by Caryl Emerson and Michel Holquist (ed.) Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Hock, Ronald F  
1997 The Rhetoric of Romance. In *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C. – A.D. 400.* Porter, Stanley E (ed.). Leiden, New York, Cologne: Brill.
- Hunter, R L  
1994 History and historicity in the romance of Chariton *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, 34.2.
- Ivanov, V V  
1973 'Znachenie idej M. M. Bakhtina....', *Trudy po znakovym systemam* VI (Tartu, 1973): 44 (cited by Todorov (1984:6)).
- Johnson, Luke Timothy  
1992 Gospel of Luke-Acts. In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary.* In Freedman, David Noel, Herion, Gary A, Graf, David F, Pleins, John David, Beck, Astrid B (eds.). New York, London, Toronto, Sydney and Auckland: Doubleday.

- Klumbies, Paul-Gerhard  
2003  
Das Sterben Jesu als Schauspiel nach Lk 23. In *Biblische Zeitschrift*. Zenger, Erich, Ebner, Martin (eds.), pp. 44-49. Jahrgang 47 – Heft 2, 186-205.
- Kolasny, Judette  
1990  
An Example of Rhetorical Criticism: Luke 4:16-30. In *New Views on Luke and Acts*. Richard, Earl (ed.). Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press.
- Laato, A  
1997  
*A Star is Rising: The Historical Development of the Old Testament Royal Ideology and the Rise of the Jewish Messianic Expectations*. In *University of South Florida International Studies in Formative Christianity and Judaism*, 5. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- La Capra, D  
1983  
*Bakhtin Rethinking Intellectual History: Texts, Contexts, Language*. New York: Ithaca.
- Leaney, A R C  
1993  
Christmas. In *Oxford Companion to the Bible*. In Metzger, Bruce M and Coogan, Michael D (eds.), pp. 112-113. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Levine, Herbert  
1992  
The Dialogic Discourse of Psalms. In *Hermeneutics, the Bible and Literary Criticism*. Loades, A, McLain, M (eds.), pp. 145-161. New York: St Martin's.
- Lindars, B  
1961  
*New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations*. London: SCM Press.
- Lodge, David  
1988  
*Modern Criticism and Theory: A Reader*. London: Longman.
- Kerényi, K  
1927  
*Die griechisch-orientalische Romanliteratur in religionsgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung*. Tübingen.
- Kristeva, Julia  
1976  
*Le texte du roman: Approche sémiologique d'une structure discursive transformationnelle*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton.
- Mack, Burton  
1988  
*A Myth of Innocence*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

- Mandolfo, Carleen  
2000  
The Dialogue between Faith and Experience. The Didactic Voice in Psalms of Lament. PhD dissertation. Emory University.
- Marshall, I Howard  
1978  
*The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text.* Exeter Paternoster Press/Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- 1992  
Luke as Theologian. In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Freedman, David Noel, Herion Gary, A, Graf, David F, Pleins, John David, Beck, Astrid B, (eds.). New York, London, Toronto, Sydney and Auckland: Doubleday.
- McCracken, David  
1993  
Character in the Boundary: Bakhtin's Interindividuality in Biblical Narratives. In *Semeia* 63, pp. 29-42.
- Merkelbach, R  
1962  
*Roman und Mysterium in der Antike.* Munich and Berlin: Beck.
- Metzger, Bruce M and Coogan, Michael D (eds.)  
1993  
*The Oxford Companion to the Bible.* New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Meyers, Carol L, and Meyers, Eric M  
1987  
*Haggai, Zechariah 1-8.* New York and Oxford: Doubleday.
- Mitchell, D C  
1997  
*The Message of the Psalter: An Eschatological Programme in the Book of Psalms.* In *Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series*, 252. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Momigliano, Arnaldo  
1971  
*The Development of Greek Biography.* Harvard: University Press.
- Morgan, J R and Stoneman, Richard (eds.)  
1994  
*Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context.* London and New York: Routledge.
- Moore, Stephen, D  
1987  
Are the Gospels Unified Narratives? In SBLSP 26, ed. K H Richards, 443-458. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- 1989  
*Literary Criticism and the Gospels: The Theoretical Challenge.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Morson, Gary Saul and Emerson, Caryl  
1990 *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Neiryneck, Frans  
1993 Genre of Gospel. In *The Oxford Companion to the Bible*. Metzger, Bruce M, Coogan, Michael D (eds.). New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Newsom, Carol A  
1996 Bakhtin, the Bible and Dialogic Truth. In *The Journal of Religion*, Vol. 76, pp. 290-306.
- 2002 The Book of Job as Polyphonic Text. In *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament*, Vol. 97, pp. 87-108.
- Pardes, Ilana  
1992 *Countertraditions in the Bible: A Feminist Approach*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- 1997 The Biography of Israel: Imagining the Birth of a Nation. In *Comparative Literature* 49, pp. 24-41.
- 2000 *The Biography of Ancient Israel: National Narratives in the Bible*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Parsons, Mikeal C, Pervo, Richard I  
1993 *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress.
- Perry, Ben Edwin  
1967 *The Ancient Romances: A Literary-Historical Account of their Origins*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Pervo, Richard I  
1987 *Profit with Delight*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- 1989 *Luke's Story of Paul*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Petersen, David L  
1984 *Haggai & Zechariah 1-8*. London: SCM Press.
- 1995 *Zechariah 9-14 and Malachi: A Commentary*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Phillips, Gary A  
1992 "What is Written? How are You Reading?" Gospel, Intertextuality and Doing Lukewise: A Writerly Reading of Lk 10:25-37 (and 38-42), in *SBLSP* 31: 266-301.

- Plepelits, K  
1976 *Chariton: Deutsche Übersetzung, Einleitung, Erläuterungen.* Stuttgart: Hiersemann.
- Plümacher, Eckhard  
1992 Luke as Historian, translated by Dennis Martin. In *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Freedman, David Noel, Herion, Gary A, Graf, David F, Pleins, John David, Beck, Astrid B (eds.), Vol. 4. New York, London, Toronto, Sydney and Auckland: Doubleday.
- Polzin, Robert  
1980 *Moses and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History, Part 1: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges.* New York: Seabury.
- 1989 *Samuel and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History, Part 2: 1 Samuel.* San Francisco: Harper and Row.
- 1993 *David and the Deuteronomist: A Literary Study of the Deuteronomistic History. Part 3: 2 Samuel.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Praeder, Susan Marie  
1981 Luke-Acts and the Ancient Novel. In SBL 1981 Seminar Papers. Chico USA: Scholars Press.
- Pseudo-Callisthenes (c.140-340 CE)  
1989 *The Alexander Romance*, translated by Ken Dowden. In *Collected Ancient Greek Novels*. Reardon B P (ed.). Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- Radl, W  
1988 *Das Lukas-Evangelium.* (Erträge der Forschung 261), 52. Darmstadt.
- Reardon, B P (ed.)  
1989 *Collected Ancient Greek Novels.* Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.
- 1991 *The Form of the Greek Romance.* Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Reiser, M  
2001 *Sprache und literarische Formen des Neuen Testaments. Eine Einführung.* UTB 2197, Paderborn 2001, 96.

- Robbins, Vernon K  
1981  
Laudation Stories in the Gospel of Luke and Plutarch's *Alexander*. in *Society for Biblical Literature Seminar Papers*. USA: Scholars Press.
- 1992  
Form Criticism. In *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Freedman, David Noel, Herion, Gary A, Graf, David F, Pleins, John David, Beck, Astrid B (eds.), Vol. 2, pp. 838-844. New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Auckland: Doubleday.
- Rohde, E (1876)  
1914  
*Der griechische Roman und seine Vorläufer*. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.
- Rohde, Joachim  
1968  
*Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists*. London: SCM Press Ltd.
- Rose, Walter H  
2000  
*Zemah and Zerubbabel*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Ruden, Sarah  
2000  
*Notes and Topical Commentaries in Petronius, Satyricon*, translated by Sarah Ruden. Indianapolis/Cambridge: Hackett Publishing Company.
- Ruiz Montero, C  
1991  
Aspects of the Vocabulary of Chariton of Aphrodisias. In *Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 41, pp. 484-489.
- Schmeling, G L  
1974  
*Chariton*. New York: Twayne Publishers.
- Schwartz, Sandra  
2003  
Rome in the Greek Novel? Images and Ideas of Empire in Chariton's Persia. In *Arethusa: Center and Periphery in the Roman World*, Vol. 36, Number 3/ Fall 2003.
- Smith, Morton  
1971  
Prolegoma to a Discussion of Aretologies, Divine Men, The Gospels and Jesus. In *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol XC 1971.
- Soards, Marion L  
1990  
A Literary Analysis of the Origin and Purpose of Luke's Account of the Mockery of Jesus. In *New Views on Luke and Acts*, Richard, Earl (ed.). Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press.

- Stahl, Nanette  
1995 *Law and Liminality in the Bible.* Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Staley, Jeffrey L  
1993 "With the Power of the Spirit": Plotting the program and Parallels of Luke 4: 14-37 in Luke-Acts. In *Journal of Biblical Literature*,  
1995 Narrative Structure (Self Stricture) in Luke 4: 14-9: 62: The United States of Luke's Story World. In *Semeia*, Vol 72, pp. 173-213.
- Stanton, Graham  
2002 *The Gospels and Jesus.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stein, Robert H  
1992 Redaction Criticism – New Testament. In *Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Freedman, Noel et al (eds.). Vol. 5. pp. 647-650. New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Auckland: Doubleday.
- Stern, Menahem  
1987 Josephus and the Roman Empire as Reflected in *The Jewish War*. In *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity*. Feldman, Louis H, Hata, Gohei (eds.). Detroit, Michigan: Wayne State University Press.
- Stoneman, Richard  
1994 *The Alexander Romance: From History to Fiction*. In *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*. Morgan, J R, Stoneman, Richard (eds.). London and New York: Routledge.
- Sykes, Seth  
1997 Time and Space in Haggai-Zechariah 1-8: A Bakhtinian Analysis of a Prophetic Chronicle. In *Journal of the Study of the Old Testament*, Vol. 76, pp.97-124.
- Talbert, Charles H  
1974 *Literary Patters, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts*. Montana: Scholars Press.  
1977 *What is a Gospel?: The Genre of the Canonical Gospels*. Philadelphia: Fortress.  
1986 *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel*. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company.

- Talbert, Charles H  
1989  
Luke-Acts. In *The New Testament and its Modern Interpreters*. Epp, Eldon Jay, MacRae, George W (eds.). Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Tannehill, Robert C  
1986  
*The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation Vol 1: The Gospel according to Luke*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Tatum, James  
1994  
The Education of Cyrus. In Morgan, J R and Stoneman, Richard (eds.). *Greek Fiction: The Greek Novel in Context*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Taylor, Vincent  
1960  
*The Gospels*. London: The Epworth Press.
- Tihanov, Galin  
1998  
Bakhtin's Essays on the Novel (1935-41): A Study of their Intellectual Background and Innovativeness. *Dialogism 1* (1998) pp.30-56.
- Todorov, Tzvetan  
1984  
*Mikhail Bakhtin: The Dialogic Principle*, translated by Wlad Godzich. *Theory and History of Literature* Vol. 13. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Tolbert, Mary Ann  
1989  
*Sowing the Gospel: Mark's World in Literary Historical Perspective*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Versnel, H S  
1986  
Greek Myth and Ritual: The Case of Kronos. In *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*. Bremmer, Jan (ed.), pp. 121-152. Totowa, New Jersey: Barnes and Noble Books.
- Weeden, T J  
1968  
Heresy. In *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 59, pp.145-58.
- 1971  
*Mark: Traditions in Conflict*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Weinreich, O  
1962  
*Der griechische Liebesroman*. Zürich: Artemis.

- Wellek, René and Warren, Austin  
1982                    *Theory of Literature*, 3<sup>rd</sup> edition. Harmondsworth:  
Penguin.
- White, Hugh C  
1991                    *Narration and Discourse in the Book of Genesis*.  
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wiley, Patricia Tull  
1997                    *Remember the Former Things: The Recollection of  
Previous Texts in Second Isaiah*. Atlanta: Scholar's Press.
- Winkler, John J  
1994                    The Invention of Romance. In *The Search for the Ancient  
Novel*. Tatum, James (ed.). Baltimore and London: John  
Hopkins University Press.
- Wilson, Brian E  
1991                    Synoptic Format Phenomena. A paper read at the 2001  
International meeting of the Society of Biblical Literature.  
Rome: Pontifical Gregorian University.
- Wilson, S G  
1983                    *Luke and the Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University  
Press.

### Film

- Chapman, Graham, Cleese, John, Gilliam, Terry, Idle, Eric, Jones, Terry, Palm, Michael  
1979                    *Monty Python's Life of Brian*, directed by Terry Jones.  
Starring Graham Chapman, John Cleese, Terry Gilliam,  
Eric Idle, Terry Jones, Michael Palm. Python (Monty)  
Pictures Ltd: CBS Fox Video.
- Gibson, Mel, McEveety, Steven, Davey, Bruce  
2004                    *The Passion of the Christ*, directed by Mel Gibson.  
Starring James Caviezel, Claudia Gerini, Hristo Naumov  
Shopov. Icon Productions: New Market Films.

