

RBL 11/30/1998

Paffenroth, Kim.
The Story of Jesus According to L

JSNTSup 147

Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997. Pp. 200, Cloth, \$58.00, ISBN 1850756759.

Mark Goodacre
University of Birmingham
Birmingham, B15 2TT UK

The feverish interest in Q, its stratification, its history, and its genre has tended to be so obsessive in recent times that its poor relations M and L have been somewhat neglected. In *The Story of Jesus According to L*, Kim Paffenroth is attempting to make up for the lack and to engage in a thorough investigation of the special Lukan material, with a view to isolating a coherent pre-Lukan L source.

Paffenroth begins, after the statutory but well-done introductory survey (chapter 1), by delimiting the material to be considered (chapter 2). He eliminates material that might reasonably be thought to be Luke's redaction of Q or Mark, or that might be Lukan composition. He then submits the remaining material to analysis under several headings: vocabulary and style (chapter 3), formal characteristics (chapter 4), and content (Chapter 5).

The evidence gathered in each section points to the same conclusion, that "the L material does seem to have enough dissimilarities from Lukan style, form, and content to make it probable that this material is pre-Lukan" (p. 143) and, further, that there are such "internal consistencies of style, form and content" that it becomes likely that the L material is from one unified source and not a number of diverse sources. Paffenroth is inclined toward a written L source, the outline, genre, and history of which is proposed in the conclusion (pp. 143-58). The book ends appropriately with "a presentation of L as I have reconstructed it" (pp. 159-65).

Paffenroth's coherent, readable thesis is a well-argued contribution not only to a neglected area of research into the synoptic problem, but also to studies of Luke and, more broadly, Christian origins. For a reviewer who is inclined to see Lukan creativity on a much broader scale in the L material, however, there are several qualms.

(1) The argument from language often has it too easy. Like many other synoptic scholars, Paffenroth does not pay adequate attention to the thorny issue of Luke's versatility. Among the evangelists, he is the most capable of apparently writing "uncharacteristically" since he has the largest vocabulary, the greatest number of *hapax legomena*, and a disturbing habit of varying his synonyms. Paffenroth does not engage, for example, with Michael Goulder's claim that Luke introduces more *hapaxes* into Mark than he takes over. The difficulty is compounded by the fact that Paffenroth seems to work with a highly idiosyncratic definition of the term *hapax legomena*. Though on p. 70 they are "words that occur nowhere else in Luke-Acts," on p. 73 he goes on to discuss "hapax legomena that occur in more than one L pericope," listing words such as *br/exw* (Luke 7:38, 44; 17:29) and *g/amos* (Luke 12:36; 14:8). I do not understand how words like this, "that occur in *more than one L pericope*" (p. 78, my emphasis), can be described as *hapax legomena*.

(2) In the search for "un-Lukan" features, one cannot help thinking that with a sharp enough scalpel, everything is unique. On the Zacchaeus story, for example, often thought to be so typical of Luke, we discover that "the fit with Lukan theology is again not perfect" (pp. 64-75).

(3) The methodology, which proceeds from Luke's known redactional procedures (based on use of Mark and Q) to the establishment of unknown source material (L), is potentially helpful but a little too mechanically employed. Due attention is not always given to the contexts in which certain features occur, nor to the overall development of the story of Luke-Acts.

(4) Paffenroth apparently assumes that Luke's redactional habits would have been even throughout his work. This is a possible assumption but not the only possible assumption. What if Luke's reaction to material from oral tradition was different from his reaction to material from written tradition? What if Luke had interacted with the different kinds of material for differing lengths of time? What if "L" materials were, on the whole, more to Luke's taste and so more richly redacted than Mark and Q, with more care, attention, and flare?

These criticisms ought not obscure the fact that this is a useful study, with some genuinely interesting observations and contributions. If it succeeds in its attempt to reopen the debate over Luke's sources, it will have scored an important goal.

I noticed the following errors in the book, "geneogy" (p. 54), *pr/oz* (p. 63, n. 229), "noed" (p. 71), "ocurs" (p. 78), the title of Hawkins's *Horae Synopticae* given incorrectly (p. 80, n. 65), "casezs" (p. 80), *hm/era* (p. 81), "L. Healings" (p. 110), "simizlarly" (p. 132, n. 101).

