

Textual Criticism and Lukan Studies: The (Dis)Connection Between the Two

Mikeal C. Parsons and Gregory M. Barnhill, Baylor University

Abstract: This article proposes that scholarship on Luke’s Gospel and the pursuits of textual criticism are mutually beneficial to one another, and thus each would benefit from greater attention to the other. We demonstrate this proposal through three areas of inquiry: (1) the disconnection of recent developments and discussions in textual criticism on the text of Luke from many interpreters and exegetes of Luke; (2) the way in which select commentators of Luke have handled text-critical issues and their relationship to the standard critical edition of their era of scholarship; and (3) the promise of attention to individual early manuscripts and witnesses to the early text of Luke for addressing exegetical and theological issues. With few exceptions, commentaries on Luke since the late nineteenth century have been influenced primarily by the critical text available, but not as often by the most recently scholarly developments in textual criticism. This article suggests that greater attention to “narrative textual criticism” on the part of Lukan exegetes, specifically considering early manuscripts and witnesses to the text of Luke as early “reception history” and interpretations of Luke, could enrich the task of the history of interpretation of the Third Gospel.

To examine the (dis)connect between textual criticism and Lukan studies, particularly in the form of commentaries on the Third Gospel, is to take aim at two moving targets. As Yii-Jan Lin (and others) have shown, the contemporary practice of New Testament textual criticism moves along at least two trajectories. “Traditional textual criticism,” as she calls it, still aims at recovering an “original” or “initial” text or “earliest attainable text” (any term will be contested).¹ “Narrative textual criticism,” her name for the other trajectory (with which she identifies most closely the work of Eldon Epp, David Parker, and Bart Ehrman), seeks to “analyze the geologic record of texts, studying variants preserved in different layers of history and valuing them for their own sake rather than only as a means of reaching a mythical ancestor.”² While this binary description is useful,³ we rather think of the various approaches to text-critical is-

¹ Yii-Jan Lin, *The Erotic Life of Manuscripts: New Testament Textual Criticism and the Biological Sciences* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 154.

² Lin, *Erotic Life of Manuscripts*, 98. On the other hand, not all “narrative textual critics” have abandoned the search for origins. Lin quotes another of the NTC trinity, Bart Ehrman who argued: “you can’t know what an author meant if you don’t know what he or she said”; Bart D. Ehrman, “Text and Interpretation: The Exegetical Significance of the ‘Original’ Text,” in *Studies in the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, NTTS 33 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 309.

³ The binary works well for Lin in her critique of treating the text as a living, autonomous agent: “the text is understood as a living organism, whether with a skin color and disposition, when it

sues along a continuum, from those primarily invested in establishing and interpreting a base text to those more interested in the different layers of interpretive history, with many points to be plotted in between.⁴

The situation with commentaries is no different. In 1989, in response to the emergence of narrative criticism and other newer methodologies, Alan Culpepper traced the evolution of the commentary genre from pesher commentaries at Qumran (e.g., 1QpHab), to commentaries on Christian scriptures by Origen and Augustine, to the Reformers, to historical-critical commentaries, and finally to what he called the “forerunners” of the next generation of commentaries, mostly, as he imagined it, narrative-critical in nature.⁵ If anything, the *kinds* of commentaries available now thirty years later have proliferated even more. For our purposes, we call attention to two additional kinds of commentaries: (1) the reception history commentary, of which the Blackwell’s Bible Commentary is an example; and (2) the theological commentary, of which the Brazos Theological, the Two Horizons, and the Belief Theological Commentaries are noteworthy specimens.⁶ When considered alongside historical-critical commentaries, the reception history and theological commentaries present interesting, and to some degree, parallel comparisons to traditional and “narrative” textual criticisms. Furthermore, it is not surprising, given their purpose(s), that theological commentaries would exhibit the least interest in traditional textual criticism. For example, literary scholar and medievalist, David Lyle Jeffrey, author of the Brazos Theological Commentary on Luke, used the New King James Version as the “normative English translation,” not because of any perception on his part that the NKJV was based on a superior base of Greek manuscripts but rather because of its “rhetorical power, historical resonance, and continuing presence . . . in many English, literary, and musical settings.”⁷ This approach represents a (nearly) total disconnect with the entire text-critical enterprise, however one construes that endeavor.

is classified, or as a promiscuous, indiscriminate lover that bears corrupted offspring, when its genealogy is traced” (Lin, *Erotic Life of Manuscripts*, 157).

⁴ For example, one can certainly posit differences between the three “narrative text critics” highlighted by Lin. Ehrman does not abandon the notion of an initiating text that has been “corrupted” and, though he has not written a commentary proper on any New Testament text, he had to exercise text-critical judgment in establishing the text of the Apostolic Fathers in his work of Loeb editor and translator of those works. Also, Eldon Epp made judgments regarding the initial text in his monograph on Junia, which traces the afterlife of a textual variant, but with an intent to establish what Paul wrote and its historical and theological implications. Eldon Epp, *Junia: The First Woman Apostle* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005). Parker, on the other hand, has focused on the “fluidity” of the text, but he is also aware, from his position as editor of IGNTP John, of the tension between the “living text” and the “initial text”: see his “Is ‘Living Text’ Compatible with ‘Initial Text’? Editing the Gospel of John,” in *The Textual History of the Greek New Testament: Changing Views in Contemporary Research*, SBLTCS 8, ed. Klaus Wachtel and Michael W. Holmes (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010), 13–21.

⁵ R. Alan Culpepper, “Commentary on Biblical Narratives: Changing Paradigms,” *Forum* 5.3 (1989): 87–102. As was typical of that time period, Culpepper traced the evolution by noting where the commentaries located the meaning of the text (outside the text, in the text, in the reader).

⁶ In the case of the Brazos series, the authors were “not chosen because of their historical or philological expertise. In the main, they are not biblical scholars in the conventional, modern sense of the term. Instead, the commentators were chosen because of their knowledge of and expertise in using the Christian doctrinal tradition.” R. R. Reno, “Series Preface,” in David Lyle Jeffrey, *Luke, Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2012), xii.

⁷ Jeffrey, *Luke*, xv–xvi.

Textual Criticism and Commentaries on Luke

The interaction between other commentaries and textual criticism can be plotted along a spectrum. We have surveyed the broad interaction of forty-two commentaries on Luke over the past 125 years, including both historical-critical/philological and those self-described as literary/narrative/rhetorical/theological. In the appendix, we give the textual decisions by those commentaries (and key critical editions) on twelve of Luke's most-discussed textual problems (3:22; 10:41–42; 22:19b–20, 43–44; 23:34a; and the so-called “Western noninterpolations”). The key critical editions are in blue; the color-coded columns are to highlight ways in which two key editions (WH and NA/UBS) have shaped textual decisions of commentaries in their era.⁸

Regarding historical-critical commentaries, such as ICC, Culpepper observed: “The first need of historical criticism was to establish a textual base.”⁹ This endeavor would seem to be fundamental to the commentator tasked with commenting on the text of the Third Gospel and in line with the traditional goal of New Testament textual criticism, which has been widely held to be that of establishing the “original text” of the New Testament. However, this task has been complicated by text critics who have raised serious questions and/or objections to this approach and who have probed the ambiguity of terminology like “original” or “initial” text. One thinks of the work of Eldon Epp, David Parker, Michael Holmes, and others in this regard.¹⁰ Parker, for example, has argued that the belief “that the purpose of textual criticism is to recover the original text” is “unhelpful” and even has done “harm” to the field of textual criticism.¹¹ Terminology among many text critics has now shifted to speak of the “initial” text (or *Ausgangstext*), but few of the commentaries surveyed engage this theoretical discussion or its implications for the task of commentary writing.

The continuum of interaction with the current state of textual criticism on the part of Lukan commentators can be seen most clearly in the relationship of commentators to the prevailing critical edition of the day. We intend to explore the breadth of this spectrum without being exhaustive. The text of the Third Gospel represents distinctive challenges both to its interpreters and its editors. For example, of the six passages that Holmes chose to enclose in brackets to indicate the text is “doubtful,” four occur in Luke (22:19–20; 24:40; 24:51; 24:52).¹² We have found that even when commentators occasionally depart from the critical edition available

⁸ We are grateful to Samuel Otwell for his assistance in constructing the chart.

⁹ Culpepper, “Commentary,” 92.

¹⁰ Michael Holmes, “From ‘Original Text’ to ‘Initial Text’: The Traditional Goal of New Testament Textual Criticism in Contemporary Discussion,” in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestionis*, NTTSD 42, ed. Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes, 2nd ed. (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 637–88; Eldon J. Epp, “The Multivalence of the Term ‘Original Text’ in New Testament Textual Criticism,” *HTR* 92 (1999): 245–81. For Parker, see next note. For one of the more recent and detailed analysis of the more recent terminology of *initial text* and *Ausgangstext*, see Eldon J. Epp, “In the Beginning Was the New Testament Text, but Which Text? A Consideration of ‘Ausgangstext’ and ‘Initial Text,’” in *Texts and Traditions: Essays in Honour of J. Keith Elliot*, NTTSD 47, ed. Peter Doble and Jeffrey Kloha (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 35–70.

¹¹ David C. Parker, *The Living Text of the Gospels* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 2, 3; see also 3–7 for his extended explanation.

¹² Michael Holmes, ed., *The Greek New Testament SBL Edition* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature; Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2010), xiv, xv. The other two bracketed texts in the SBL text are Eph 1:1 and Col 1:20.

to them, they do not always take into account the most recent text-critical work.¹³ Moreover, even among those commentaries produced since the mid-90s the goals of “narrative textual criticism” are largely neglected in favor of a typical, traditional pursuit of the old notion of the original text as a first step in exegesis. After surveying the history of the connections and disconnections between Lukan commentators and textual criticism, we will offer some reflections on the benefits of integrating “narrative textual criticism” into the tasks of Lukan exegesis.

From Westcott and Hort to the UBS/NA Text

An obvious starting point for exploring the relationship of Lukan commentaries to the developments of textual criticism is Alfred Plummer’s 1896 ICC volume. Having been published only fifteen years after Westcott and Hort’s *Greek New Testament*, Plummer explicitly states, “The text commented upon is that of Westcott and Hort. The very few instances in which the editor is inclined to dissent from this text are noted as they occur.”¹⁴ These instances are indeed few and far between, as we have noted about twenty cases where Plummer’s Greek text disagrees with Westcott and Hort, all of them essentially minor in significance.¹⁵ At 10:41, Plummer follows Westcott and Hort’s longer reading, “But few things are needed, indeed only one,” with no comment on the textual problem.¹⁶ At both 22:43–44 and 23:34a, Plummer concedes to Westcott and Hort’s arguments for their omission, but comments that they must still be retained because “it matters little whether Lk. included them in his narrative, so long as their authenticity as evangelic tradition is acknowledged.”¹⁷ Later Plummer remarks on 22:43–44, “It is true, whoever wrote it.”¹⁸ We can summarize that Plummer follows Westcott and Hort’s text primarily, at some points almost begrudgingly, and even on the Western noninterpolations.¹⁹

Westcott and Hort’s text dominated for decades,²⁰ and the state of Luke’s text at the middle of the twentieth century can be viewed well through the comments in *The Interpreter’s Bible* of 1952.²¹ This commentary series is peculiar because the exegesis is written by one scholar and the exposition by another. In the case of Luke MacLean Gilmour wrote the exegesis and the

¹³ There are some exceptions to this claim; cf. Mikeal C. Parsons, *Luke*, Paideia Commentaries on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015), 9–10 (on the Western noninterpolations) and 320–21 (on Luke 22:43–44).

¹⁴ Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Luke*, ICC (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1896), lxxxviii.

¹⁵ Differences from Westcott-Hort: 1:15; 2:12, 13, 16; 5:39; 6:31; 7:20, 44; 9:13; 10:15; 11:10; 14:17; 16:12; 17:12; 18:30; 19:2; 19:13; 19:17; 23:31, 42; 24:37.

¹⁶ Except on the following $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$ or $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ in 10:42. The more recent NA/UBS critical editions have adopted the shorter reading (“one”). According to Tommy Wasserman, this change is largely due to mistaken readings of manuscript evidence, patristic citations, and evaluation of internal evidence; see “Bringing Sisters Back Together: Another Look at Luke 10:41–42,” *JBL* 137 (2018): 439–61. The recent SBL critical edition (Holmes, *The Greek New Testament*) adopts this longer reading.

¹⁷ See Plummer, *Luke*, 509; also 531, 544–45.

¹⁸ Plummer, *Luke*, 544.

¹⁹ See Plummer, *Luke*, 566–69.

²⁰ John Martin Creed’s influential 1930 commentary on Luke adopts Westcott and Hort’s text as its basis, only departing in a small number of instances. See John Martin Creed, *The Gospel according to St. Luke* (London: MacMillan, 1930), esp. his comments in the introduction.

²¹ S. MacLean Gilmour, “The Gospel according to St. Luke: Introduction and Exegesis,” in *The Interpreter’s Bible*, vol. 8 (New York: Abingdon, 1952).

exposition was written by four other scholars.²² Often it seems that the expositors were unaware of what the Lukan exegete had said about the text!²³ While praising Westcott and Hort's text, Gilmour notes that other "text types" represented by P45 and Codex Bezae and its "allies" are to be given more weight, a decision which has resulted in the somewhat "eclectic" text behind the RSV printed throughout the commentary.²⁴ Gilmour still notes that "the judgment of many modern scholars is in agreement with that of Westcott and Hort" regarding the shorter "Western" readings in Luke, but that the longer "Western" readings are "generally suspicious."²⁵ For example, Gilmour assumes the shorter text at 22:19b–20,²⁶ and throughout chapter 24 the exegesis agrees in adopting the shorter "Western noninterpolations," while at places the exposition includes them (e.g., 24:36b and 24:51b). At 22:43–44 and 23:34a Gilmour argues for the omission of both questionable passages, following Westcott and Hort, but the exposition by Paul Scherer argues precisely the opposite!²⁷ The influence of P45 is felt at 10:41, where the longer reading (the text of Westcott and Hort) is judged suspicious because the shorter reading "one thing is necessary" has the support of the papyrus.²⁸

After the mid-twentieth century, a flurry of developments in textual criticism led to some major revisions to the influence that Westcott and Hort's edition had upon the text of Luke, leading to several significant changes to the Nestle-Aland text of Luke in NA²⁵ (1963), NA²⁶ (1979), and UBS³ (1975). Of course, the NA²⁶ and UBS³ merged into a single text, in what some came to consider a new "Textus Receptus."²⁹ These changes had clear implications for commentaries, especially when combined with Bruce Metzger's 1971 *Textual Commentary*, which became a standard reference point for defending the readings of the Nestle-Aland and UBS critical texts—and remains so today in its second edition (1994). Many commentators have abandoned text-critical work on their own, choosing rather to "outsource" that task to Metzger's *Textual Commentary*.³⁰ Or as R. P. C. Hanson once purportedly and famously quipped: "I look upon the textual critic as I look upon the man who comes to clean the drains. I should not like to do it myself, but I am very glad that someone likes to do it."³¹

In this period, Joseph Fitzmyer's 1981 commentary stands out for his clear adoption of the Nestle-Aland/UBS text along with lucid discussions of important textual problems. In the introduction, Fitzmyer notes his agreement with the NA/UBS text on the so-called "Western

²² The exposition of chs. 1–6 was by Walter Russell Bowie, chs. 7–12 by John Knox, chs. 13–18 by George Buttrick, and chs. 19–24 by Paul Scherer.

²³ In this regard, Krister Stendahl's old "two-step" hermeneutic ("what it meant/what it means") seems to have taken missteps in the IB commentary on Luke. See Krister Stendahl, "Biblical Theology, Contemporary," *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. G. A. Buttrick (Nashville: Abingdon, 1962), 1:418–32.

²⁴ Gilmour, "Luke," 20.

²⁵ Gilmour, "Luke," 21.

²⁶ Gilmour, "Luke," 379–80.

²⁷ See Gilmour, "Luke," 387, 390, 408.

²⁸ Gilmour, "Luke," 199.

²⁹ See I. A. Moir, "Can We Risk Another 'Textus Receptus'?" *JBL* 100 (1981): 614–18; H.-W. Bartsch, "Ein neuer Textus Receptus für das griechische Neue Testament?" *NTS* 27 (1981): 585–92; and Kurt Aland's reply: "Ein neuer Textus Receptus für das griechische Neue Testament?" *NTS* 28 (1982): 145–53.

³⁰ An insight we owe to Michael Holmes in an email dated 31 October 2018.

³¹ Attributed to Hanson by J. N. Birdsall in "Irenaeus and the Number of the Beast (Rev 13,18)," in *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis*, FS Delobel, BETL 161 (Leuven: University Press, 2002), 349–59, here 358–59. We are grateful to Nicholas Zola for drawing our attention to this anecdote.

noninterpolations,” and remarks that the longer readings ought to have at least a B rating in the *Textual Commentary*.³² He puts high importance on the witness of P75 to decide many textual problems.³³ This can be seen most clearly at 10:41, where P75 is given the deciding vote as “the oldest text of Luke.”³⁴ Indeed, in all our test passages Fitzmyer agrees fully with the critical editions of NA/UBS.³⁵ Broadly speaking, Fitzmyer frequently discusses textual problems but very rarely adopts readings against the NA/UBS text.³⁶ While Fitzmyer’s discussions of the textual problems offer insight and depth, the decisions, like Plummer’s, conform to the critical text of his day. On the other hand, given the relative newness of the scholarship that led to these developments in NA²⁶/UBS³, Fitzmyer’s work, again like Plummer’s, can also be viewed as current with the leading developments on Luke’s text.

Two historical-critical commentaries of recent decades deserve mention for their engagement with textual criticism. François Bovon’s commentary on Luke provides excellent treatments of the most important variants,³⁷ and Michael Wolter’s 2008 commentary comments upon eighty-eight textual problems.³⁸ Although Wolter makes no comment about its base text, every textual problem surveyed is contained in the NA²⁷ apparatus, and he departs from NA²⁷ in twenty-one instances, half of which are places where the NA²⁷ text is in brackets.³⁹ Wolter follows NA²⁷ fully in handling the shorter “Western” readings of Luke; in fact, in some cases he makes no mention of the variant readings,⁴⁰ and at 24:12 he is entirely certain that the verse is original.⁴¹ Wolter goes against the NA²⁷ text at the two double-bracketed passages: at 22:43–44 Wolter decides it is a *non liquet*, although he places double brackets around the verses in his translation section, and at 23:34a he decides in favor of the longer text with Jesus’ prayer for enemies.⁴² Wolter’s relation to NA/UBS critical texts is similar in kind to Plummer’s relation to Westcott and Hort: some critical independence in significant cases, but on the whole a reliance on the most recent critical text.

³² Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke (I–IX): Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, AB 28 (New York: Doubleday, 1981), 128–32, esp. 131.

³³ Which is in line with the philosophy of NA/UBS.

³⁴ Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke (X–XXIV): Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, AB 28A (New York: Doubleday, 1981), 894: “However, the recent discovery of P75, the oldest text of Luke, more or less decides the issue in favor of the reading in this lemma.”

³⁵ See Fitzmyer, *Luke (I–IX)*, 485; Fitzmyer, *Luke (X–XXIV)*, 894, 1388, 1443, and 1503.

³⁶ E.g., at 5:2 Fitzmyer notes that the *lectio difficilior* is “little boats” (πλοιάρια) rather than “boats” (πλοῖα), but he still defers to the NA²⁶ text (*Luke [I–IX]*, 566); and at 8:29 Fitzmyer disagrees with NA²⁶.

³⁷ Bovon’s introduction draws attention to the “good condition” of the text of Luke, listing out thirty-four textual problems, six in greater detail. François Bovon, *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1–9:50*, trans. Christine M. Thomas, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), 1. His comments on Luke 3:22; 22:19b–20; and 22:43–44 are especially thorough.

³⁸ Michael Wolter, *The Gospel according to Luke*, trans. Wayne Coppins and Christoph Heilig, 2 vols. (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016–2017). Translation of *Das Lukasevangelium* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).

³⁹ With NA²⁷: 1:37, 46; 2:11, 14, 40; 3:22, 33, 36; 4:17, 31, 41; 5:1, 17, 39; 6:1, 5; 8:2, 3, 16, 26; 9:1, 13, 52, 55; 10:1, 15 (2x), 21, 41–42, 42b; 11:2, 13, 48; 12:14, 18, 56; 13:9, 35; 14:5; 15:21; 16:31; 17:9, 11, 30; 18:14; 19:15, 25; 20:9; 21:19, 35; 22:19b–20; 22:31; 23:17, 42, 53; 24:10, 12, 13 (2x), 17, 26, 38, 47, 50, 51, 52. Against NA²⁷: 3:20; 7:32; 8:43; 9:2, 3; 10:32, 39; 11:14, 33 (2x); 12:27; 13:27; 14:26; 15:16; 17:12, 24; 18:11, 14; 20:27; 22:43–44; 23:34a.

⁴⁰ See throughout Wolter, *Luke 2:539–75*. The major study influencing Wolter in this regard appears to be A. W. Zwiep, “The Text of the Ascension Narratives,” *NTS* 42 (1996): 219–44.

⁴¹ Wolter, *Luke 2:545*.

⁴² Wolter, *Luke 2:479, 482–83* (on 22:43–44), 525 (on 23:34a).

A Near-Total Disconnect

In a large sample of commentaries on Luke, however, we find that such close attention to the textual problems of Luke is not as apparent. The general relationship of Lukan exegetes to text critics is unidirectional: the exegetes receive a text and comment upon the NA/UBS text, occasionally with critical independence, but even then, that is limited mainly to the major textual problems. For example, in the *New Interpreter's Bible*, Culpepper's commentary on Luke does not discuss Luke's text in the introduction and mentions occasionally the most difficult textual problems in the Gospel. While not commenting upon the text of Luke 3:22 or 10:41–42—even though here the textual problem is obvious with the NIV and NRSV printed side by side (which read differently from one another)—Culpepper does discuss a number of text critical issues in the final chapters of Luke. At 22:19b–20 Culpepper notes the textual problem and accepts the longer text in his interpretation,⁴³ while at other “Western noninterpolation” passages he generally accepts the longer readings, explicitly “following the majority of recent critical editions and translations,” although noting, especially in the case of 24:12, that “authenticity is far from certain.”⁴⁴ And while he follows the general consensus that 22:43–44 are an “early gloss on the text,” at 23:34a he favors accepting the prayer as authentic, departing from the NA/UBS critical text.⁴⁵

In the cases of Luke 22:43–44 and 23:34a, which NA/UBS has placed in double brackets to indicate that they are secondary, it seems as if commentaries adopt whatever text is printed, despite what the brackets or apparatus suggests about authenticity. For example, in Joel Green's NICNT commentary, in the twenty-one instances where he discusses a text-critical problem, he only goes against the NA text at two places, 22:43–44 and 23:34a, choosing to admit these texts where NA has double brackets.⁴⁶ John Carroll is a notable exception to this trend, opting for the shorter “Western noninterpolation” texts. He concludes:

I recognize that the “Luke” known to many readers of the Gospel, both ancient and modern, has included the longer form of the text. In the absence of the earliest text as composed by Luke (a state of affairs that will never be remedied), *any* text that is presented as a basis for interpretation will be an artificial construct and thus only approximate a complex textual reality that was fluid for some centuries and therefore cannot be captured with precision.⁴⁷

Still, most of the exegetes who comment on the “Western noninterpolations” do so by considering the variants in isolation from each other. And even when they are explicitly considered together as a group, this is never done in light of other variants in the last three chapters of Luke, despite the fact that twenty years ago, Parker drew our attention to the “incontrovertible evidence that the text of these chapters was not fixed, and indeed, continued to grow for centuries after its composition.”⁴⁸ Parker notes that of the 167 verses in Luke 22–24, 25 percent of them have variants and on that basis observed:

⁴³ R. Alan Culpepper, “The Gospel of Luke,” in *New Interpreter's Bible*, vol. 9 (Nashville: Abingdon, 1995), 418–19.

⁴⁴ Culpepper, “Luke,” 470–71 (on 24:12), 485, 488–89.

⁴⁵ Culpepper, “Luke,” 433, 455. At 22:43–44, Culpepper weighs Ehrman and Plunkett's arguments (and Nolland's discussion) as more convincing than those of Raymond Brown.

⁴⁶ Those twenty-one locations are 1:66, 78; 2:5, 14, 33; 3:22; 4:17, 18, 44; 5:39; 10:1, 38, 42; 16:22; 22:19b–20; 22:43–44; 23:34a; 24:3b, 12, 37, 50–53.

⁴⁷ John T. Carroll, *Luke: A Commentary* (Nashville: Westminster John Knox, 2012), 15.

⁴⁸ Parker, *Living Text*, 172. Parker's work can now be supplemented with the recent proposal by Matthew D. C. Larsen that “gospel texts are not stable, finished, discrete books” but rather an “open-ended, unfinished, and living work.” Matthew D. C. Larsen, *Gospels before the Book* (Ox-

There was a tradition of expanding the text, and all witnesses succumbed to it in one way or another.... The entire text of Luke 22–4 ... requires special treatment because of the extent to which it continued to grow. Within this growing text, the Western non-interpolations are a distinctive sub-group marked out particularly by its anti-docetic emphasis.⁴⁹

Parker then proposes a third way of analyzing these chapters beyond those who consider the quality of manuscript evidence versus those who consider the readings on their own merit:

In the study of the last chapters of Luke, an approach is to be advocated which begins neither with the character of the witnesses nor with the reasonableness of the readings, but with the nature of the way in which the text was passed down the generations.... behind the various texts and groups of witnesses there may be observed a tradition that permitted and encouraged the expansion of the Lukan passion narrative.⁵⁰

Few stretches of text bear out better the acuity of Parker's observation that "the manuscripts are not only transmitters of the tradition. They *are* the tradition."⁵¹

Further Possibilities of "Narrative Textual Criticism" for Lukan Exegesis

In his SBL edition, Michael Holmes observed: "The standard text is viewed by some of those who use it as a 'final' text to be passively accepted rather than a 'working' text subject to verification and improvement.... With a mindset such as this, it is not surprising that entire commentaries have been written that simply take the standard text as printed and scarcely discuss textual matters."⁵² This brief survey of Luke commentaries provides evidence for Holmes's assertion. The survey demonstrates that even among the leading historical-critical commentaries, textual criticism is generally practiced under the strong influence of the critical text available; while among those commentaries emphasizing other strategies for reading Luke's Gospel, the critical text is almost entirely taken as the "original" text of Luke's Gospel.

Furthermore, the editors of the NA/UBS text have done little to discourage this view of a "final" text.⁵³ Kent Clarke has documented an increasing "textual optimism" over the course

ford University Press, 2018), 3, 4. Larsen goes on to conclude that the canonical gospels are to be understood as the gospel "textualized, yet still open, fluid, and in a constant state of flux" (150). While we may not embrace all of Larsen's conclusions on whether Mark itself is to be regarded as unfinished, Larsen adds evidence to the position advocated here regarding the importance of the textual fluidity of the gospels for interpretation.

⁴⁹ Parker, *Living Text*, 173.

⁵⁰ Parker, *Living Text*, 174. Parker concluded: "We are accustomed to associate legendary accretions with apocryphal Gospels. Here, we find a number appearing in canonical Luke. The Gospel story continues to grow within as well as beyond the canonical pages. We might say that Luke is not, in these early centuries, a closed book. It is open, and successive generations write on its pages" (174).

⁵¹ Parker, *Living Text*, 209. Again, Larsen's recent study comes to similar conclusions regarding the entire gospel tradition: "In the open and fluid framework I propose, it may prove unhelpful to distinguish between textual production and 'reception history'" (*Gospels before the Book*, 148).

⁵² Holmes, *Greek New Testament*, vii, viii.

⁵³ Kurt Aland, for example, claimed about NA²⁶ that "a hundred years after Westcott-Hort, the goal of an edition of the New Testament 'in the original Greek' appears to have been reached." Trans. Eldon Epp from "Der neue 'Standard-Text' in seinem Verhältnis zu den frühen Papyri und Majuskeln," in E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee, eds., *New Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis; Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1981), 274.

of the various editions of the UBS text in terms of the notorious rating system assigned to variants. A quick comparison between UBS¹ through UBS³ and UBS⁴ shows this optimism: the number of readings in Luke with A ratings increased from 4 percent (7 variants) to 27 percent (45 variants); the B ratings increased from 27 percent (47 variants) to 47 percent (78 variants); the C ratings decreased from 55 percent (97 variants) to 26 percent (44 variants); and the D ratings decreased from 15 percent (26 variants) to 0 percent (0 variants). The number of variants total decreased from 177 to 167.⁵⁴ The percentage of A and B ratings, representing the view that the text is “certain” or “almost certain” more than doubled from 31 percent in the first three editions to 74 percent in UBS⁴. This (over) confidence in the critical text is illustrated by Clarke with the extended example of Luke 19:25 in which the rating jumped from D in UBS¹ to A in UBS⁴ with no change in manuscript evidence.⁵⁵ Admittedly, the Editio Critica Maior project (ECM) is producing a less “certain” text (judging from the increased number of variants for which no singular reading is preferred in the texts of the Catholic Epistles and Acts). But given the degree to which the Coherence Based Genealogical Method (CBGM) currently baffles exegetes, commentators will likely become more not less dependent on the printed critical edition, at least for the foreseeable future.⁵⁶

What seems to be lacking almost altogether among Lukan commentators is a strategy for employing “narrative textual criticism” toward the ends of exegesis, the history of interpretation, or reception history. Indeed, even François Bovon’s *Hermeneia* commentary (which offers *Wirkungsgeschichte* observations) appears to be hesitant to explore this aspect of the text. He is quite aware of the implications of Ehrman, Parker, and others’ arguments about the pursuit of the “original text” in a comment about 22:19b–20 (which he regards as original): “Shall we accept the opinion of these scholars, give up finding the original text of Luke, and say that these two forms of Luke 22 are of equal value and correspond to two contemporary forms of Luke-Acts?”⁵⁷ Bovon answers negatively, thereby implying that the primary goal of textual criticism is to pursue the original text and missing the potential of “narrative textual criticism” for exegesis.

One example of this potential is the “Western” reading at Luke 3:22, which very few commentaries or critical editions adopt. Many regard this direct citation of Ps 2:7 as a harmonization to the LXX with limited external support.⁵⁸ In fact, only two of the commentaries

⁵⁴ Kent D. Clarke, *Textual Optimism: A Critique of the United Bible Societies’ Greek New Testament*, JSNTSup 138 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997), 76–77. Clarke’s general observations regarding the general confidence expressed in the printed text by the editorial committee are correct, despite certain flaws in his method and presentation of data; cf. Mikeal C. Parsons, “Kent D. Clarke’s *Textual Optimism: A Critique of the United Bible Societies’ Greek New Testament*,” *The Bible Translator* 50.3 (1999): 346–50.

⁵⁵ Clarke, *Textual Optimism*, 154–66.

⁵⁶ For an introduction to the CBGM, see Tommy Wasserman and Peter J. Gurry, *A New Approach to Textual Criticism: An Introduction to the Coherence-Based Genealogical Methods* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017). For example, it will be interesting to see if commentators simply follow the printed text in the case of variants marked with a diamond, the current siglum used in NA²⁸ for the Catholic Epistles (and also in the ECM) to indicate variants for which the editors did not have a singular preferred reading.

⁵⁷ Bovon, *Luke* 3, 155. It is not clear that Bovon, at this point, is fairly representing the points made by the “narrative textual critics.”

⁵⁸ Ps 2:7 LXX reads *υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε*. See, e.g., Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 112–13; Bart D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*, rev. ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 73–79; Bovon, *Luke* 1, 129.

surveyed here adopted this text.⁵⁹ Wolter speaks for most that the reading is “certainly secondary,”⁶⁰ although Ehrman’s strong argument in its favor has been mostly neglected by Lukan exegetes.⁶¹ Still, many commentaries determine that the original wording of Luke 3:22 is *drawn from Ps 2:7* and creates an allusion.⁶²

What would change, however, if one were to view the citation of Ps 2:7 found in Codex Bezae, some Old Latin manuscripts, Justin, Clement, Methodius, Hilary, and Augustine as an early interpretation of the verse, rather than as an inferior corruption of the seemingly pure original? In their recent commentary, A. J. Levine and Ben Witherington seem to follow the line of thinking of Parker’s *Living Text of the Gospels* by concluding about 3:22, “Which reading was the original, or whether there ever was an ‘original’ version of the Gospel as opposed to multiple contemporaneous written versions, cannot be determined.”⁶³ Here Levine and Witherington show their debt to the theoretical bases of “narrative textual criticism,” but provide no further comment upon the exegetical significance of the variant reading.

Perhaps this early interpretation of Luke’s baptismal scene, likely even more ancient than the early witnesses that have transmitted it, correctly perceived the Lukan allusion to Ps 2:7 and does indeed have exegetical significance. Two reasons support this claim. First, the citation sheds light on interpretation of Luke’s Gospel as a whole. An exact Psalms quotation is unsurprising given Luke’s many deployments of the diction and style of the Greek Scriptures throughout the first few chapters. A citation of, or at least an allusion to, Ps 2:7 at 3:22 is virtually required by the larger David structures that connect Luke and Acts, and Acts 13:33 is the “mirror” to the “image” in 3:22.⁶⁴ On internal grounds, the quotation seems appropriate; even Bovon seriously considers the strength of the “Western” reading on internal grounds before ultimately

⁵⁹ Indeed, this is one of the places where the apparatus in the first three UBS editions gave a “C” rating but increased to “B” in UBS⁴ (on which see Clarke, *Textual Optimism*, 190). There are many who prefer this reading from before the mid-twentieth century rise of the NA/UBS text: e.g., T. Zahn, *Das Evangelium des Lucas* (Leipzig: Deichert, 1913), 199–203; E. Klostermann, *Das Lukasevangelium*, HNT 5 (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1929); A. R. C. Leaney, *The Gospel according to St Luke*, Black’s NT Commentaries (London: Hendrickson, 1958), 110–11; as well as B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels: A Study of Origins* (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1925), 143; W. Manson, *The Gospel of Luke*, Moffatt NT Commentary (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930); and W. Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, THKNT (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1966), 107.

⁶⁰ Wolter, *Luke*, 1:177.

⁶¹ Ehrman, *Orthodox Corruption*, 73–79.

⁶² Except for Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 485–86, who even claims that those who see an allusion to Ps 2:7 here have been unduly influenced by the “inferior reading.” See also John Nolland, *Luke 1–9:20*, WBC 35A (Dallas: Word Books, 1989), 162–63. For the allusion, see Wolter, *Luke* 1:177; Hans Klein, *Das Lukasevangelium*, 10th ed., KEKNT I/3 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 171; Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, NICNT (Grand Rapids; Cambridge, UK: Eerdmans, 1997), 186; Bovon, *Luke* 1, 129.

⁶³ Amy-Jill Levine and Ben Witherington III, *The Gospel of Luke*, New Cambridge Bible Commentary (Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 94. We say “seem to follow” because Parker’s *Living Text of the Gospels* is not cited here (or elsewhere in the commentary—only David C. Parker, *Codex Bezae: An early Christian manuscript and its text* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992] is cited). Here they cite Ben Witherington III, “The Anti-Feminist Tendencies of the Western Text of Acts,” *JBL* 103 (1984): 82–84.

⁶⁴ Peter Doble, “Codex Bezae and Luke 3:22—Internal Evidence from Luke-Acts,” in *Texts and Traditions: Essays in Honour of J. Keith Elliot*, NTTSD 47, ed. Peter Doble and Jeffrey Kloha (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 175–99, here 195.

deciding to follow the Nestle text.⁶⁵ Thus, even if the citation is secondary, its presence in the textual tradition potentially spotlights certain aspects of Lukan theology and use of Scripture.

The second reason that the “Western” reading of Luke 3:22 proves exegetically significant emerges from a recent study by Garrick Allen, who has recently explored such “exegetical textual alterations” in Revelation. Allen argues that in several cases copyists perceive the inner logic of the text and make modifications that indicate their interpretation of the text. For example, the copyist of P115 has modified Rev 2:27–28 more closely to the text of Ps 2:9 LXX where an allusion is present in the context of Rev 2.⁶⁶ This allusion is commonly admitted by interpreters of Revelation,⁶⁷ and Allen suggests that “the correspondence with 2:9 suggests that the original reading [of P115] was designed to facilitate identification of the Psalm, an important messianic text in early Christianity.”⁶⁸ Such readings do not so much impose external theological ideas onto the text, as much as they display the understanding of the text by the earliest scribal readers/interpreters.⁶⁹ If Luke 3:22 is approached from this angle, then the variant reading stands not as an error but as a guide to Lukan interpretation from the second century.⁷⁰ Moreover, those who opt for an allusion to Ps 2:7 here, which includes a host of interpreters, could adduce this textual variant as exegetical support.

This role of textual variants in exegesis is, generally speaking, a missing element in Lukan scholarship, particularly commentaries, and we would all do well to heed the warnings being sounded by Wasserman and Epp that when the goal of textual criticism “is defined as restoring the original text of the various authors, variants tend to have a binary character—they are either in or out,” but “when the goal of textual criticism is to explore the wealth of information about the history and thought of the early churches that is disclosed by variant readings, then all meaningful variants are held in much higher esteem.”⁷¹

⁶⁵ Bovon, *Luke 1*, 129. Bovon’s serious consideration is apparent from his comment that the “internal criteria perhaps favor the Western text” and citation of Augustin George, “Jésus Fils de Dieu dans l’évangile selon Saint Luc,” *RB* 72 (1965): 185–209, in favor of the “Western” text.

⁶⁶ See Garrick V. Allen, “Textual History and Reception History: Exegetical Variation in the Apocalypse,” *NovT* 59 (2017): 297–319, here 313–14. This allusion is commonly noted by interpreters of Revelation.

⁶⁷ E.g., Craig R. Koester, *Revelation: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 38A (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2014), 301–2; David E. Aune, *Revelation 1–5*, WBC 52 (Dallas: Word Books, 1997), 209–12.

⁶⁸ Allen, “Textual History and Reception History,” 314.

⁶⁹ As Allen notes, “the wording of a manuscript remained malleable inasmuch as variation corresponded to or illuminated the text’s underlying meaning as perceived by its scribe” (“Textual History and Reception History,” 300). Allen is not alone; even Aland and Aland comment, “While it is true that from at least the third century the scribes tried to copy their exemplars faithfully to the letter, they also followed the meaning as they transcribed the text” (*Text of the New Testament*, 69). Allen gives as further possible examples Codex Sinaiticus at Rev 4:3; 6:14a; 7:6; 10:1; 16:15; 18:3b; 22:10; and P115 at Rev 5:6; 9:19; 11:7b, 12; 14:2a, 9, 15.

⁷⁰ David Parker has argued that it is unlikely that it was scribes who acted as interpreters, at least during the process of copying: “scribes are unlikely to have been the people changing the text, at least as they wrote. It seems more likely that users annotated copies, or made suggestions, or that some changes were made by scribes preparing a MS for use as an exemplar for copying (witness the C group of correctors to Sinaiticus)” (email from David Parker, 11 November 2018). Cf. D. C. Parker, *An Introduction to the New Testament Manuscripts and Their Texts* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 151–54.

⁷¹ Eldon Jay Epp, “It’s All about Variants: A Variant-Conscious Approach to New Testament Textual Criticism,” *HTR* 100 (2007): 275; cited approvingly in Wasserman, “Bringing Sisters Back Together,” 450.

Holmes has also urged that a “fuller understanding of the goal of New Testament textual criticism” should include “both identifying the earliest text *and* also studying all the variant readings for the light they shed on how particular individuals and faith communities adopted, used, and sometimes altered the texts that they read, studied, and transmitted.”⁷² By drawing on the recent developments in “narrative textual criticism,”⁷³ Lukan studies could also adopt a “fuller understanding” of the task of the commentary and fruitfully explore the role that textual variants could play in the subsequent reception and interpretation of Luke’s Gospel. The interpreter is assisted in this goal by the extensive critical apparatus provided in the two volumes of the IGNTP edition of Luke.⁷⁴ Of course, as Parker has recently reminded us, it is not always easy to “distinguish between intentional revision and accidental changes which happen to make sense.”⁷⁵ Nonetheless, as he concludes, “there are enough such readings—some stylistically and some theologically motivated—to justify the new approaches which have sprung up in contemporary textual criticism, and which it is to be hoped will continue to be developed.”⁷⁶

Conclusion

In conclusion, let us return again to the work of Parker who observed:

Textual criticism of the New Testament has been damaged by the notion that it is best left in the hands of experts. This view is no doubt a part of a general division of knowledge into compartments.... It is clear that there is a certain amount of knowledge necessary to practice this discipline. But harm has been done by the assumption that the discipline itself is off limits for anyone who has not devoted their life to it.⁷⁷

This is true even, or especially, when the task at hand is the production of (another!) commentary on the Third Gospel. Writing a commentary these days is a gargantuan task, and anyone currently contemplating such an enterprise might despair at the thought of adding one (or is it a few) more task(s) to an already impossibly long list. But exegetes ignore at our own peril the tasks of considering the rich manuscript tradition with all its variations and mutations as evidence of a living text to be engaged and of understanding those variants, and the manuscripts themselves, as representatives of the various ways in which the Third Gospel has been

⁷² Holmes, *Greek New Testament*, viii.

⁷³ In addition to the work of Parker, Ehrman and others, Claire Clivaz too has called for a method of *par le lectorat antique*, or “through the ancient readership.” See Claire Clivaz, “Luke, Acts, and the Ancient Readership: The Cultures of Author, Scribes, and Readers in New Testament Exegesis,” in *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts*, ed. Andrew F. Gregory and C. Kavin Rowe (The University of South Carolina Press, 2010), 153–71, here 154. Also see the comments by Hans Forster in regard to the Gospel of John in “Textual Criticism and the Interpretation of Texts,” in *Early Readers, Scholars and Editors of the New Testament: Papers from the Eighth Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, ed. H. A. G. Houghton, Texts and Studies 11 (Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2014), 163–87, esp. 168.

⁷⁴ *The Gospel according to Luke. Part One: Chapters 1–12; Part Two: Chapters 13–24*, IGNTP (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1984, 1987).

⁷⁵ D. C. Parker, “Variants and Variance,” in *Texts and Traditions: Essays in Honour of J. Keith Elliot*, NTTSD 47, ed. Peter Doble and Jeffrey Kloha (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 25–34; here 27.

⁷⁶ Parker, “Variants and Variance,” 34. For an example of how variants can be used to inform issues of grammar and style, see e.g., Martin M. Culy, Mikeal C. Parsons, and Joshua J. Stigall, *Luke: A Handbook on the Greek Text* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2010), 53 (on 1:64), 141 (on 4:29), 274 (on 8:27), 343 (on 10:2), 481 (on 14:10), 542 (on 17:6).

⁷⁷ Parker, *Living Text*, 2.

received in the tradition (and may be part of the tradition). We have focused in this presentation almost exclusively on the ways in which commentators can profit from a reconnection with the text-critical enterprise. No doubt text critics can learn a great deal from exegetes who have spent years, even a lifetime, studying the vocabulary and style of an individual author (at least ostensibly), if and when the quest is to establish something like an “authorial” version behind the initial text, but that is itself a complicated and contested proposal and the topic for another day.⁷⁸ Working together and in tandem and occasionally in tension, commentators and text-critics might work more effectively and self-consciously aware of their vital role as preservers, transmitters, and, at times, critics of that living tradition we know as the Gospel of Luke.

⁷⁸ Such an enterprise would have to address Parker’s concern: “The exegete is eager to be given an authorial text. The initial text is not such a text. What should we do to bridge the gulf? Does exegetical method, in particular, its study of authorial style, thought, and text, offer a tool for making the initial text into an authorial text? If it does, is this process a suitable matter for textual criticism? It is worth observing that the boundaries are certain to be obscured, since textual critics use judgments on style and thought in comparing readings in order to reconstruct the textual history. But only rarely does such analysis depart beyond the readings known in the extant witnesses. Using similar techniques to restore an authorial text from an initial text would consist solely of emendations. It is interesting to note in this connection that most of what are known as conjectural emendations have been the work of literary critics far more than of textual critics. On the other hand, how useful are exegetes in the task of reconstructing an initial text? The textual scholar has to reckon with the fact that such a text, based on a period of transmission extending over (in the case of the Gospels) at least a century, will already show signs of what its readers rather than its author thought it should contain” (“Is ‘Living Text’ Compatible with ‘Initial Text’?”, 20)

Appendix

Chart of Forty-Two Commentaries, Major Studies, and Critical Texts
Surveyed on Twelve Textual Variation Units

Commentaries, Major Studies, and Critical Texts	Luke 3:22 (Baptism Scene)	Luke 10:41-42 (Jesus's Saying to Martha)	Luke 22:19b-20 (Bread & Cup)	Luke 22:43-44 (Angel & Agony)
Westcott and Hort (1881)		few or one	shorter	shorter
Plummer, Alfred (ICC 1896)		few or one	shorter	shorter
Zahn, Theodor (1913)	D	one	shorter	longer
Creed, John Martin (1930)		omit (foll. D)	longer	longer
Lenski, Richard C. H. (LCNT 1946)		one	(longer)	(longer)
Geldenhuis, N. (NICNT 1951)		(one)	shorter	longer
Gilmour, S. MacLean (IB 1952)		one	shorter	shorter
Schmid (Regensberger 1960)		[few or] one	longer	longer
NA 25 (1963)		few or one	double brackets	double brackets
UBS 3 (1975) & NA26 (1979)		one	longer	double brackets
Marshall, I. Howard (NIGTC 1978)		either one or few	longer	longer
Talbert, C. H. (1982; rev. 2002)		undecided	longer	longer
Fitzmyer, Joseph A. (AYB 1981, 1985)		one	longer	shorter
Morris, Leon (TNTC 1987)		one	(longer)	longer
Tannehill, Robert C. (Narr. Unity 1989)		not discussed	longer	longer
Nolland, John (WBC 1989, 1993)		one	longer	shorter
Craddock, Fred B. (INT 1990)		undecided	longer	shorter
Ernst, Josef (1993)		one	longer	longer
Stein, Robert H. (NAC 1993)		one	longer	shorter
Ehrman, Bart D. (Orthodox Corr. 1993)	D	not discussed	shorter	shorter
Bock, Darrell L. (BECNT 1994)		one	longer	longer
Ringe, Sharon H. (1995)		(one)	longer	longer
Culpepper, R. Alan (NIB 1995)		not discussed	longer	shorter
Tannehill, Robert C. (ANTC 1996)		one	longer	undecided
Bock, Darrell L. (NIVAC 1996)		(one)	longer	longer
Green, Joel B. (NICNT 1997)		one	longer	longer
Parker, David (Living Text, 1997)		not discussed	shorter	shorter
Bovon, François (HERM 2002-2013)		one	longer	longer
Johnson, Luke Timothy (SP 2006)		one	longer	longer
Klein, Hans (2006)		few or one	longer	longer
Wolter, Michael (2008)		one	longer	undecided
Vinson, Richard B. (2008)	D	one	longer	shorter
González, Justo L. (2010)		not discussed	not discussed	shorter
SBLGNT (Holmes, 2010)		few or one	brackets	longer
Garland, David E. (ZECNT 2011)		one	longer	longer
Jeffrey, David Lyle (BTC 2012)		(one)	(longer)	(longer)
Carroll, John T. (NTL 2012)		one	shorter	shorter
France, R. T. (TTCS 2013)		few or one	(longer)	shorter
Edwards, James R. (PNTC 2015)		one	(longer)	(longer)
Parsons, Mikeal C. (PCNT 2015)		one	shorter	longer (brackets)
Levine and Witherington (NCBC 2018)		one	longer	shorter
Spencer, F. Scott (THCNT, 2019)		few or one	longer	longer

Note: Critical Editions are in blue rows; parentheses around readings indicate that the textual problem is not discussed in depth. The green and orange in the columns for Luke 22:19b–20 and 24:51 indicate the shifting thoughts on these textual problems with Nestle-Aland 25th ed. and UBS 3rd ed.

Commentaries, Major Studies, and Critical Texts	Luke 23:34a (Forgiveness Prayer)	Luke 24:3 (Lord Jesus)	Luke 24:6 (“not here but raised”)	Luke 24:12 (Peter runs)
Westcott and Hort (1881)	shorter	shorter	shorter	shorter
Plummer, Alfred (ICC 1896)	shorter	shorter	shorter	shorter
Zahn, Theodor (1913)	longer	NA	NA	longer
Creed, John Martin (1930)	shorter	shorter	shorter	longer
Lenski, Richard C. H. (LCNT 1946)	longer	longer	longer	longer
Geldenhuis, N. (NICNT 1951)	longer	shorter	(longer)	shorter
Gilmour, S. MacLean (IB 1952)	shorter	*	shorter	shorter
Schmid (Regensberger 1960)	longer	shorter	shorter	shorter
NA 25 (1963)	double brackets	longer	double brackets	shorter
UBS 3 (1975) & NA26 (1979)	double brackets	longer	longer	longer
Marshall, I. Howard (NIGTC 1978)	longer	longer	longer	longer
Talbert, C. H. (1982; rev. 2002)	longer	(longer)	(longer)	longer
Fitzmyer, Joseph A. (AYB 1981, 1985)	shorter	longer	longer	longer
Morris, Leon (TNTC 1987)	longer	(shorter)	longer	(longer)
Tannehill, Robert C. (Narr. Unity 1989)	longer	NA	NA	longer
Nolland, John (WBC 1989, 1993)	longer	longer	longer	longer
Craddock, Fred B. (INT 1990)	longer	NA	NA	longer
Ernst, Josef (1993)	longer	(longer)	(longer)	longer
Stein, Robert H. (NAC 1993)	longer	longer	longer	longer
Ehrman, Bart D. (Orthodox Corr. 1993)	shorter	shorter	shorter	shorter
Bock, Darrell L. (BECNT 1994)	longer	longer	longer	longer
Ringe, Sharon H. (1995)	longer	(shorter)	(shorter)	longer
Culpepper, R. Alan (NIB 1995)	longer	NA	longer	longer
Tannehill, Robert C. (ANTC 1996)	longer	longer	NA	longer
Bock, Darrell L. (NIVAC 1996)	longer	(longer)	(longer)	(longer)
Green, Joel B. (NICNT 1997)	longer	longer	(longer)	longer
Parker, David (Living Text, 1997)	longer	shorter	shorter	shorter
Bovon, François (HERM 2002-2013)	longer	longer	longer	longer
Johnson, Luke Timothy (SP 2006)	longer	longer	(longer)	longer
Klein, Hans (2006)	longer	longer	longer	longer
Wolter, Michael (2008)	longer	(longer)	(longer)	longer
Vinson, Richard B. (2008)	longer	(longer)	(longer)	(longer)
González, Justo L. (2010)	longer	not discussed	not discussed	not discussed
SBLGNT (Holmes, 2010)	longer	shorter	shorter	longer
Garland, David E. (ZECNT 2011)	longer	longer	longer	longer
Jeffrey, David Lyle (BTC 2012)	(longer)	NA	(longer)	(longer)
Carroll, John T. (NTL 2012)	longer	shorter	shorter	shorter
France, R. T. (TTCS 2013)	longer	NA	(longer)	longer
Edwards, James R. (PNTC 2015)	longer	(longer)	(longer)	longer
Parsons, Mikeal C. (PCNT 2015)	shorter (brackets)	shorter	shorter	shorter
Levine and Witherington (NCBC 2018)	(longer)	(shorter/longer)	(shorter/longer)	split
Spencer, F. Scott (THCNT, 2019)	longer	(longer)	(longer)	(longer)

Commentaries, Major Studies, and Critical Texts	Luke 24:36 (Peace to you)	Luke 24:40 (Shows hands & feet)	Luke 24:51 (Ascension)	Luke 24:52 (Worship)	Translation or Text
Westcott and Hort (1881)	shorter	shorter	shorter	shorter	
Plummer, Alfred (ICC 1896)	shorter	shorter	shorter	shorter	author
Zahn, Theodor (1913)	longer	shorter	shorter	shorter	none
Creed, John Martin (1930)	shorter	shorter	shorter	shorter	Westcott & Hort
Lenski, Richard C. H. (LCNT 1946)	(longer)	longer	(longer)	(longer)	author
Geldenhuis, N. (NICNT 1951)	shorter	shorter	shorter	shorter	RSV/NA
Gilmour, S. MacLean (IB 1952)	shorter	shorter	shorter	shorter	RSV/NRSV
Schmid (Regensberger 1960)	shorter	shorter	shorter	shorter	author
NA 25 (1963)	shorter	shorter	shorter	shorter	
UBS 3 (1975) & NA26 (1979)	longer	longer	longer	longer	
Marshall, I. Howard (NIGTC 1978)	longer	longer	longer	longer	author (UBS3)
Talbert, C. H. (1982; rev. 2002)	(longer)	(longer)	longer	(longer)	
Fitzmyer, Joseph A. (AYB 1981, 1985)	longer	longer	longer	longer	author (NA26)
Morris, Leon (TNTC 1987)	longer	longer	longer	longer	RSV
Tannehill, Robert C. (Narr. Unity 1989)	(longer)	NA	undecided	undecided	author
Nolland, John (WBC 1989, 1993)	longer	longer	longer	longer	author
Craddock, Fred B. (INT 1990)	undecided	undecided	longer	NA	RSV
Ernst, Josef (1993)	longer	(longer)	longer	longer	none
Stein, Robert H. (NAC 1993)	longer	longer	longer	longer	NIV
Ehrman, Bart D. (Orthodox Corr. 1993)	shorter	shorter	shorter	shorter	
Bock, Darrell L. (BECNT 1994)	longer	longer	longer	longer	author
Ringe, Sharon H. (1995)	(longer)	(longer)	(longer)	(longer)	NRSV
Culpepper, R. Alan (NIB 1995)	NA	shorter	longer	longer	NRSV/NIV
Tannehill, Robert C. (ANTC 1996)	longer	NA	longer	longer	none
Bock, Darrell L. (NIVAC 1996)	(longer)	(longer)	(longer)	(longer)	NIV
Green, Joel B. (NICNT 1997)	(longer)	(longer)	longer	longer	NRSV
Parker, David (Living Text, 1997)	shorter	shorter	shorter	shorter	
Bovon, François (HERM 2002-2013)	longer	longer	longer	longer	author
Johnson, Luke Timothy (SP 2006)	longer	(longer)	longer	(longer)	author
Klein, Hans (2006)	longer	longer	longer	longer	none
Wolter, Michael (2008)	(longer)	(longer)	longer	longer	author
Vinson, Richard B. (2008)	(longer)	longer	(longer)	(longer)	none
González, Justo L. (2010)	not discussed	not discussed	not discussed	not discussed	none
SBLGNT (Holmes, 2010)	shorter	brackets	brackets	brackets	
Garland, David E. (ZECNT 2011)	(longer)	(longer)	longer	(longer)	author
Jeffrey, David Lyle (BTC 2012)	(longer)	(longer)	(longer)	NA	KJV
Carroll, John T. (NTL 2012)	shorter	shorter	shorter	shorter	author
France, R. T. (TTCS 2013)	(longer)	NA	(longer)	NA	NIV
Edwards, James R. (PNTC 2015)	longer	longer	longer	longer	NIV
Parsons, Mikeal C. (PCNT 2015)	shorter	shorter	shorter	shorter	author (NA28/UBS4)
Levine and Witherington (NCBC 2018)	(shorter/longer)	(shorter/longer)	(longer)	(shorter)	NRSV
Spencer, F. Scott (THCNT, 2019)	(longer)	(longer)	(longer)	(longer)	none