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Last April 6-7 I had an opportunity to attend a NT Symposium at Southeastern Seminary in which one of the topics of discussion was the Synoptic Problem.¹ This was supposedly going to be a balanced presentation of views, and yet four of the five participants, Craig Blomberg, Scot McKnight, Darrell Bock, and Grant Osborne, were advocates of the two-source theory. Only one, William Farmer, was an advocate of the two-gospel hypothesis. Noticeably absent was any advocate of literary independence among the synoptic gospels. When I asked about this I was told that the independence theory was not considered a solution to the Synoptic Problem because it simply states that there is no problem. I soon found that some of the participants were quite defensive about The Jesus Crisis by Robert Thomas and David Farnell.² In this book, Thomas and Farnell accuse evangelical scholars, who hold to the two-source theory and practice critical methodologies such as form and redaction criticism, of differing only in degree but not in kind from the radical conclusions of the Jesus Seminar. These are serious charges, and yet one of the participants at the Southeastern meeting claimed that Thomas misrepresents him over a dozen times in The Jesus Crisis. The debate has been continued in an exchange of articles between Robert Thomas and Grant Osborne in JETS.³ Thomas would rule all use of historical critical tools out of bounds a priori because he considers them tainted with negative presuppositions that necessarily de-historicize the text and deny biblical inerrancy. Osborne believes it is possible to practice source, form, and redaction criticism apart from such negative presuppositions and results, and that he and others are in fact doing so.

Is it possible to practice redaction criticism from an evangelical perspective without de-historicizing the text? Have evangelical scholars actually succeeded in doing so? The purpose of this paper is to look at this question from a pragmatic point of view by comparing the work of four commentators on the book of Luke. The first to apply redaction-critical techniques to the gospel of Luke was Hans Conzelmann.⁴ His work has been called “one of the truly seminal works of our time in the field of New Testament research.”⁵ Then, I. Howard Marshall was the first evangelical to apply redaction criticism to the gospel of Luke.⁶ Finally, Robert Stein and Darrell Bock are two members

¹ The papers presented on the Synoptic Problem are forthcoming from Baker as Rethinking the Synoptic Problem.
² Robert L. Thomas and F. David Farnell, eds., The Jesus Crisis (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1998).
of the Evangelical Theological Society who have written recent commentaries on the
gospel of Luke.\textsuperscript{7} Both have written advocating an evangelical use of historical-critical
methods\textsuperscript{8} and both have been suggested by Osborne as examples of evangelicals who use
historical criticism without de-historicizing the text.\textsuperscript{9}

Luke 9:51-19:27 will serve as a test case. This section is commonly referred to as
the “travel narrative” or “central section.”\textsuperscript{10} It opens with a statement that can be
construed to mean that Jesus is embarking on His final journey to Jerusalem and closes
just prior to Jesus’ triumphal entry in 19:28-44. Much of the material in between is
unique to Luke, and the section as a whole has long presented a problem to New
Testament scholars interested in the chronology of Jesus’ ministry. From all
appearances, Jesus quickly makes the journey from Galilee as far as Bethany, for he
arrives at the home of Mary and Martha in 10:38. The next nine chapters show Jesus
constantly traveling and teaching, and yet making no further progress towards His goal.
In fact, Jesus is found back on the border between Galilee and Samaria in 17:11. This
makes the proposal of a single journey to Jerusalem seem strained at best, and in the
minds of some, entirely untenable.

\textbf{Conzelmann}

According to Conzelmann, Luke betrays his ignorance of Palestinian geography
when he speaks of the border between Samaria and Galilee in 17:11. Although the
statement is reconcilable with an accurate map of Israel, Conzelmann believes that Luke,
who had never been there, had a mistaken conception of the relationship between Judea,
Galilee, and Samaria. Luke supposedly “knows that the inhabitants of Galilee and Judea
are Jewish and that the Samaritans are distinct from them.”\textsuperscript{11} Judea and Galilee must
therefore have bordered one another. Judea was on the coast, with Galilee further inland.
Samaria had a southern border with them. Conzelmann further argues that Luke does not
know that Mary and Martha live in Bethany. He states, “Any identification with the
Johannine setting in Bethany should be avoided, for it would be an attempt to reconstruct
the historical facts. Luke is not familiar with the exact place.”\textsuperscript{12} Conzelmann is now able
to reconstruct the one long journey that Luke had in mind. Jesus attempted to go into
Samaria and was rejected. He then traveled through Galilee along the border with
Samaria, came into Judea, passed through Jericho, and came to Jerusalem.

\textsuperscript{8} E.g. Robert H. Stein, “What is Redaction Criticism,” in \textit{Gospels and Tradition} (Grand Rapids:
Baker, 1991), 21-34; Robert H. Stein \textit{The Synoptic Problem} (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987); Darrell L.
Dockery (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1991), 173-196. See the critique of Stein and Bock by Farnell in
“Form Criticism and Tradition Criticism,” in \textit{The Jesus Crisis} (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 1998), 210-213,
216-219.
\textsuperscript{9} Osborne, “Response,” 116.
\textsuperscript{10} There is broad agreement about the beginning of this section, but considerable difference of
opinion concerning its conclusion. Marshall would end the section at 19:10 while Bock extends it to 19:44.
Conzelmann and Stein both close the section at 19:27.
\textsuperscript{11} Conzelmann, 69.
\textsuperscript{12} Conzelmann, 67.
But this journey and the episodes that it contains do not belong together. According to Conzelmann, “the journey motif and the description of Jesus’ ministry are not only not integrated with one another, they are positively incompatible.”\textsuperscript{13} The journey is therefore “a piece of deliberate editorial work”\textsuperscript{14} and does not reflect the historical facts. This does not create a problem for Conzelmann. Rather it enables him to discern Luke’s Christology from the material that Luke has added to the tradition. The journey motif is Luke’s way of showing that Jesus must suffer and die in Jerusalem.

Marshall

Marshall does not accept Conzelmann’s contention that the journey motif was a Lucan creation.\textsuperscript{15} He finds the motif of a journey in Mark 10:1-52 as well and concludes that it was deeply imbedded in the tradition. Luke found mention of the journey in his sources and incorporated it into his presentation. He uses it “to indicate that from the first prediction of the passion onwards (Luke 9:22) Jesus was conscious of the shadow of Jerusalem hanging over his ministry and had His ultimate destination in view.”\textsuperscript{16}

Luke’s unique contribution is the thought that this was the last journey to Jerusalem. But Marshall considers it “impossible to construct an itinerary that runs clearly through this section…. Luke cannot have been consciously providing a geographical progress from Galilee to Jerusalem.”\textsuperscript{17} Marshall takes an agnostic viewpoint towards the correct chronology of the events recorded, since in his view Luke uncritically accepted the material in his sources without trying to construct an accurate chronology. Several episodes must be out of place according to Marshall’s reading of the text.

Stein

Stein also accepts the basic journey motif. He notes, “Each Synoptic Gospel points out that after the transfiguration Jesus headed toward Jerusalem.”\textsuperscript{18} But beyond this he is skeptical of the exact chronology. Stein states, “Since the arrangement of much of the Gospel material is frequently due to nonchronological motives, it is impossible to postulate how soon after the events surrounding Caesarea Philippi and the transfiguration Jesus came to Jerusalem.”\textsuperscript{19} In particular, regarding the central section of Luke, he states,

The placement of these materials is due to literary concerns. Thus we cannot argue that this journey must have taken a considerable amount of time for Jesus to have taught all this material. The nonchronological nature of Luke’s placement of Jesus’ teachings found in Luke 9:51-18:14 is also seen in that much of this

\textsuperscript{13}Conzelmann, 67.
\textsuperscript{14}Conzelmann, 62.
\textsuperscript{19}Stein, Jesus the Messiah, 175.
material is found in Matthew before his accounts of the events surrounding Caesarea Philippi and the transfiguration.  

Bock

Bock also sees the organizational principle of Luke’s central section as being theological rather than chronological. He considers it an accurate “summary of Jesus’ final phase of ministry” but notes that there is an “absence of clear chronological and geographical indicators.” Consequently, Bock states,

The concern is not so much a straight-line journey but an accurate representative portrayal of this decisive period…. Some sequencing may be present and traceable, and where it exists it is important; it is not, however, the major concern of the section…. As a result, one should pinpoint the place and time only when Luke makes the connection clear and otherwise be content to know that Luke is describing something in the final phase of Jesus’ ministry.

Luke 9:51-56

The material in this paragraph is unique to Luke. All four commentators seem to accept its authenticity, though Bock argues for it most vigorously. Conzelmann and Marshall simply insist that it comes from a pre-Lucan source. Both Conzelmann and Marshall also consider Luke 9:51 a Lucan creation which sets the theme for the entire travel narrative. Marshall also argues that the story that follows about Jesus’ rejection in a Samaritan village is chronologically out of place. In subsequent material Jesus is still in Galilee so He cannot have entered Samaria this early on His last journey. It is possible that the episode is taken from an earlier journey but Marshall assumes that 9:51 intends to introduce Jesus’ last journey.


This paragraph records three encounters between Jesus and would-be disciples. The first two incidents (Luke 9:57-60) are closely parallel to Matt 8:19-22. The third (Luke 9:61-62) is unique to Luke. But the setting in Matthew is different from that in Luke. Matthew records these incidents as Jesus and His disciples are preparing to cross the lake from Capernaum to Decapolis. Luke records them as they going along the road to Jerusalem.

---

20 Stein, Jesus the Messiah, 175.
Bock lists three possible interpretations. 1) Matthew may have the right chronological placement and Luke may be topical. 2) Luke may have the right chronological placement and Matthew may be topical. 3) Both Matthew and Luke may place this event topically. He rejects the possibility of distinct events as well as the suggestion that the event is not historical. Bock prefers the third option, that both Matthew and Luke have placed this event topically. Conzelmann considers the words καὶ πορευομένων ἀυτῶν in v 57 “to be an editorial contribution” and Stein says that “Luke placed these sayings in the travel narrative” by the use of these words. Marshall understands these encounters to come from a catena in Q dealing with discipleship. Matthew and Luke have each placed the incidents, as they consider appropriate. Thus, none of the four consider the words καὶ πορευομένων ἀυτῶν historically reliable. Stein suggests that traveling along the road (ὁδὸς) may be “a metaphor for the ethical demands of the Christian ‘way’.”

Bock believes the first two encounters are drawn from a common Q source and that Luke has generalized the first while Matthew has simply not mentioned that Jesus initiated the second conversation. Thus the accuracy of both accounts is preserved. Marshall considers the Matthaean form of the second encounter original and argues “that Luke has shifted Jesus’ command ‘Follow me’ to the beginning of the scene, so that the conversation begins less abruptly and Luke is able to add the command to go and preach at the end of the reply of Jesus.” Stein also considers the command to go and preach a Lucan addition. Thus both Marshall and Stein apparently have Luke putting words in Jesus’ mouth that He did not speak.

Bock argues for the authenticity of the third incident and denies that it is a Lucan creation. It is perhaps drawn from a different version of Q or from one of Luke’s other sources. Marshall also considers it likely that the third incident comes from a different version of Q, or else that Matthew simply omitted it.

**Luke 10:1-24**

Luke is the only gospel to record the sending of the seventy. The sending of the twelve has been related previously in Luke 9:1-6 (with parallels in Matt 10:1, 9-14; Mark 6:7-13). The difficulty comes in that there are also many similarities between Luke’s account of the sending of the seventy and Matthew’s account of the sending of the twelve. Luke 10:1-12 has many verbal similarities to Matt 9:37-38; 10:7-16. Luke

---

28 Conzelmann, 66.  

Marshall suggests that Mark had one account of this event and Q had another.

Luke based his account of the mission of the Twelve on Mk. (with some influence from Q), but Matthew conflated material from Mk. With parallel material from Q; both the Marcan and Q material were probably based ultimately on the same tradition [emphasis added]. These facts raise the question of the historicity of the present account.\footnote{Marshall, The Gospel of Luke, 412-413.}

Marshall goes on to say that Luke avoids doublets so it is “unlikely that Luke simply invented the second mission.” It is “more probable that he was following his sources.” Marshall also says, “It seems likely that the mission sayings in Q were addressed to a wider group than merely the Twelve, and that Mark has narrowed their scope [emphasis added].” On the whole, it appears that Marshall believes there was only one historical event behind the two accounts in Luke. He attempts to exonerate Luke by saying that he is only following his sources, but the sources, it seems, go back to the same event.

Marshall considers it “inconceivable that Jesus himself could follow up all the visits of 36 pairs of missionaries, nor is there any evidence that he did so.” He suggests that Luke uses this story to allude to the mission of the church. Stein follows the same reasoning.

That Luke wanted his readers to think that Jesus was to visit thirty-six separate towns on the way to Jerusalem is unlikely. To do so would have entailed a most circuitous route. It probably is better to understand this as preparing these villages for Jesus’ spiritual coming after the resurrection.\footnote{Stein, Luke, 304.}

Bock accepts the authenticity of both accounts in Luke. “That the instructions to both groups should be basically the same is not surprising, since efforts by the same person to organize different groups for a similar task often share similar elements.” But he questions the chronological placement of this second mission because the woes expressed in vv 13-15 are directed against Galilean cities. They seem more appropriate to a Galilean setting.

One cannot rule out the possibility that Luke arranged the material thematically, so that the second Galilean mission is placed after the first mission and near the

\footnotesize{\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{Marshall} Marshall, \textit{The Gospel of Luke}, 413. Conzelmann (67) holds that Luke differentiated his sources by adding the “editorial word” εἰρήνη in v 1. Luke is also responsible for casting this material, “which presupposes a fixed center of operations, as is shown by x, 17,” as part of the journey to Jerusalem.
\bibitem{Stein} Stein, \textit{Luke}, 304.
\end{thebibliography}}
Samaritan mission. The only temporal note, Luke 10:1, indicates that the event occurred after the discussion on discipleship, which Matthew had in Matt. 8:18-22.\textsuperscript{46}

Thus Bock is willing to rearrange the events, but denies that any creative elements are present.\textsuperscript{47} Marshall also considers it unlikely that vv 13-16 stand in their original context, favoring the context in Matthew following the mission of the Twelve.\textsuperscript{48}

Bock considers vv 21-24 to be a separate event from the parallels in Matthew. He notes that John 10:15 and 17:2 are also thematically similar, suggesting that Jesus made similar remarks on more than one occasion.

[A]n itinerant ministry has repetition, which could lead to the use of similar material in distinct settings. These factors raise the probability that additional material is the reason for such differences. One need not choose between Luke and Matthew in such cases.\textsuperscript{49}

But Marshall prefers the parallels in Matthew and considers it likely that either Luke or Q has combined two originally separate sayings.\textsuperscript{50} He does defend them as authentic sayings of Jesus though, based on their Jewish background.\textsuperscript{51}

**Luke 10:25-37**

The parable of the Good Samaritan is unique to Luke, but the initial exchange in vv 25-28 bears some surface similarity to Matt 22:35-40; Mark 12:28-31. In both cases a lawyer asks Jesus a question and in both cases Deut 6:5 and Lev 19:18 are cited in response. But here the similarity ends. The differences are greater than the similarities. In the first place, the questions are different. In Matthew the question is “Teacher, which is the great commandment in the Law?”\textsuperscript{52} Here it is “Teacher, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?” In Matthew and Mark, Jesus answers the question but in Luke Jesus turns the question around and the lawyer answers it. Most importantly, in Matthew and Mark the incident occurs after Jesus has already reached Jerusalem and is teaching in the temple but in Luke the incident occurs while Jesus is still traveling.

Marshall considers it “incontestable that Luke knew Mark’s form of the story and regarded his own as an equivalent to it, although this does not mean that he regarded the two incidents as identical.”\textsuperscript{53} He suggests that some of the differences might be due to Luke’s redactional activity. But there are also some details common to Matthew and Luke that are absent from Mark. This suggests the possibility that Q had a different version of the story. According to Marshall, “It is certainly possible to regard the

\textsuperscript{52} Matt 22:36 (NASB). Mark 12:28 has “What commandment is the foremost of all?”
versions in all three Gospels as independent developments of the one basic story.”

However, he stops short of committing himself to this possibility and offers as an alternative the possibility that Luke records a separate incident.

Stein argues for the unity of the question and the parable the follows. He considers the possibility of a source in Mark or Q for Luke’s material but seems favorably disposed to the possibility “that these are two different incidents in Jesus’ ministry.” Bock goes so far as to call the possibility of two events likely.

Luke 10:38-42

Jesus comes to the home of Mary and Martha. This incident is unique to Luke. John’s gospel identifies the hometown of Mary and Martha as Bethany, which is approximately two miles from Jerusalem, but Luke simply identifies it as “a certain village” (κωμή τοῦ οίκου). Conzelmann says that Luke is ignorant of the exact place. Marshall believes that Luke was aware of a tradition that placed them in Bethany but omits the place name “because he does not regard Jesus as being near Jerusalem at this point.” In other words, Luke knows the incident is out of place but places it where he does for theological reasons. Bock is similar. He says, “If Bethany was the only home of these women (John 11:1, 18; 12:1) and if these two are the same ladies that are present in John, then Luke’s arrangement of the journey section is more thematic and topical.” He believes Luke omitted the reference to Bethany “because he is not yet stressing in the journey sequence being near to Jerusalem.” Stein also believes this account is placed here for literary reasons.


Most of the next nine chapters can be passed over quickly. There are few chronological and geographical markers and most of these are quite general. The crowds are increasing. Jesus is traveling and teaching. His teachings are sometimes similar to material found in Matthew, and occasionally Mark, in other settings.

---

57 Conzelmann, 67.
Marshall and Stein routinely assign these to Q, which often entails a chronological and geographical dislocation by either Matthew, Luke, or both. Bock occasionally does the same, though he is willing to recognize separate incidents for most of these. From Luke 18:15 onward, the accounts of the three synoptic gospels increasingly coalesce as Jesus makes his final approach to Jerusalem.

Luke 13:22-35, however, requires some attention. Verse 22 is the first reminder that Jesus is traveling toward Jerusalem since 9:53. Marshall considers this a Lucan insertion that provides no geographical information at all. Conzelmann denies that vv 31-33 originally belonged in a journey setting. He acknowledges that “Luke has the support of existing tradition, but he develops it by producing from the available materials a new plan of the life of Jesus in three stages.” Luke uses this incident to show that the journey has a purpose in itself and must be of a long duration. Marshall states that this incident “raises no historical difficulties” and argues against theories of significant redactional activity. Bock places this incident geographically in either Perea or Galilee.

Verses 34-35 are very close to the wording of Matt 23:37-39 though the setting is different. Matthew’s account occurs after Jesus has reached Jerusalem and is in the temple. Marshall and Stein both suggest that Luke has dislocated the incident based on a catchword link with “Jerusalem” but Bock considers it “more likely that independent material is present or that such a speech was given on multiple occasions.” The words “how often” (ποσάκις) in v 34 suggest to Marshall several visits by Jesus to Jerusalem and the possibility of harmonization with John. Stein allows for this possibility as well, though he does not seem to prefer it.

Luke 17:11

A brief word about Luke 17:11 is also in order. This was the linchpin of Conzelmann’s argument for Luke’s geographical ineptitude. The phrase διὰ μέσον Σαμαρείας καὶ Γαλιλαίας is difficult to interpret. It might refer to a journey through both regions or to a journey along the border of the two regions. Marshall suggests that Perea


68 Conzelmann, 68.


might be considered part of Galilee, so the reference might be to the border between Samaria and Perea.75 Bock argues that ministry on the Galilean-Samaritan border is entirely appropriate since Jesus approach to Jerusalem is temporal, not geographical.76 Conzelmann considers it strange that Samaria is mentioned first.77 Marshall and Stein both explain this as being due to the importance of the Samaritan leper in the story that follows.78

**Evaluation**

Grant Osborne has spoken of “two dangers in the current debate: doctrinal deviation (as some de-historicize the Biblical text), and a vigilante approach (as others demand their own interpretations in the name of inerrancy),”79 In what follows, I hope to warn against the first without falling into the second. Thomas has identified four types of editorial activity that redaction critics find in the gospels: selectivity, arrangement, modification, and creativity.80 The first two of these present no difficulty. The gospel writers clearly “did not use all the material available to them,” nor did they “always arrange their material in chronological order.”81 Thomas also sees the suggestion of minor modifications in the gospel accounts as acceptable.

However, when such modifications are extensive enough to revise the substance of what was done or said on a given occasion, the boundaries of an adequate view of inspiration are exceeded, and the critical tool has moved into the realm of “historic” or radical Redaction Criticism. The same is true of the alleged creativity practiced by the gospel writers. If material that is in any degree non-historical is attributed to the writers’ creativity, the approach is no longer conservative.82

How do the commentaries by Marshall, Stein, and Bock fare in this regard? In the material reviewed, Bock never seems to go beyond the suggestion of selection and arrangement by the gospel writer. He upholds the historicity of each incident recorded. While the degree of topical arrangement he allows for in Luke’s central section at times seems excessive, it would seem that anyone who allows for topical arrangement anywhere in the gospels cannot disallow this as a viable exegetical option.

---

77 Conzelmann, 68.
81 Thomas, “Redaction Criticism,” 257. Thomas allows that Matthew 8-9 are thematically arranged.
82 Johnston, et al., “The Evangelical and Redaction Criticism in the Synoptic Gospels,” 8. Osborne (“Round Four,” 405) also speaks of a growing consensus to allow “selection, arrangement, or modification so long as they do not impinge upon the historical veracity of the gospel material.”
Stein, on the other hand, goes beyond selection and arrangement on a number of occasions. He suggests that Luke added details to “place” incidents in settings that are not historically accurate. He even has Luke placing words in Jesus’ mouth that Jesus did not speak.\footnote{An example not mentioned previously relates to the parable of the minas in Luke 19:11-27. Stein (Luke, 471) states, “All of 19:11-27 does not stem from Jesus. The opening verse is clearly from Luke’s hand, and this reveals how he interpreted this parable. Other material in the parable also reveals his theological emphases.”} Stein is a member in good standing of the Evangelical Theological Society and I do not question his commitment to inerrancy. It is my evaluation, however, that he has written some things in his commentary that are inconsistent with that commitment. John Warwick Montgomery says it well.

Whether one attaches the word “inerrant” to the end product is really of little consequence. It is meaningless to use the word inerrancy for a situation in which the “inerrant” record says that Jesus did things and said things temporally, geographically, and substantively which he did not in fact do or say.\footnote{John Warwick Montgomery, “Evangelicals and Biblical Criticism: The Continuing Saga,” Global Journal of Classical Theology 2/1 (1999). Available from http://www.trinitysem.edu/journal/jwm_ad_osborne.html. Internet; accessed 3/2/01.}

My evaluation of Marshall would be similar. While he seems favorable to the historicity of Luke’s overall account, his insistence on seeing Q whenever there are vaguely similar passages in Matthew leads him to posit significant editorial changes in the details of that account. His use of critical tools often cannot get him beyond leaving the question of historicity open.\footnote{An example not mentioned previously relates to story of the Samaritan leper in 17:11-19. Marshall (The Gospel of Luke, 650) lists objections to the historicity of the account then concludes, “These considerations, however, do not disprove historicity, and it is better to leave the question open.”} Marshall seems genuinely skeptical of the historicity of the mission of the seventy.
A Proposed Chronology

It is possible to construct a coherent chronology of Luke’s central section by building on a few foundational principles.


2. The material in Luke 9:51-19:27 that is similar to material Matthew places in a different setting most often represents a separate incident. Almost all of this is teaching of Jesus and it is reasonable to expect an itinerant preacher to repeat Himself with variations in another location. The lone exception to this is Luke 9:57-62 (=Matt 8:19-22) where the dialogue makes the suggestion of a separate incident difficult. It is suggested that Luke represents the proper chronological placement of this event and Matthew has arranged the material topically.

3. The chronological markers in Luke 9:51-19:27, though slight, are sufficient to indicate a sequence of events. This is not problematic once the attempt to construct a geographical straight-line itinerary is abandoned.

4. The reconstruction suggested here allows for a convenient harmonization with the gospel of John.

Luke 9:51 corresponds to Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem for the Feast of Tabernacles in John 7. John records that Jesus did not travel to this feast publicly, but privately and later than the rest of the crowds. Luke records a journey through Samaria, which would be quicker than the normal route by way of Perea.


Luke 13:22 records a visit to Jerusalem for the Feast of Dedication. Following this Jesus returns to Perea (John 10:40). He returns to Bethany briefly and raises Lazarus from the dead (John 11).

Eventually Jesus makes His way north through Samaria (Luke 17:11) and joins the pilgrims from Galilee as they travel through Perea to Jerusalem for the Passover. This last journey corresponds to the journey recorded in Matthew 19-20 and Mark 10.