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ABSTRACT
The preaching of John the Baptist is considerably changed by the inclusion of the Sondergut-tradition (3:10-14) by Luke. The judgement of John's preaching is toned down and Luke's socio-economical interest is communicated. People should share, not exploit one another and accept social outcasts. This ethic integrates with the merciful attitude which Luke communicates in the rest of the Gospel towards all kinds of suffering.

1 INTRODUCTION
Luke's Gospel is often typified as the 'Gospel for the poor' (cf Degenhardt 1965; Schmithals 1975; Pilgrim 1981) and as the Gospel which has a special interest in socio-political matters (cf Guthrie 1970:90-92; Cassidy 1980; Cassidy 1987; Cassidy & Scharper 1983; Ford 1984). In the process emphasis is especially laid on the Lucan Jesus who is advocating the specific social stance which is so accommodating towards the 'underdog'. It is my contention that Luke also employs one of his other main characters to convey his point of view vis-à-vis social ethics. He has also done so with Mary in the Magnificat (cf Scheffler 1988b:43-52) and by introducing the Standespredigt (preaching on social ranks, 3:10-14; cf however par 3.2) into the mouth of John the Baptist, the latter's preaching and ministry as a whole communicates Luke's special interest. It will be the purpose of this article to trace Luke's activity in order to achieve this purpose. The Standespredigt is therefore to be analysed within the immediate context of John's ministry as reported in Luke 3:1-20, as well as the Gospel as a whole.

The main focus of this article will be on the Standespredigt. First of all the immediate context (3:1-9,15-20) in which the Standespredigt appears will be examined (par 2). Well aware of the fact that the treatment of Luke 3:1-9,15-20 could just as well have taken place as part of Luke's redactional or compositional activity with regard to the Standespredigt itself, we deem a glimpse into the broader framework of John's preaching as desirable for an adequate understanding of Luke 3:10-14. Secondly the socio-ethic of the Lucan Baptist as it especially appears from 3:10-14 will receive our attention (par 3). The Standespredigt will be scrutinised as far as its structure, genre, tradition and redaction is concerned (par 3.1-3.4). In the concluding paragraph (4) the socio-ethic is summarised as mercy towards various kinds of suffering.

2 LUKE'S PRESENTATION OF BAPTIST-TRADITIONS FROM MARK AND Q
In Luke 3:1-20 Luke relates John's ministry and ultimate fate. For this purpose he uses all the sources known to him and compiles a new account.
The following table provides some insight into the sources used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VERSE</th>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th>TRAD/RED</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>historical note</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>Luke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6</td>
<td>preaching of repentance</td>
<td>mainly trad</td>
<td>Mk 1:2-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-9</td>
<td>eschatological doom</td>
<td>mainly trad</td>
<td>Q (Mt 3:7-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>ethical preaching</td>
<td>mainly trad</td>
<td>Sondergut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-17</td>
<td>messianic preaching</td>
<td>mainly trad</td>
<td>Mk &amp; Q (Mt 3:11-12; Mk 1:7-8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>summary</td>
<td>red</td>
<td>Luke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>fate of John</td>
<td>mainly red</td>
<td>Lk &amp; Mk 6:17-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In our present discussion of 3:1-9,15-20 we shall focus on Luke’s presentation of the Mark- and Q-traditions in so far as his redaction reflects his special view on ethical matters. We shall also ask to what extent his presentation of these traditions is influenced by the incorporation of the Standespredigt which seems (as is clear from the table above) to occupy a central place in his presentation of the Baptist’s ministry.

By starting with a historical note (the second in his Gospel – cf 2:1-2), Luke demarcates a new section in his Gospel in which John and Jesus’ ministries are grouped together and therefore viewed as being closely related (cf Tannehill 1986:52-53). This is important, for as will emerge below, John’s ethical preaching is viewed to be along the same lines as that of Jesus.

By mentioning the political and religious leaders who were in power in Palestine when John’s and Jesus’ ministries took place, Luke situates his report of these ministries within world history. Not only his view on the historicity of John’s ministry is thereby underscored, but also the contrast between the ‘humble history’ of John and the ‘official history’ of world leaders. At another place in his Gospel Luke explicitly makes this distinction between John and those in high places:

> What then did you go out to see? A man clothed in soft clothing? Behold, those who are gorgeously appareled and live in luxury are in kings’ courts (Lk 7:25 – RSV).

The rhetorical implication is clearly that John’s is a humble lifestyle. Luke repeatedly pictures John as having his home in the desert (1:80; 3:2; 7:24 — perhaps among the Anawim of Qumran?), in contrast to Mark 1:4 which states that he went out into the desert (ἐγένετο...ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ). According to Lindijer (1981:38-39) Luke pictures John as one who chose the lifestyle of the poor from free will. For Luke John’s ‘humble history’ forms part of the history of salvation, and salvation, which in Luke usually implies alleviation for the lowly (cf Glöckner 1975:121-124; Scheffler 1988:167-170), does not primarily take place in high places but among the ordinary people of the land (the ἐγκλητικοί — cf 3:17,10).
This portrayal of the Lucan Baptist as being one of the lowly is of primary importance for the latter's socio-ethic, for Luke portrays John as being consistent with the ethic which he preaches (especially as it is reflected in the Standespredigt).

In his version of John's preaching of repentance (Lk 3:3-6; par Mk 1:2-6), Luke portrays John as the one who took the initiative and went out in every district about the Jordan (contra Mk 1:4). This view of John as a type of missionary preacher (cf Schneider 1977:85) who goes out (ἦλθεν) to preach the release of sins not only tones in with the well-known motif of Luke's universalism (πᾶσαν...περίχωρον), but also with his view of John as primarily a preacher of salvation rather than mere doom. With regard to John the reader already knows from Luke 1:77 the connection between the forgiveness of sins (ἀφέσις ἁμαρτιών) and knowledge of salvation (γνῶσις οἰκτήρας). The link is now again made when Luke (contra Mk 1:3) gives a longer quotation from Deutero-Isaiah which includes Isaiah 40:5 (= Lk 3:6: καὶ ἂνευτι πᾶσα σάρξ τοῦ οἰκτήρον τοῦ Θεοῦ - LXX). Luke therefore clearly underscores the liberating and universal (πᾶσα σάρξ) dimensions of the motif of the forgiveness of sins. As we shall see below, this redaction of Mark will also clearly integrate with the socio-ethic of the Lucan Baptist, because salvation and universalism appear to be the driving force behind that ethic.

In Luke 3:7-9 Luke is relatively faithful in his transmission of the 'preaching of doom' of the Q-source (cf Mt 3:7-10), but in his context he interprets it as the introduction to the Standespredigt. For this reason he introduces the 'multitudes' in verse 7 (contra Q = Mt 3:7 which reads Pharisees and Sadducees) who again respond in verse 10. This does not mean that according to Luke the Pharisees and Sadducees are in principle excluded from salvation (cf Lk 15:31-32). Luke rather emphasises (versus Pharisaic and Sadducaic particularism) that salvation is not exclusively meant for these groups, but for all (the δὲ Χαλκοὶ - cf Fitzmyer 1981:467), especially also those whom the Pharisees and Sadducees excluded (e.g the toll-collectors and soldiers - 3:12,14; see Jeremias 1971:113). The connection with the Standespredigt by means of the δὲ Χαλκοὶ (with the τελῶναι and στρατευόμενοι emerging from them) therefore also has the implication that the Baptist's attack on nationalistic particularism in verse 8 (on who can be children of Abraham) is intensified. In the Standespredigt it emerges that toll-collectors can also, in the words of verse 8, be raised as children of Abraham and later in the Gospel Zacchaeus the toll-collector is explicitly called 'a son of Abraham' (19:9).

The close connection in the Lucan context between the Sondergut-tradition of the Standespredigt and the Q-tradition on eschatological doom therefore has the result that the preaching of doom is actually turned against itself because of the new focus on the possibilities of salvation. This gracious attitude which emerges from the new Lucan version also lies at the basis of his socio-ethic.

At this stage the Standespredigt actually should have deserved our attention. Since it will receive separate and fuller treatment below, the last part of the report on John's ministry (verses 15-20) will first be discussed briefly. However, it will emerge that, as it was the case with
the *Standespredigt* and its immediate preceding paragraph (3:7-9), the meaning of John's messianic preaching (3:15-17) as well as the summary of his preaching as a whole (verse 18) is co-determined by its combination with the *Standespredigt*. It will therefore be appropriate to refer to these verses again in our discussion of the *Standespredigt* itself.

Of the synoptic Gospels only Luke (cf Jn 1:24-27!) remarks that the people mistook John for being the Messiah. What is important in the Lucan version is that the opinion regarding John was formed on the basis of his preaching thus far (especially the *Standespredigt*). The salvific aspect of John's preaching has received particular attention, with the result that 'the people were in expectation' and 'questioned in their hearts' (3:15). However, Luke's sources (Mk and Q — cf Mk 1:7-8 and Mt 3:11-12) on the ἴσχυρότερος μου seems to be rather harsher than Luke's own thought and in line with the preaching of doom encountered earlier (cf Lk 3:7-9; Mt 3:7-10). For Luke, however, the ἴσχυρότερος is also the Messiah and the Messiah has salvatory connotations. In fact, the Messiah forms the climax of John's salvation preaching. The Marcan and Q-traditions therefore had to be reinterpreted to this extent.

Luke has 3:16 in common with Mark and Matthew and 3:17 in common with Q (Mt 3:12). He achieves his purpose of focussing on salvation by means of a minor redaction of the latter verse. It reads as follows:

**Luke 3:17**

His winnowing fork is in his hand, to *clear* his threshing floor, and to *gather* his wheat into his granary, but the chaff he will *burn* with unquenchable fire.

**Matthew 3:12**

His winnowing fork is in his hand, and he will *clear* his threshing floor and *will gather* his wheat into the granary, but the chaff he *will burn* with unquenchable fire.

Luke's redaction consists only of changing two future tenses of Q into aorist infinitives (διακαθαρεῖν -> διακαθάρα; συνάξειν -> συναγαγεῖν). The result is that Jesus' positive salvation activity is pictured as something that will take place immediately. However, Luke leaves the word κατακάυσαν in the future tense. Luke therefore de-eschatologise the positive salvation activity and creates a gap between God's merciful attitude towards men (= the present gathering of wheat) and the judgement (= the future burning of the chaff). What in Q refers to the eschatological day of judgement is by Luke reinterpreted to focus on the positive salvific aspect that takes place here and now (cf Schneider 1977:87). This is similar to the reinterpretation which he attained in 3:7-9 (cf above).

What Luke wanted to achieve with his compilation of 3:1-20 is actually spelled out by himself in 3:18. John παρακαλῶν εὐηγελίζετο: his preaching is essentially not a preaching of doom, but good news (cf 1:19; 2:10; 4:18; 7:22; 9:6). The judgement preachings of Q are in his view only exhortations which serves John's preaching of salvation to the people (cf Bornhäuser 1934:1-2). This 'easing' of judgement preaching and its exhortatory use appear again in the Gospel. The severe threat of hellfire of Mark 9:43-48 is omitted after Luke 17:2, but the day of judgement is
used to motivate care among Christians in Luke 12:35-48 (cf Scheffler 1988:367-368). As a man who had sympathy with sufferers, Luke (despite his commitment to transmit his sources), disliked and toned judgement preaching down, or employed it to promote an ethic of care towards sufferers.

Luke concludes his version of John's ministry by a redactional comment (referring to information from his source — cf Mk 6:17ff) on the fate of John (3:19-20). Luke pictures the Baptist as the forerunner of Jesus, not only as far as the latter's socio-ethic is concerned, but also with regard to his suffering. As was the case with Jesus, the notion that a consistent socio-ethic leads to suffering also applies to John. Therefore it is important that John's sufferings are mentioned here where he explicitly reports about the relationship between John and Jesus. The socio-ethic of John and Jesus seems to be of the same brand, but the ethic of Jesus will even exceed that of John (cf 6:29). Since the same also applies to Jesus' suffering, Luke does not directly report about John's death but only about his imprisonment (cf Ellis 1974:91).

3 THE SOCIO-ETHIC OF THE STANDESPREDIGT

The main focus of this article is meant to be on the socio-ethic of the Lucan Baptist as it emerges from the Sondergut-tradition which became to be known as his Standespredigt (however, cf 3.2 below). Enevitably our consideration above of the text which surrounds 3:10-14 has already given us a preliminary understanding of these verses themselves. It has emerged that the incorporation of this tradition changed the tenor of the other traditions considerably. What has been said above about Luke 3:1-9,15-20 should therefore best be scrutinised again in the light of the more detailed analysis of the Standespredigt that follows.

3.1 Demarcation and textcritical issues

As became evident above, the Standespredigt is well embedded in the narrative which surrounds it. However, for tradition-historical reasons (it belongs to Luke's Sondergut) it can also be demarcated as a unit in itself. Being inserted in the Q-tradition which precedes and follows it (3:7-9//Mt 3:7-9 and 3:16-17//Mt 3:11-12), its social ethical teaching also forms a contrast to the severe judgment preaching of the Q-tradition (cf Wellhausen 1904:5).

However, by means of redactional activity (cf verses 7, 10 and 15) Luke linked it to its present context thereby giving the preaching of John a new meaning (cf above and below). A separate look at the tradition is therefore justified, but not without its relation to the context in which it appears.

As far as textcritical issues are concerned we limit ourselves to variants which pertain to our present interest, namely the socio-ethical dimension. Codex Bezae deserves our attention. Probably in pursuance of Acts 16:30 D reads τί ποιήσωμεν ἵνα σωθῶμεν in verses 10, 12 and 14. Most commentators (cf e.g Grundman 1974:103) regard this reading (although not the original) as a correct interpretation of the question asked by the multitudes, toll-collectors and soldiers (= what shall we do in order to
be saved from the coming judgement?). However, the link between the ethical preaching and the preceding pericope was actually established by the changing of καρπὸν ἄξιον in the Q-document into καρποῖς ἄξιοις (cf Mt 3:8 and Lk 3:8). Although D's reading is not totally out of context (cf 3:7), the actual intention of the question is rather: what shall we do that will be fruits in keeping with repentance? Codex Bezae's reading therefore does not only lack enough support from textual witnesses but also does not do sufficient justice to the context of 3:7-14.

3.2 The structure and genre of the Standespredigt
As far as structural analysis is concerned, it should be noted at the outset that I assign only a relative value to it. I do not regard it as the final key in involving the meaning of the text. In my view it complements redaction criticism, since it is based on the final text (the one left by the redactor). The division of the text into thought units, interrelated in subsections, facilitates reference to the text and permits a provisional assessment of the overall construction of a passage.1

The Standespredigt actually forms the center of John's preaching, although 3:15-17 can be regarded as its climax. It is so closely linked to the judgment preaching to the multitudes in verses 7-9, so that verses 10-11 can even be regarded as part of that subsection, which as a whole will then concern John's interaction with the multitudes. The interaction with the toll-collectors (3:12-13) and soldiers (3:14) are then in themselves further subsections (Klostermann 1975:53). Keeping this close connection with 3:7-9 in mind, the structure of 3:10-14 can then be regarded as follows (in the ensuing discussion all references will be in accordance with the verse numbering given below):

Luke 3:10-14

10 a Καὶ ἐπηρώτων αὐτὸν οἱ ὄχλοι λέγοντες:
   b τί οὖν ποιήσωμεν;

11 a ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς:
   b ὁ ἔχων δύο χιτώνας μεταδότω τῷ μὴ ἔχοντι,
   c καὶ ὁ ἔχων βραχίων ὁμοίως ποιεῖτο.

12 a ἦλθον δὲ καὶ τελῶναι βαπτίσθηναι
   b καὶ εἶπαν πρὸς αὐτὸν:
   c διδάσκαλε, τί ποιήσωμεν;

13 a ὃ δὲ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτοὺς:
   b μηδὲν πλέον παρὰ τὸ διατεταγμένον ὑμῖν πράσσετε.

14 a ἐπηρώτων δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ στρατευόμενοι λέγοντες:
   b τί ποιήσωμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς;
   c καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς:
   d μηδένα διασειότατο
   e μηδὲ συκοφάντηστε
   f καὶ ἀρκείσθη τοῖς ὑπανίοις ὑμῶν.
Three subsections, A, B and C can be distinguished as having the question τί ποιήσωμεν in common. This question responds to the command of the Baptist in the previous pericope to do καρποὺς ἀξίους τῆς μετανοίας (3:8).

In subsection A the answer given to the multitudes contains a general positive statement of what all people (therefore it is addressed to the ὄχλοι) should do in order to produce fruit in keeping with repentance. The precepts functions on a concrete material and economical level: those who have food and clothing (not necessarily the rich) should share with those who have nothing (the begging poor). Becoming poor oneself (in accordance with the Armfrömigkeit of the Anawim), the meticulous observance of the law (cf Ps 1:2-3), prayers, fastings or cultic observations (cf Mt 23:4,23) are not demanded, but positive charity in daily life instead.

In subsection B the toll-collectors (for the preference of this term see Fitzmyer 1981:469-470; cf also Scheffler 1988b:68-69; 1988c:27) are addressed with regard to their own specific situation and the καρποὺς ἀξίους τῆς μετανοίας are for them even more concretised. The answer to them is specific and negative in the sense that emphasis is laid on what they should not do rather than on what they should do. This is possible because the positive command to share also applies to them as part of the multitudes. What they should not do also functions on an economical level: they should not exploit their position (cf Fitzmyer 1981:470) and the ignorance of ordinary people with regard to toll tariffs in order to enrich themselves, because for this they were especially hated and regarded as social outcasts. On the other hand, what is expected of them is not as harsh as what would have been expected of them by the religious establishment, namely to quit their job and to do restitution (Jeremias 1971:113).

In subsection C another despised profession (soldiers) is dealt with. They probably were Jewish mercenaries who served in the army of Herod Antipas (Wellhausen 1904:5; Bornhäuser 1934:12-14; Holtz 1964:467; Fitzmyer 1986:370). Like the toll-collectors, they are also cautioned not to abuse their position in order to obtain money by violence or false accusation, and also they are not required to quit their profession. The positive aspect of what is said to them (and the tax-collectors) is expressed in the words: ‘be content with your wages’ — 3:14).

Taken as a whole, the pericope communicates an economical message. People should positively share material goods with the poor. However, economical sharing, economic justice and the prevention of greed (πλεονεξία — cf 12:15) go hand in hand (cf Degenhardt 1965:60). Hence the Baptist’s exhortation against over-collection and the obtaining of money by violence or false accusation.

With regard to literary type or genre it should be noted that the designation Standespredigt (which in effect has become a proper name for this pericope in German literature) is not actually correct. It refers to the introduction of the toll-collectors and soldiers in verses 12-14 as representatives of various ranks (= Stände) of society. This, however, overlooks the important initial saying addressed to the multitudes who are representative of all people in general (cf Schneider 1977:86). Bultmann (1967:155) discusses the passage under the heading ‘Gesetzesworte und
Gemeinderegeln' and calls it 'ein katechismusartiges Stück...eine späte
ehellenistische Bildung'. It is also doubtful that it can come from an
early Christian baptism catechism since the answers given to the
toll-collectors and soldiers are too specific.

If merely the form of Luke 3:10-14 is taken into account, the
question-answer scheme is conspicuous. This dialogical scheme is
reminiscent of the so-called 'Socratic interrogation' which originated in
Hellenistic rhetoric but was used by rabbi's (and the evangelists) in
organising their materials (e.g. Lk 7:36-50; 10:25-37). However, it does
not have the specific form of the 'Socratic interrogation', which usually
consists of a question, counter-question, forced answer and refuting
answer (Ellis 1974:121; Scheffler 1989a:65-66). If the content of the
pericope is taken into account Schneider's (1977:86) typification as
'sittliche Unterweisung' or Schürmann's (1969:166) as 'paränetische
Summarium' is probably the most appropriate. In my view it should be
called social ethical teaching.

By employing the genre of teaching (on a question answer basis), the
Baptist is not depicted as a preacher of doom who communicates by means of
a monologue. His liberating message therefore seems to be facilitated by
the choice of the genre, especially if it is kept in mind that the
addressees of Luke's Gospel were Greeks.

3.3 The tradition behind the Standespredigt
source or 'Sonderquelle' (= SLk, cf Grundmann 1974:103), Q (Schürmann
1969:169) or Luke himself (Horn 1983:92-93) have been suggested as
possible origins.

If the pericope is regarded as coming from the Sondergut, the tidy
stylistic integration particularly with 3:7-9, (cf 2 above) remains a
problem. It seems as if 3:10-14 is interwoven so much into its present
textual context that an autonomous existence in another source
(SLK) can hardly be visualised (cf especially οὖν in 3:10b and δὲ καὶ...βαπτισθήναι
in 12a which presuppose 3:7-9).

To regard it as Q-material, which Matthew omitted, neutralises the
problems mentioned above, but is unlikely in view of the already mentioned
(cf above) contrast in content between 3:10-14 and 3:7-9,16-17. The
Standespredigt, as far as content is concerned, 'disturbs' the severity of
Q's preaching of judgement rather than toning in with it (cf 2 above).

According to Bultmann (1967:155) the Standespredigt is 'vielleicht...
eine relativ späte hellenistische Bildung, die aus dem überlieferten Wort
v.l...herausgesponnen ist (von Lk selbst?).' This suggestion was taken up
by Horn 1983:92-93) who vigorously argues for Lucan authorship for the
following reasons:

Firstly, the language is Lucan. Horn extensively quotes Jeremias
(1980:107-112) but the latter reaches a different conclusion (112).

Secondly, the dialogical scheme is Lucan (cf Flender 1968:79-83). This
is probably true (cf besides Horn's and Flender's references also 7:36-50;
8:39-47; 10:25-37), but does not imply that a dialogical scheme cannot
contain traditional material (cf Mk 14:3-9 in Lk 7:36-50 and Mk 12:28-34 in Lk 10:25-37).

Thirdly, Luke's choice of the toll-collectors and soldiers as John's addressees, complements his interest in these groups, as can be discerned from the rest of his writings (toll-collectors: 5:33-39; 7:29; 15:1; 18:9-14; 19:1-10; soldiers: 7:1-10; the omission of Mk 15:16-20a; 23:47; Ac 10:1-45; 16:23-40). This argument in itself is certainly true, but still does not imply Lucan authorship for 3:10-14 as a whole.

Fourthly, Horn regards 3:10-14 as Lucan because the pericope integrates with the immediate context stylistically and as far as content is concerned with his peculiar social interest in the rest of the Gospel. Although compelling, even this argument is not enough proof for Lucan authorship since Luke could have been responsible for the smooth stylistic integration into the immediate context of 3:1-20. He also could have chosen a whole tradition (or parts of tradition) that integrated with his social interest, as he, for example probably did with the Magnificat.

Even the convergence of the above-mentioned arguments need not necessarily be indicative of Lucan authorship. Perhaps Horn pushed the argument so far for the sake of substantiating his thesis that Luke rather wanted to communicate a 'Wohltätigkeitssparänese', for example as reflected in 3:11 than 'ebionitische Armutsforderung' (1983:169-188). However, his arguments do seem to suggest at least substantial redactional activity in 3:10-14. Most problems are most likely met by a thesis which does justice to probable traditional material (according to Schmidt 1969:26 all three sayings contained in the present responses and according to Schottroff & Stegemann 1978:138, only the first) which was reworked by Luke himself into the dialogical scheme (cf the coherent structure of the passage as it emerges from the structural analysis, par 3.2). Although speculation on this remains a non liquet, these traditional sayings need not have originated with the Baptist himself (especially if Q reflects the 'severe' nature of his preaching correctly), but could even have been borrowed from traditions like Isaiah 58:7 and Ezekiel 18:5-9 (in accordance of Luke's practice of creative reinterpretation — cf Scheffler 1988:82).

3.4 Redaction criticism of Luke 3:10-14

Since redaction critism is often regarded as being in a dead end, some preliminary remarks on my view of it is necessary.

To my mind redaction criticism of Luke's Gospel should be conceived as the total activity of the redactor, who is also the final author of the text. It is therefore not limited to the actual editing of Mark (which I prefer to call specific redaction), but also includes the overall composition of the narrative. As far as the tracing of the redactor's activity with regard to a specific tradition (e.g. the Standespredigt) is concerned, three matters deserve attention. Firstly, the contribution of Luke to the tradition should be established (which is difficult when the Vorlage is not available, as is the case with the Standespredigt). Thereafter the integration of the tradition within its immediate context (e.g. Lk 3:1-20) should be investigated, whereafter the place of the tradition in the Gospel as a whole should be accounted for. To my mind any
exegesis which concerns itself with the complicated nature of the Synoptic Gospels (especially Matthew and Luke), cannot deny the relevance of these questions which redaction criticism seeks to answer.

If our analysis of the tradition of Luke 3:10-14 is correct, in his specific redaction Luke himself reworked the three sayings 11b-c, 13b and 14d-f into the present dialogical scheme. Since Q does not spell out directly what the fruit of repentance is, Luke saw this as an opportunity to communicate his special socio-economical interest. Viewed from this perspective, the Standespredigt can be regarded as a midrash on καρπὸν ἄξιον τῆς μετανοίας (Mt 3:8). This seems to be a redactional technique of Luke's, namely to develop his social concern from the instigation he gets from specific words or phrases or (cf for example 11:39-41 where he changed the subject from the washing of hands to the giving of alms — cf Scheffler 1988b:66; 1988c:26).

Luke wanted to communicate the saying on sharing (11b-c) as a fruit of repentance, but because it is a saying which he thought to be generally applicable, he made the ὁχλοι John's addressees. He consequently had to introduce the ὁχλοι in 3:7 also (contra Mt which reads Pharisees and Sadducees). The result of this was that the judgement preaching is addressed to the ὁχλοι, but in the present context it is toned down because of the close linkage to 3:10-11. In the context the judgement preaching of Q is thereby paraenetically employed to invoke a positive reaction of sharing (cf 3:18).

Probably in pursuance of the universal tenor in the saying that God is able from stones, to raise up children to Abraham (3:8, cf 19:9), Luke specifically introduces the toll-collectors and soldiers to be amongst those who came for baptism. If it is accepted that Q read 'Pharisees and Sadducees' in 3:7 (par Mt 3:7), there is irony in Luke's deliberate choice of social groups that were hated by the same Pharisees and Sadducees and that were also excluded from membership in their religious parties (cf Jeremias 1971:113; Edwards 1981:30; Ford 1984:40-41). Because of their mere contact with the Gentiles, Jewish toll-collectors were ostracised according to the strict abiders by the law (cf Holtz 1964:471, n15, also Lk 7:34). Because Luke transmitted three different sayings as the fruit of repentance he changed the καρπὸν ἄξιον of Q (cf Mt 3:8) into the plural (καρποὺς ἄξιους in Lk 3:8).

Important for the integration and meaning of 3:10-14 within the context of 3:1-20 (cf also par 2 above) is also Luke's redactional activity in the verses that follow 3:10-14. Luke 3:15 is redactional (Jeremias 1980:109) and states that the people, on account of the Standespredigt, suspected that John was the Messiah. This serves a double purpose: Firstly, because the Standespredigt serves as the 'historical basis' for the misunderstanding regarding John's possible messiaship, (Schmidt 1969:27) the socio-economic implications of Luke's concept of the Messiah is suggested. Secondly, the misunderstanding is used to illustrate Jesus' superiority over John.

That Luke meant the Standespredigt to be good news is especially clear from 3:15 (προσδοκῶντος) and 3:18 (εὐηγελίζετο). Luke not only motivates
The ethical teaching by means of the judgement preaching of 3:7–9, but also alleviates the latter by means of the Standespredigt. In considering Luke 3:10–14 in relation to the rest of the Gospel, the frequent call to renounce riches (Besitzverzicht) and to do charity, is conspicuous. Throughout the Gospel the addressees are prompted to sell (from) their goods and to give to the poor. In 6:29 Luke interprets love for the enemies as giving away what one has left even if one was the victim of theft, in 11:41 Jesus says that one should not give so much attention to the washing of a cup as to giving alms from what is within it; in 12:33 the ‘treasure in heaven' implies a literal selling of possessions and giving of alms; in 14:13,21 the poor are among those whom should be invited to a banquet; in 16:19–30 the rich man ends in Hades for not having cared for the poor Lazarus; in 18:22 the rich ruler is urged to sell what he possesses and to distribute it to the poor; in 19:8 Zacchaeus is presented as setting a positive example in giving half of his goods to the poor (= halber Besitzversicht as in 3:11 — cf Schottroff & Stegemann 1978:137–140). The book of Acts integrates with these ideals of sharing. The first believers 'sold their possessions and goods and distributed them to all, as any had need' (Ac 2:45) and Paul is depicted as one who coveted no riches but rather set the good example of labouring to support the weak (Ac 20:33–35). Because the saying of 3:11 is addressed to the multitude, it is not just the rich who are enjoined to give to the poor; those among the poor who have even a little should also give to the begging poor (who have nothing). The presentation of the early church in Acts 2:44–47 as a sharing community seems to correlate with John's socio-ethic. That the community was probably poor is suggested by the collection taken for them by the hellenistic churches (Rm 15:26; 2 Cor 8:4). In Jerusalem (Luke's ideal) it was not just a case of the rich giving to the poor, but of Christians, rich and poor alike, sharing.

According to Conzelmann (1964:93) Luke incorporated the Standespredigt in order to create a ‘Zwischenraum von unbestimmter...Dauer von der Parusie'. This view integrates with Conzelmann's threefold scheme of the history of salvation which he distinguishes in Luke. However, to view this as the main focus of the Standespredigt is to overlook the subject matter of 3:10–14 itself and not to integrate that subject matter with similar recurring motifs in the rest of the Gospel. Conzelmann's scheme itself, is, however, not hereby denied. One could even argue that Luke (cf Lk 16:16) incorporated the Standespredigt in John's preaching to use the spokesman of all three stages of salvation history to propagate his social interest: John (Old Testament), Jesus (Mitte der Zeit) and Paul (the church, cf Ac 20:33–35). This would also complement a narratological reading of Luke-Acts in which the point of view of the narrator is communicated through the main characters (the protagonist Jesus, and his helpers) of the story.

4. CONCLUSION: MERCY TOWARDS SUFFERERS IN LUKE 3:10–14

Luke's version of the Q-saying in 6:36 reads γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες instead of ἔσεσθε οὕν ὑμεῖς τέλειοι (Mt 5:48). Compassion towards various kinds of
suffering lies at the basis of the Lucan ethic, and not least so in the ethic which he communicates through the character of John the Baptist. The ethic in 3:10-14 functions primarily on the socio-economical level.

By means of all three sayings Luke seems to give his answer firstly to economic suffering. According to him salvation comes to the poor when charity and mutual sharing take place in daily life among people and when covetous exploitation is eliminated. To share with the poor is demanded both from the rich as well as the ordinary poor who must share with the begging poor (Schottroff & Stegemann 1978:138). According to Schmithals (1980:52) the ideal of mutual sharing amongst the poor was especially meaningful from the perspective of Luke’s own time when Christians became poor as a result of persecutions and had to rely on one another to survive. That persecutions formed part of the situation of Luke’s day is probable, but perhaps does not represent the whole truth. Seccombe (1983:13-16) also indicated that certain texts in Luke’s Gospel suggest a situation in which the Christians were ‘choked by the cares and riches and pleasures of life’ (8:14; cf also 12:45; 17:26-37). It therefore seems probable that there were rich and poor Christians in Luke’s community, and in this situation an ethic of economic sharing and justice is advocated (cf also Van Tilborg 1988:212-215; Scheffler 1989b:261-262).

The ethic of the Baptist also accords with the author’s ethic on a mere social level in that it polemises against social ostracism. To be merciful also means to accept all categories of people socially. Horn (1983:93) alleges that it is ‘wahrscheinlich dass Lk die Welt der Zöllner und Soldaten in irgendeiner Form vor Augen hat’, but he does not link this observation to any concentration on the soldiers and toll-collectors as suffering groups. The Standespredigt cannot solely be regarded as an ‘an alle gerichtete Mahnung zur Wohltätigkeit’ (contra Degenhardt 1965:60). By deliberately introducing the toll-collectors and soldiers (at the expense of the Pharisees and Sadducees) Luke gives special attention to the ‘social underdog’. In the text they are addressed by John as economical ‘topdogs’ who should not exploit people, but they simultaneously function as social (and political) ‘underdogs’ who (because of their oppressive economical activities and collaboration with Rome) were written off not only by the Sadducees, Pharisees and Qumran community but indeed by all the people of the land (cf Bornhäuser 1934:10-11,13; Jeremias 1971:181). Ellis (1974:87) remarks aptly: ‘Significantly, Luke records that it is the social outcast, the grafting politicians, and their soldier-police who express serious concern. The religious leaders, Abraham’s children par excellence do not respond.’ This correlates with another redactional note of Luke (7:29-30; cf Mt 21:32): ‘When they heard this all the people and the tax collectors justified God, having been baptized with the baptism of John; but the Pharisees and the lawyers rejected the purpose of God for themselves, not having been baptized by him’. The response of the good Samaritan, who did charity when the religious leaders (who despised the Samaritans) passed by, comes to mind.

To view the concept ‘underdog’ or suffering within a broader framework (and not merely an economical one) therefore proves to be worthwhile. The same person can be ‘underdog’ from a certain perspective and ‘topdog’ from
another. To emphasise only the economical aspect does harm to Luke's sympathy for all those who suffer and even distort his emphasis on the poor. For the motivation behind his emphasis on the suffering of the poor is not in the first place a political or economical philosophy or ideology but a concern which he also has for rich toll-collectors or soldiers who are social outcasts.

ENDNOTES
1 It should be noted that I define a thought unit as a meaningful semantic unit. It is therefore not the same as a colon, which is distinguished on a syntactic basis in classical South African discourse analysis (cf Louw 1982:95).
2 According to Louw and Nida the term συκοφαντείν 'refers to a practice in which persons could bring charges against an individual and receive a part of the fine or indemnity paid to the court' (1988:438). The only other instance of the use of the term in the New Testament also occurs in Luke (19:8), in a context very similar to that of 3:13b. It is, however, interesting that the term is used in 19:8 in connection with a toll-collector so that its reference in 19:8 can be regarded as synonymous to the πλέον παρά τὸ διατεταγμένον πράσσειν of 3:13b (cf also Holtz 1964:472 n27).
3 I believe that Vorster's opinion is valid as far as Mark's Gospel is concerned (cf Vorster 1980:57; also Botha 1989:26-61). Generalisations towards all the synoptic Gospels should however be avoided in the light of (amongst others) Luke's prologue.
4 It is interesting that the similarity in Josephus' presentation of the ministry of the Baptist (Jos Ant 18,117): '[He] was a good man, and commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, both as to righteousness towards one another, and piety towards God, and so to come to baptism...' Holtz (1964:461) is correct in his judgement that Josephus' report is of little historical value, since, like Luke, he could have changed 'den eschatologische Bussruf in eine ethische Predigt.'
5 The figure of Abraham plays an important role in Luke's soteriology. When the exaltation of the lowly occurs, Abraham is often associated with the liberation. In the Magnificat and the Benedictus (1:55,77) he is the father of the oppressed Israel (cf Scheffler 1988b:76-79; 1988c:30-32); when Jesus heals the bent woman he calles her a 'daughter of Abraham' (13:16); when the poor Lazarus died he found himself in 'Abraham's bosom' (16:22-23) and when Zacchaeus the toll-collector repented Jesus said: 'Today salvation has come to this house, since he also is a son of Abraham' (19:9).
6 As is the case with the figure of Abraham, the term εὐαγγελίζεσθαι is used mostly by Luke with reference to salvation, which includes the upliftment of the lowly or the alleviation of suffering. In 1:19 it describes the pregnancy of the childless Elizabeth, in 2:10 the birth of the Saviour, in 4:18 and 7:22 Jesus' own summary of his ministry to various suffering groups and in 9:6 the 'underdog'-ministry of the apostles.
Contra Holtz (1964:462-463), the difference between halber Besitzverzicht and total Besitzverzicht need in my opinion not be driven to extremes. The paradox of Luke's call to the rich both to renounce their possessions and to be charitable (while retaining possessions) is to some extent clarified if one views it from the angle of Luke's emphasis on suffering (cf Scheffler 1988b 178-179).
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