

## The Four Types of Miracle Story Genre in the Third Gospel

Cztery rodzaje gatunku opowiadania o cudzie  
w Trzeciej Ewangelii

Wojciech Wasiak<sup>1</sup>

Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań  
Faculty of Theology

**Abstract:** The article serves as a continuation of the previous study, further developing the narrative definition of the ‘miracle story’ genre. The four main types of this genre—healing, resurrection, exorcism, and nature miracles—are re-examined using narrative and form-critical methodologies. A comparative analysis of Luke’s use of these four types of miracle stories offers insights into their functions within the context of Luke’s overarching narrative. The study reveals that miracle stories primarily focus on the communal character of the Jewish crowd, with the exception of nature miracles, which place the disciples at the center of the pericopes.

**Keywords:** miracle story, healings, exorcisms, resuscitations, nature miracles, Gospel of Luke, the crowd

**Abstrakt:** Artykuł jest kontynuacją poprzedniego, rozwijającą narracyjną definicję *miracle story*. Cztery rodzaje tego gatunku (uzdrowienia, wskrzeszenia, egzorcyzmy, cuda natury) zostały na nowo zanalizowane przy pomocy narzędzi narracyjnych i krytyki form. Porównanie zastosowania czterech rodzajów gatunku w Łk pozwala zauważyć naturę tych scen w kontekście szerszej narracji Łukaszej. Z analizy wynika przede wszystkim, że *miracle stories* dotyczą głównie postaci tłumu żydowskiego oprócz cudów natury, które stawiają uczniów w centrum perykop.

**Słowa kluczowe:** opowiadania o cudach, uzdrowienia, egzorcyzmy, wskrzeszenia, cuda natury, Ewangelia Łukasza, tłum

---

<sup>1</sup> Wojciech Wasiak—PhD in Sacred Scripture from the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome; a lecturer at Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań. His areas of specialization include: Luke-Acts and the Synoptic Gospels; e-mail: [schaf1@wp.pl](mailto:schaf1@wp.pl); <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9164-9395>.

This article is related to the previous one, which introduced a new narrative definition of the Miracle Story Genre.<sup>2</sup> The following definition will serve as the basis for this study: ‘A miracle story is a narrative (a pericope with the plot) which contains:

- 1) A problem at the beginning of the story (in exposition or complication) concerning a character(s) who can be called the recipient(s) (i.e., a minor character who experiences and benefits from the miracle),
- 2a) A turning point which resolves the initial problem entirely through a miraculous deed performed by a miracle worker, who is the protagonist of the story,
- 2b) Or a turning point which is thematically connected with the miraculous solution of the problem that has occurred in the story (in the storyworld) before or will occur later.”<sup>3</sup>

The goal of this article is to provide a precise distinction between four different types of miracle stories already established in the scholarly literature. Furthermore, this classification will offer a characterisation of miracle stories in the Gospel of Luke that will be narratively relevant for the analysis of this gospel.

## 1. Status Quaestionis

The ‘classic’ division of miracle stories, as identified by Bultmann (Dibelius, on the other hand, coined just one general category for miracle stories without further classification), includes four kinds: 1. healings, 2. exorcisms, 3. raisings from the dead, and 4. nature miracles. However, the more fundamental distinction is twofold: *Heilungswunder* (the first three categories), which concerns people, and *Naturwunder*, which concerns things.<sup>4</sup> This fundamental dichotomy was also respected by Van der Loos.<sup>5</sup> Generally, the fourfold classification of miracle stories (MS) is frequently employed in scholarly works such as J.P. Meier’s dissertation<sup>6</sup> and the classic commentaries by J. Nolland and J. Fitzmyer, who consistently adhere to Bultmann’s classification.<sup>7</sup> Bovon, on

---

<sup>2</sup> W. Wasiak, *New Narrative Definition of the Miracle Story Genre in the Context of the Third Gospel*, ‘Poznańskie Studia Teologiczne’ 43 (2023), pp. 51–73.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid., p. 59.

<sup>4</sup> R. Bultmann, *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, Göttingen 1931, pp. 223–230, 247–249.

<sup>5</sup> H. van der Loos, *The Miracles of Jesus*, Leiden 1965, pp. 339, 580.

<sup>6</sup> J.P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew. Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, vol. 2: *Mentor, message, and miracle*, New York 1994, p. 754.

<sup>7</sup> ‘The exorcism stories are but one of the four kinds of miracle stories in this Gospel; there are, in addition, healing stories (sometimes not easily distinguished from exorcisms), resuscitations, and nature miracles.’ J. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX: Introduction, Translation, and*

the other hand, adopts a more polemical stance, with his objections primarily focusing on nature miracles.<sup>8</sup>

The category of nature miracles has undergone the most criticism.<sup>9</sup> The classification by Theissen (Exorzismen, Therapien, Epiphanien, Rettungswundern, Geschenkwunder, Norm-wundern)<sup>10</sup> avoids the term and concept of nature miracles. Instead, four new types of miracles are introduced to replace 'nature miracle'. Theissen's classification offers a more meticulous analysis compared to Bultmann's, warranting a more thorough examination, particularly concerning the difference between healings and exorcisms. Theissen defends the separation of these two categories, a distinction also observed in the narrative of Luke 6:18–19, 7:21, and 13:32, where they are treated separately by the narrator. Moreover, in healings, a miracle worker deals with demonic influence, whereas in exorcisms, the focus is on the demon's presence, 'Dasein'.<sup>11</sup> The essential motifs in exorcisms include the expulsion of a demon, the struggle of the exorcist, and the demon's destructive activity on nature. This depiction is valuable, but there is one objection: these three elements do not always occur. For instance, in Mark 7:24–30, there is no explicit fight against the demon or any devastating activity by the demon.

Healing, conversely, lacks the demonic element and, more importantly, the curing power is transmitted rather than fought for. 'Beide Wundertaten, Exorzismen und Therapien, sind Taten numinosen Vermögens. Der Unterschied ist eine Frage der Akzente: in Exorzismen setzt sich diese Macht antagonistisch durch, das mysterium tremendum überwiegt. In den Heilungen dominiert das mysterium fascinosum'.<sup>12</sup> Theissen observes that the specific motifs of how the miracle occurs in exorcisms and healings are closely related. Nevertheless, three traits primarily emerge in healings: a) the power to heal, b) its transmission to the sick person through a touch, c) or other means of curing. The transmission of power (Kraftübertragung) distinguishes the two subcategories. Healings emphasize the significance of illness as a weakness, while exorcisms emphasize seizure by an alien force. 'Die Hilfeleistung des Wundertäters ist entsprechend verschieden.

---

Notes, New Haven–London 2008, p. 542. J. Nolland, *Word Biblical Commentary: Luke 1:1–9:20*, Dallas 1989, p. 397. Cf. also W. Cotter, *Miracles in Greco-Roman Antiquity: A Sourcebook for the Study of New Testament Miracle Stories*, London 1999, p. 4.

<sup>8</sup> F. Bovon, *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1–9:50*, Minneapolis 2002, p. 355: 'To describe this as a nature miracle is imprecise and outmoded'.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. G.H. Twelftree, *Nature Miracles and the Historical Jesus*, in: *The Nature Miracles of Jesus: Problems, Perspectives, and Prospects*, ed. by G.H. Twelftree, Eugene 2017, p. 5.

<sup>10</sup> G. Theissen, *Urchristliche Wundergeschichten. Ein Beitrag zur formgeschichtlichen Erforschung der synoptischen Evangelien*, Gütersloh 1987, p. 92.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 94.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 98.

Dort geht er antagonistisch vor, zeigt die dunkle, abweisende Seite seiner numinosen Macht; hier dagegen strahlt er positiv Kraft aus und beweist so die lichte, "faszinierende" Seite seiner Begabung'.<sup>13</sup>

Epiphanies, as incorporated into 'miracle stories' by Theissen, are more straightforward to define and are less central to the subject of this paper. They occur when divinity appears in person, and include partial epiphanies, which contain signs typically accompanying an epiphany, such as an earthquake. Additionally, rescue miracles entail the 'nature miracle', including sea rescues and liberations from prison. This type of MS is characterized by the overcoming of nature and involves the transformation of things (Sachen): wind, boats, chains, etc. Gift miracles, conversely, multiply or transform some material goods. The spontaneous action of a miracle worker is a characteristic of this subclass. The second trait is that the miracle itself is not very apparent, like the multiplication of bread. The third aspect is the emphasis on the demonstration of a miracle. The sixth and last category, *Normwundern*, is a complex construct and comprises several subcategories that always centre around some rule which is to be established (e.g., Sabbath healings), confirmed (Acts 28:1–6), or serves as the basis for punishment. Surprisingly, the category of raising the dead does not occur in Theissen's division.

Theissen's classification provides valuable comparisons and analyses, which have been utilized in this paper. Nevertheless, it appears that this scheme is overly detailed and lacks a consistent criterion for dividing the subcategories. The same critique applies to other proposals that attempt to replace the term 'nature miracle' and include 'epiphanies', such as the classification by J.L. Bailey and L.D. Vander Broek (which includes exorcisms, controversy stories containing miracles, healing stories as responses, provision stories, rescue stories, epiphanies).<sup>14</sup> Theissen's division has been influential, and has been adopted by scholars such as Rudolf Pesch and Reinhard Kratz, who have also included the category of 'remote healings' in their schemes.<sup>15</sup>

J.P. Meier adopts Bultmann's fourfold scheme, acknowledging that while the definitions of the first three categories are acceptable, he finds the last category, 'nature miracles', to be problematic.<sup>16</sup> Meier critiques the term 'nature' itself, the

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., p. 102.

<sup>14</sup> J.L. Bailey, L.D. Van der Broek, *Literary Forms in the New Testament: A Handbook*, Louisville 1992, p. 137.

<sup>15</sup> R. Pesch, R. Kratz, *So liest man synoptisch. Anleitungen und Kommentar Zum Studium der Synoptischen Evangelien, band 2*, in: *Wundergeschichten*, teil 1, Frankfurt am Main 1976, pp. 10–11: 'Dämonenaus-treibungswundergeschichte, Heilungswundergeschichte, Totenerweckungswundergeschichte, Rettungswundergeschichte, Geschenk-wundergeschichte, Normenwundergeschichte, Fernheilungswundergeschichte'.

<sup>16</sup> J.P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew*, p. 1034.

various forms of nature miracles, and their differentiation from the other categories. Ultimately, he aligns with a position similar to Theissen's, replacing 'nature miracles' with his own categories. B.L. Blackburn bases his analysis on Meier's adaptation.<sup>17</sup> However, these and other proposals that exclude 'nature miracles' are criticized by Twelftree, who argues that there is no better term to describe 'divine action associated with Jesus that involve the natural world rather than direct human health and wellbeing'.<sup>18</sup>

Kahl criticizes Bultmann's classification at its core, arguing that: 'the differentiation of miracle stories in "Heilungswundern" und "Naturwunder" is artificial and reflects a modern rather than an ancient concept of "nature"'.<sup>19</sup> Green perceives the classification of 'nature miracle' as outmoded, at least in some cases. Bovon, analyzing the silencing of the storm, rejects classifying it as a nature miracle and instead speaks of 'victory of the hero (German Helden) over the elements',<sup>20</sup> referring to Theissen's concept of 'rescue miracle'. Ultimately, Bovon states that it is like an exorcism but distinct. Bovon's deliberation and lack of consistency suggest, in the author's opinion, that there is no need to correct Bultmann on this matter. Nevertheless, recent monographs apply different divisions. Manfred Köhnlein categorizes MS into healings, exorcisms, Normwunder, nature miracles, gift miracles, and resuscitations.<sup>21</sup> Eric Eve reduces the categories to three: healings, exorcisms, and anomalous miracles, which include nature miracles and resuscitations.<sup>22</sup> Kiffiak presents a division into healings (including resuscitations), exorcisms, epiphanies, nature miracles, and rescue miracles.<sup>23</sup>

## 2. Four Types of the Miracle Story

Regarding Bultmann's division, the author asserts that it reflects a valuable intuition, although he proposes formulating the classification criterion differently. All traditionally categorized and recently contested 'nature miracles' are undoubtedly distinctive, and suitability of the term 'nature miracle' is secondary. There is a need for a subcategory encompassing all miracles performed 'not on people'.

---

<sup>17</sup> B.L. Blackburn, *The miracles of Jesus*, in: *The Cambridge Companion to Miracles*, ed. by G.H. Twelftree, Cambridge 2011, pp. 114, 127.

<sup>18</sup> G.H. Twelftree, *Nature Miracles*..., p. 5.

<sup>19</sup> W. Kahl, *New Testament Miracle Stories in Their Religious-Historical Setting: A Religions-geschichtliche Comparison from a Structural Perspective*, Göttingen 1994, p. 223.

<sup>20</sup> F. Bovon, *Luke 1*..., p. 317; J.B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, Grand Rapids 1997, p. 354.

<sup>21</sup> M. Köhnlein, *Wunder Jesu — Protest- und Hoffnungsgeschichten*, Stuttgart 2010, p. 17.

<sup>22</sup> E. Eve, *The Healer from Nazareth: Jesus' Miracles in Historical Context*, London 2009, pp. 145–160.

<sup>23</sup> J. Kiffiak, *Responses in the Miracle Stories of the Gospels*, Tübingen 2017, p. 591.

The fourfold division remains coherent. Rudolf Pesch states that all types of MS are *personorientiert*, whereas what we call nature miracles are *sachorientiert*.<sup>24</sup> The difference lies in the subject being transformed: 1) the health of a person, 2) demonic possession, 3) a dead person, and 4) objects that are part of the material world. Though many exegetes have provided their own divisions, as partially described before, there is no need to alter Bultmann's 'classic' cataloguing. Instead, we will aim to integrate it into our narrative scheme of MS:

Table 1. The structure of miracle stories (MS) and their types

recipient who is the ‘bearer’ of ἀγών ←————→ solution of ἀγών by miracle worker

appears explicitly in the story	characteristic of ἀγών	characteristic of a solution	appears explicitly in the story
experiences the miracle and benefits from it	<b>an</b> initial problem; appears in exposition or complication	a miracle; usually appears <b>at the</b> turning point or is strictly related to it	performs the miracle
	usually impossible or very difficult to overcome by human strength	means total elimination of difficulty	
	visible, perceivable	is a sign	

↓

↓

Type of MS	How does ἀγών concern the recipient?	Way of overcoming ἀγών
1. healing MS (HMS)	concerns recipient direct (disease)	healings
2. nature MS (NMS)	concerns recipient indirectly (lack of food, storm)	elimination of the problem according to its kind
3. exorcism MS (EMS)	the recipient suffers from an antagonist	overcoming the antagonist (exorcism, punishment, etc.)
4. resuscitation (RMS)	recipient is dead	resuscitation

The above classification is based on the narrative elements of character and action rather than content.<sup>25</sup> Specifically, it focuses on the roles of the miracle worker and a recipient, as well as the nature of the action performed. A miracle worker remains unchanged by the miracle, while the recipient experiences a significant transformation, corresponding to different kinds of miracles deeds.

<sup>24</sup> R. Pesch, R. Kratz, *So liest man...*, pp. 15, 18. The authors refer to Theissen's work at this point.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. E. Eve, *Healer...*, p. 416: 'Jesus' healings and exorcisms underline Jesus' authority, spread his fame and provoke opposition from the authorities. His so-called 'nature miracles' both

The distinction between healing miracles (HMS) and exorcism miracles (EMS) becomes clear in this context, although it is often debated in scholarship. In EMS, there is an antagonist—an active and hostile rival of the miracle worker who oppresses the recipient. The solution of the problem involves overcoming this antagonist. It differs from HMS, where the miracle worker may face opponents (e.g., Pharisees) but does not have to defeat a personal antagonist. An opponent is a character in MS who makes the main action (solution) more difficult. In other words, when the antagonist occurs in the MS, it is always the EMS. The case of Acts 13:1–12 is particularly interesting.<sup>26</sup> First, it is an MS: there is an initial problem (Elymas obstructs the proclamation and conversion of the proconsul) which appears in the complication and regards a recipient (the proconsul, who experiences the miraculous punishment and the grace in it, which directly causes his conversion). There is also a miracle worker, Paul, who performs the miracle of punishment at the turning point. Second, it is the EMS: there is an antagonist, and overcoming this antagonist is the solution (and the miracle). Seeing the correlation between this miracle and the EMS is not as unusual as it might seem. Saint Paul seems to confirm our intuition when he calls Elymas ‘son of the devil’ in verse 10. This kind of story can also be called an ‘antagonist miracle story’; yet, we retain the common labelling because in Luke, all antagonists in MS are demons, making EMS an accurate term. In EMS, due to their nature, the relationship between the miracle worker and the antagonist is usually depicted in detail, which is the main particularity of the story. However, the struggle with a demon does not need to be explicitly narrated, as shown in Mark 7:24–30, contrary to Theissen’s perspective.<sup>27</sup>

To grasp the difference between healings and resuscitations (which are sometimes classified together under one category) is not difficult. Technically speaking, when there is no recipient of the miracle in the MS from the beginning, or when the absence of a recipient appears in the course of action (Luke 8:49), and a recipient emerges after the miracle, this suffices to categorize it as a resuscitation miracle story (RMS). This type is not numerous in Luke or the New Testament; nonetheless, according to our division, it differs sufficiently from healing

---

underline disciples’ failure to understand and the Christological stakes from the issue of Jesus’ extraordinary authority to that of his messianic identity.’ This is an example of an attempt to characterize types of MS according to their content and meaning. Nevertheless, exorcisms in Luke never provoke opposition from authorities, and the NMS in Luke 5:1–11 does not seem to recount the failure of the disciples to recognize Jesus.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. M. Rydryck, *Miracles of Judgment in Luke-Acts*, in: *Miracles Revisited: New Testament Miracle Stories and their Concepts of Reality*, (Studies of the Bible and Its Reception 2), ed. by S. Alkier, A. Weissenrieder, Berlin 2013, p. 32.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. A.C. Wire, *The Structure of the Gospel Miracle Stories and Their Tellers*, ‘Semeia: An Experimental Journal for Biblical Criticism’ 11 (1978), p. 88 who makes the same observation.



stories. RMS are expected to extend the role of characters such as helpers and petitioners, though this is not always the case, as seen in Luke 7:11–17. In RMS, the recipient is not very active after the resuscitation and does not respond or react. This kind of story has a strong impact on spectators.

The difference between HMS and NMS is also discernible. The initial difficulty in HMS affects the recipient personally, manifesting as some form of illness or disability. In contrast, NMS address issues related to the recipient's circumstances,<sup>28</sup> such as the need to provide food, catch fish, or avoid the danger of the storm. Even if the last example might be perceived as an exorcism in some sense,<sup>29</sup> it lacks one element to qualify as EMS: the explicit presence of an antagonist. Interestingly, NMS in Luke primarily concern the disciples, who are the only collective group playing the role of recipients in NMS and are not recipients in other types of MS. The so-called 'liberation from prison' miracles (Acts 5:17–21; 12:3–17; 16:25–34)<sup>30</sup> should be classified as NMS according to our understanding of the term.

In conclusion, we adhere to the 'traditional' nomenclature of the MS division. However, alternative naming for types of MS could be considered, such as 'miracle worker stories'. This alternative classification would include healings, object miracle stories (instead of NMS), resuscitations, and antagonist miracle stories (or simply antagonist stories instead of exorcisms).

### 3. Characterisation of four types of MS in Luke

The above general considerations outline the structure of our classification of MS. Altogether, there are 18 MS in Luke:

Table 2. MS and its types in Luke

	Luke	HMS	EMS	NMS	RMS
1	4:31–37		1 exorcism		
2	4:38–39	1 healing			
3	5:1–11 S			1 nature miracle	
4	5:12–16	2 healing			

<sup>28</sup> G.H. Twelftree, *Nature Miracles...*, p. 6: 'whereas the other Gospel miracle stories directly meet human health needs, the nature miracle stories are generally of surprising changes in the natural environment that only, if at all, indirectly meet human needs'.

<sup>29</sup> It is counted as such by: W. Kirchschräger, *Jesu exorzistisches Wirken aus der Sicht des Lukas: Ein Beitrag zur lukanischen Redaktion*, Klosterneuburg 1981, p. 22.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. F. Neirynck, *The Miracle Stories in the Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction*, in: *Les Actes des Apôtres. Traditions, rédaction, théologie*, éd. J. Kremer, Leuven 1979, pp. 170–171.



5	5:17–26	3 healing			
6	6:6–11	4 healing			
7	7:1–10 wM	5 healing			
8	7:11–17 S				1 resuscitation
9	8:22–25			2 nature miracle	
10	8:26–39		2 exorcism		
11	8:40–48	6 healing			
12	8:40–56				2 resuscitation
13	9:10–17			3 nature miracle	
14	9:37–43		3 exorcism		
15	13:10–17 S	7 healing			
16	14:1–6 S	8 healing			
17	17:11–19 S	9 healing			
18	18:35–43	10 healing			

Instead of detailed exegeses of multiple pericopes, we will briefly summarize four types of MS:

a) NMS—Contrary to previous scholarly assertions, NMS are the easiest to define and characterize. In all NMS, the disciples are prominently present. In Luke 5:1–11 Peter, John and James are the recipients. Their responses and indirect reaction are recounted, with Peter being very active. In Luke 8:22–25 the disciples are recipients who respond, react and are active. In Luke 9:12–17 the miracle serves as a lesson for the disciples, who play an active role in the plot. Disciples appear as recipients only in NMS and as spectators only in all RMS, constituting all their occurrences in MS (Peter’s presence in 8:40–48 is a part of the RMS). They are virtually absent in HMS and EMS. The disciples’ responses and reactions, whether direct or indirect, occur only in NMS. The indirect reaction of the disciples (e.g., following Jesus in 5:11) is significant regarding their relationship with Jesus. NMS are crucial for characterizing the disciples<sup>31</sup> and describing their relationship with Jesus. As D. Bock observes in the context of 5:1–11: ‘It is one of many miracles on the sea (John 21:1–14; Mark 4:35–41/ Luke 8:22–25; Mark 6:45–52/Matt. 14:22–23). Interestingly, all the sea miracles involve only disciples’.<sup>32</sup> Because of this, all Lukan NMS could be called ‘disciples’ miracle stories.

b) RMS—There are only two RMS in Luke, but they follow a similar pattern. The principal recipients in the RMS are very passive both before and after the

<sup>31</sup> C. Keener, *Miracles: The Credibility of the New Testament Accounts*, vol. 1, Grand Rapids 2011, p. 30 notes, interestingly, that there is no nature miracle performed by Paul.

<sup>32</sup> D.L. Bock, *Luke*, vol. 1: 1:1–9:50, Grand Rapids 1994, p. 451, who refers to K. Berger, *Formgeschichte des Neuen Testaments*, Heidelberg 1984, pp. 309–310.

resuscitations. They do not give any response, and only in Luke 7:16 does one perform a direct reaction. Jesus' activity is the most prominent aspect of RMS in contrast with the lesser activity of other characters. The inner state of Jesus and His emotional behaviour are also emphasized in these stories.

Another characteristic of the two Lukan RMS is the emotional climate created by Jesus' sensitive behaviour, which is unparalleled in any other MS. The only MS comparable in this regard is the HMS which immediately precedes the first RMS: Luke 7:1–10. This unique story (apart from 7:11–17) explicitly narrates Jesus' inner state—amazement in verse 9.<sup>33</sup> The two RMS recount the inner state of many characters, and these are the only where someone weeps: the widow in 7:13 and the mourners in 8:52. The narrator's impressive description, ἔκλαιον δὲ πάντες καὶ ἐκόπτοντο αὐτήν, is strengthened by the fact that 'all' did lament. This emotional climate in the RMS is further reinforced by the strong family relationships between the principal and secondary recipients: the father-daughter bond in one story and the mother-son bond in the other. While a parent-child relationship also occurs in 9:37–43 involves a father and son and includes a harsh rebuke of the disciples. Unlike in other MS, there is no opponent in the RMS, and the final responses are very positive. In 7:6 and 8:49, the verb σκύλλω appears (the only two occurrences in Luke-Acts); κλαίω is found in 7:13 and 8:52 (the only two occurrences in MS); and ἐγείρω is used in 7:14 and 8:54. Additionally, J.L. Green points out other similarities between the content of these stories:

At the most basic level [two RMS—W.W.] both are stories of resuscitation, both involve an only child (7:12, 8:42) who is therefore all the more valued, both contain echoes of the analogous Elijah-account (1 Kgs 17:8–24), and Jesus' words, "Do not weep", are replicated (7:13, 8:52). As such, both are understood as evidence of Jesus' messiahship and the extension of good news to the poor (7:22).<sup>34</sup>

We remain committed to our formal analysis; however, we can assert that this statement that both RMS refer to Elijah typology is not only supported by our analysis but even reinforces it.

In RMS, the disciples play the role of spectators (though always in the company of the crowd), a role explicitly highlighted by the narrator in Luke 7:11 and by Jesus in Luke 8:51. Despite witnessing both miracles, the disciples remain notably passive. In contrast, the crowd actively engages as spectators; they respond once (even with praise), speak in direct discourse, and implicitly contribute to

---

<sup>33</sup> Furthermore, the centurion is depicted in a particularly sympathetic and compassionate light. He holds his servant in high regard and the Jewish elders affirm that he is worthy, loves the people, and acts in their favour. Moreover, he sends friends in verse 6 and demonstrates humility through his actions.

<sup>34</sup> J.B. Green, *Luke*, p. 344.

the spreading of fame in 7:17. They welcome Jesus gladly in 8:40 (ἀπεδέξατο) because ‘all’ are waiting for Him. Yet, despite this appreciation from the crowd, in a unique move within this MS, He prohibits them from witnessing the miracle He performs.

The role of the crowd is a curious one. They are spectators in both stories (mentioned in the first verses of the exposition: 7:11; 8:40) but with opposite ‘results’. In 7:16, they praise Jesus with acclamation, but in 8:51, they are not even allowed to witness the miracle. A significant initial response followed by the prevention of it must be considered together, especially since they occur in subsequent chapters.<sup>35</sup> The previously mentioned similarities and differences evoke Alter’s statement:

Broadly, when repetitions with significant variations occur in biblical narrative, the changes introduced can point to an intensification, climactic development, acceleration, of the actions and attitudes initially represented, or, on the other hand, to some unexpected, perhaps unsettling, new revelation of character or plot.<sup>36</sup>

There are no opponents or Jewish leaders as collective characters in RMS, except for Jairus. Nevertheless, there are more minor characters than usual, who play the roles of recipient, helper (though more passively as in HMS), or spectator. In RMS, there is always a response, and it is always positive. Interestingly, two indirect reactions in RMS concern the spreading of fame. This may be due to the nature of this type of MS as resuscitations are comparatively more impressive than healings, being completely beyond human capability and not expected to be requested by petitioners. Regarding the non-minor characters in MS, RMS involve the disciples and the Jewish crowd on the same level. The character of Jesus is very prominent in these stories and is characterized in a particular way by the narrator.

c) EMS—We agree with Nolland that ‘the exorcism accounts in Luke do not follow closely a fixed formal pattern’.<sup>37</sup> However, some formal characteristics

<sup>35</sup> Ibid., notes similarly: ‘a further element characteristic of this narrative unit is the presence of the crowds, who are as ubiquitous as their role is ambiguous. When they first appear they are portrayed positively, awaiting Jesus’ return and welcoming his arrival (v. 40). Soon, however, they are described in a way reminiscent of the thorns of the story of the sower, as unwanted foliage growing up alongside sprouting seedlings that will eventually choke the desired vegetation. In the final scene (vv. 51–54) unspecified bystanders laugh at Jesus, disbelieving his claims regarding the child, failing to recognize his authority to make such statements’.

<sup>36</sup> R. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, New York 1981, p. 97.

<sup>37</sup> J. Nolland, *Luke 1...*, p. 204. Although Nolland analyses more pericopes than ‘our’ EMS, his analysis also suits our consideration: ‘There is no attention to the symptoms of the man’s condition (contrast 8:27; 9:39, 42; 11:14). There is demonic recognition and self-defence (as 8:28 where, however, the initiative is given to the commanding word of Jesus; contrast 9:42; 11:14). Jesus re-

can be identified in three EMS in Luke. Notably, there is the obvious presence of an antagonist who is very active and who twice initiates the dialogue with the miracle worker. Both RMS and EMS are characterized by their great impact upon the onlookers, resulting in spreading the news about the miracle worker. This spreading of fame also occurs in one HMS, specifically in Luke 5:12–16). Among the non-minor characters in MS, EMS concerns only the Jewish crowd.

d) HMS are the most frequent type in Luke, with ten instances. A notable feature of HMS is the presence of opponents, which occurs only in this type of MS, with the exception of Jairus in the RMS. These opponents are always adversaries, except in Luke 7:1–10, where they are helpers. The Jewish crowd appears as frequently as the Jewish leaders in HMS, serving as the sole spectators in this type of story. Disciples are absent, with the exception of Peter in Luke 8:40–48, which is part of the RMS. The role of helpers is particularly prominent in HMS, where they play the most active parts. For example, in Luke 5:17–20, the bearers' faith is extolled; in Luke 7:3, the elders address Jesus in a long speech; and in Luke 8:44–47, the dialogue with Peter is significant. This participation of helpers adds a vividness to HMS, making these stories more dynamic.-

HMS are a privileged category for examining the relationship between the Jewish crowd and its leaders, they appear together (particularly when the leaders are depicted as a collective character) four times exclusively in HMS (with the exception of Jairus). Nonetheless, their implicit presence in Luke 18:35–43 holds only minor importance for the plot. All Shabbat MS are consistently HMS, as seen in Luke 6:6–11; 13:10–17; 14:1–6.

This most frequent type of MS displays a variety of motifs and features. Yet, there are discernible patterns, even if they do not occur in all HMS. The most visible particularity is that the plot of these stories frequently concerns not only the miracle itself but also a question related to it in some way. We distinguish seven HMS out of ten in which the element of dialogue dominates the miracle and adds another dimension to it, demonstrating that the issue connected with the miracle is the real point of the story. This observation coincides with the characteristic of NMS but contrasts with RMS and EMS. The seven HMS with a strong component of dialogue are: Luke 5:17–26, 6:6–11, 7:1–10, 8:40–48, 13:10–17, 14:1–6, and 17:11–19. These are labelled *apophthegms* by Bultmann, except for 8:40–48.

---

bukes the demon (as 9:42 where, however, the words of rebuke are absent; contrast 8:29–32 where a much more genial exchange occurs; 11:14). Safe completion of the exorcism is stressed (contrast 8:33; 9:42; 11:14). No attention is given to the restored state of the man (contrast 8:35; 9:42; 11:14). Finally, the amazement of the bystanders is noted (as 8:34; 9:43; 11:14)'.

## Conclusion

The general conclusions concerning the 18 Lukan MS are as follows: NMS mainly concern disciples; RMS involve both the crowd and disciples; EMS involve the crowd; and HMS involve the crowd and Jewish leaders. The Jewish crowd appears as spectators in 10 MS: a) in both RMS with one response, b) in 2 of 3 EMS with two responses, c) in 6 of 10 HMS with four responses and one indirect reaction. Jewish leaders, as a collective character, occur in six MS: five times as opponents and once as helpers (excluding the individual character of Jairus). They respond in two MS (Jairus in the RMS) and react indirectly once. The disciples appear in five MS: a) in all three NMS as recipients with two responses and one indirect reaction, b) in both RMS as spectators.

In conclusion, MS are the crucial pericopes for understanding the role of the crowd in the Gospel of Luke. Outside of the MS, the crowd is depicted as a large entity that comes to Jesus, is taught by Him, seeks healing, and tries to find Him. Individuals from the crowd occasionally ask Jesus questions. However, in the MS, the crowd is more active: they respond to His actions and offer acclamations, mostly of praise. The Jewish consciousness regarding Jesus before the Passion can be primarily discerned through the responses in the MS. The core of their relationship with Jesus is developed in these stories, contrasting with His relationship with the disciples and Jewish leaders, who are also present and active in other significant pericopes. The MS primarily concern the Jewish crowd for several reasons: a) The nature of the MS, which have a miracle at their centre, is intended to be a sign with a message for the audience, b) The Jewish crowd is the character that appears most frequently in MS (not counting Jesus), c) The Jewish crowd responds most frequently in the MS (six times, with one indirect reaction), making them the most active non-minor character in these stories. The above conclusions hold significant implications for the macro narration of Luke, which will be explored in the next article on the topic of miracle stories in the Third Gospel.

## References

- Achtemeier P.J., *The Lukan Perspective on the Miracles of Jesus: A Preliminary Sketch*, 'Journal of Biblical Literature' 94 (1975), pp. 547–562.  
 Alter R., *The Art of Biblical Narrative*, New York 1981.  
 Bailey J.L., Van der Broek L.D., *Literary Forms in the New Testament: A Handbook*, Louisville 1992.  
 Berger K., *Formgeschichte des Neuen Testaments*, Heidelberg 1984.  
 Blackburn B.L., *The miracles of Jesus*, in: *The Cambridge Companion to Miracles*, ed. by G.H. Twelftree, Cambridge 2011, pp. 185–218.

- Bock D.L., *Luke*, vol. 1: 1:1–9:50, Grand Rapids 1994.
- Bovon, F., *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1–9:50*, Minneapolis 2002.
- Bultmann R., *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, Göttingen 1931.
- Cotter W., *Miracles in Greco-Roman Antiquity: A Sourcebook for the Study of New Testament Miracle Stories*, London 1999.
- Eve E., *The Healer from Nazareth: Jesus' Miracles in Historical Context*, London 2009.
- Fitzmyer J., *The Gospel According to Luke I–IX: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, New Haven–London 2008.
- Green J.B., *The Gospel of Luke*, Grand Rapids 1997.
- Kahl W., *New Testament Miracle Stories in Their Religious-Historical Setting: A Religionsgeschichtliche Comparison from a Structural Perspective*, Göttingen 1994.
- Keener C., *Miracles: The Credibility of the New Testament Accounts*, vol. 1, Grand Rapids 2011.
- Kiffiak J., *Responses in the Miracle Stories of the Gospels*, Tübingen 2017.
- Kirchschläger W., *Jesu exorzistisches Wirken aus der Sicht des Lukas: Ein Beitrag zur lukianischen Redaktion*, Klosterneuburg 1981.
- Köhnlein M., *Wunder Jesu — Protest- und Hoffnungsgeschichten*, Stuttgart 2010.
- Loos, H. van der, *The Miracles of Jesus*, Leiden 1965.
- Meier J.P., *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, vol. 2: *Mentor, message, and miracle*, New York 1994.
- Neirynck F., *The Miracle Stories in the Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction*, in: *Les Actes des Apôtres. Traditions, rédaction, théologie*, éd. J. Kremer, Leuven 1979, pp. 169–213.
- Nolland J., *Word Biblical Commentary: Luke 1:1–9:20*, vol. 1–3, Dallas 1989.
- Pesch R., Kratz R., *So liest man synoptisch. Anleitungen und Kommentar Zum Studium der Synoptischen Evangelien*, band 2, in: *Wundergeschichten*, teil 1, Frankfurt am Main 1976.
- Rydryck M., *Miracles of Judgment in Luke-Acts*, in: *Miracles Revisited: New Testament Miracle Stories and Their Concepts of Reality*, (Studies of the Bible and Its Reception 2), ed. by S. Alkier, A. Weissenrieder, Berlin 2013, pp. 23–32.
- Theissen G., *Urchristliche Wundergeschichten. Ein Beitrag zur formgeschichtlichen Erforschung der synoptischen Evangelien*, Gütersloh 1987.
- Twelftree G.H., *Nature Miracles and the Historical Jesus*, in: *The Nature Miracles of Jesus: Problems, Perspectives, and Prospects*, ed. by G.H. Twelftree, Eugene 2017, pp. 5–27.
- Wasiak W., *New Narrative Definition of the Miracle Story Genre in the Context of the Third Gospel*, 'Poznańskie Studia Teologiczne' 43 (2023), pp. 51–73.
- Wire A.C., *The Structure of the Gospel Miracle Stories and Their Tellers*, 'Semeia: An Experimental Journal for Biblical Criticism' 11 (1978), pp. 83–113.