

beyond Aramaic-speaking Christian groups. The only cogent suggestion is that Jesus' own use of 'abbā' in prayer and his encouragement to his followers to do the same constitute the powerful originating influence required.

This makes Jesus' understanding of his relationship with God all the more remarkable. The God of Jesus' religious experience was "Father" in an unusually intense manner that involved a powerful sense of personal and special mission. And the mission to which God called Jesus apparently included extending an unusually intimate relationship to God as "Father" among those who accepted Jesus' proclamation of God's kingdom. Whatever the partial analogies offered (e.g., by Vermes) for Jesus' own intimacy with God among ancient Jewish holy men, there is no parallel for Jesus' sense that God called him to become the pioneer and catalyst for a special filial relationship to God to be enjoyed by his disciples.

See also CHRIST; HOLY SPIRIT; "I AM" SAYINGS; KINGDOM OF GOD; LOGOS; LORD; PRAYER; SON OF GOD; WISDOM; WORSHIP.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. J. Barr, "Abba Isn't Daddy," *JTS* 39 (1988) 28-47; C. K. Barrett, "The Father is greater than I" (Jo. 14:28): Subordinationist Christology in the New Testament," in *Neues Testament und Kirche*, ed. J. Gnllka (Freiburg: Herder, 1974) 144-59; R. Bauckham, "The Sonship of the Historical Jesus in Christology," *SJT* 31 (1978) 245-60; C. H. Cosgrove, "The Divine *Dei* in Luke-Acts," *NovT* 26 (1984) 168-90; J. R. Donahue, "A Neglected Factor in the Theology of Mark," *JBL* 101 (1982) 563-94; J. D. G. Dunn, *Jesus and the Spirit* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975); J. A. Fitzmyer, "Abba and Jesus' Relation to God," in *À cause de l'Évangile: Mélanges offerts à Dom Jacques Dupont*, ed. R. Gantoy (Paris: Cerf, 1985) 16-38; D. A. Hagner, "The Vision of God in Philo and John: A Comparative Study," *JETS* 14 (1971) 81-94; L. W. Hurtado, *One God, One Lord: Early Christian Devotion and Ancient Jewish Monotheism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988); J. Jeremias, *The Prayers of Jesus* (SBT 6; London: SCM, 1967); idem, *New Testament Theology: The Proclamation of Jesus* (New York: Scribner's, 1971); J. D. Kingsbury, *The Christology of Mark's Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983); R. L. Mowery, "God, Lord and Father: The Theology of the Gospel of Matthew," *BibRes* 33 (1988) 24-36; H. F. D. Sparks, "The Doctrine of the Divine Fatherhood in the Gospels," in *Studies in the Gospels*, ed. D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Blackwell, 1967) 241-62; A. C. Sundberg, "Christology in the Fourth Gospel," *BibRes* 21 (1976) 29-37; G. Vermes, *Jesus the Jew* (London: Collins, 1973).

L. W. Hurtado

GOLDEN RULE. See SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

GOLGOTHA. See DEATH OF JESUS.

GOOD. See ETHICS OF JESUS.

GOOD NEWS. See GOSPEL (GOOD NEWS); JUBILEE.

GOOD SAMARITAN. See PARABLE; SAMARITANS.

GOSPEL (GENRE)

Discussion of the literary genre of the NT Gospels involves two basic issues: (1) the literary nature of the canonical Gospels as continuous prose narratives of Jesus' ministry and their relationship to other early Christian writings; (2) the relationship of the Gospels to their Greco-Roman literary setting. There are two practical purposes served in this discussion: (1) a better understanding of the place of the Gospels in the literary history of early Christianity and the Greco-Roman world; (2) a more intelligent interpretation of the Gospels as their features are illuminated by comparison with their literary background.

Until the 1970s there was practically a consensus that the Gospels constituted a unique literary genre in the Greco-Roman world, and that any apparent analogies with other early Christian writings or from the wider Greco-Roman literary setting were irrelevant. This consensus has been challenged, however, and various scholars have argued that the Gospels are related to one or more types of Greco-Roman literature, most often biographical writings.

It is likely that both sides in the debate have a legitimate point. On the one hand, the Gospels share various characteristics of one or more types of Greco-Roman literature and in light of this can be likened to certain literary genres of that period. Moreover, we should expect that the NT authors would have been influenced by general literary conventions and practices of their day. Yet the NT Gospels also exhibit a certain uniqueness and thus form at least a partially distinctive category or subgenre. That is, the Evangelists, though influenced by their literary environment, seem to have produced works whose origin and characteristics are to be understood most directly in terms of the early Christian groups for which the Gospels were written.

1. Definition and Significance of Genre
2. The Scholarly Debate
3. The Genre of the Gospels
4. Conclusion

1. Definition and Significance of Genre.

A literary genre is a category or type of literature, such as biography or novel. Literary genres are not universal and static categories but have developed and changed over time, and genres popular in one age or culture may not be found in another. Even if a genre, such as biography, appears in more than one period or culture, the specific characteristics of the genre will often vary significantly in the different settings.

In seeking to determine a writing's genre, therefore, we must work with the genres and literary conventions relevant to the era of the writing. Thus, for example, the question of the genre(s) of the Gospels must be addressed by examining their characteristics in comparison with the types of literature current in the Greco-Roman setting (or at least accessible to the authors). Genres are to be thought of in terms of clusters of characteristics or traits. The analysis of a work's relation to literary genres should involve comparison of all the characteristics of the relevant genres and of the work in question. Emphasis on isolated characteristics of a work can produce misleading conclusions. A writing can be associated with a particular genre only to the degree that all the characteristics of the writing can be understood adequately in terms of the features of the genre.

The sorts of characteristics and factors to be considered in trying to determine a writing's genre include the following: formal features (e.g., structure, style, motifs, devices), author's intention, compositional process, setting of author, setting of intended use, and contents. Every reader brings expectations to a writing that shape the reading process and affect how the writing is understood. Acquaintance with the genre of a writing allows one's understanding of a writing to be guided in light of the features and intentions that characterize the genre. If an author sets out to write in accordance with the conventions and features of a particular genre, it may be comparatively easy to identify the genre of the writing.

But sometimes things are not so easy. For example, if an author adapts a genre to achieve a purpose not ordinarily associated with that genre, or if an author simply does not follow very methodically the full conventions of a given genre, it may be much more difficult to categorize the writing. In any case, identifying a writing's genre requires informed judgment that must be based on familiarity with the writing and its literary and social context.

2. The Scholarly Debate.

The question of the genre of the Gospels is basically a modern issue, characteristic of the modern histori-

cal investigation of the NT. Our cultural and chronological distance from the first-century setting and our modern desire to overcome this distance through accurate knowledge of the past fuel the attempt to analyze the Gospels in their literary context. It is interesting to note that the discussion of this topic has been related to wider developments in Gospel studies.

2.1. The Earlier Consensus. In 1915 C. W. Votaw argued that the Gospels can be likened to the popular biographical literature of the Greco-Roman era. But in 1923, in reply to Votaw, K. L. Schmidt argued influentially that the Gospels are a unique type of early Christian writing, not explainable by reference to any other type of literature of the ancient world. This position became the standard view among NT scholars, virtually unchallenged until recent decades.

Schmidt's case reflected in part the distinction made earlier by F. Overbeck, in which the NT was portrayed as relatively unsophisticated in comparison to the more polished literature of the classical authors and the Christian writings of the late second century and thereafter. Also, Schmidt reflected the approach of early form criticism,* which tended to view the Gospels basically as collections of the Jesus traditions of early Christian communities and minimized the role of the Evangelists as authors. Moreover, form critics emphasized that the impetus for the Gospels was not literary but kerygmatic (from the Gk *kerygma*, "proclamation"). That is, form criticism emphasized that the Gospels embody the early Christian proclamation of the significance of Jesus and were written exclusively to serve this proclamation.

2.2. The Re-Opening of the Question. By the 1970s there was a renewed investigation of the relationship of the Gospels to Greco-Roman literature. This re-examination of the previous consensus seems to have arisen in part from developments in Gospel studies (in the 1950s and subsequently) that balanced the form-critical view of the Gospels as collections of tradition with emphasis on the role of the Evangelists as effective editors of the tradition (redaction criticism*) and/or as authors who significantly determined the nature of their narratives of Jesus (recent literary criticism* of the Gospels). Although some early contributions to the renewed question of the genre of the Gospels posited a classification of them as "aretologies" (purported narratives of divine men* in antiquity), this category has not proven viable for a variety of reasons (e.g., see Kee), including the lack of evidence for such a literary genre so defined in antiquity.

Scholars who now propose links between the Gospels and Greco-Roman literature focus on one of

three genres: biography, history or novel. The modern discussion has also raised the question of whether the Gospels belong to one genre collectively or must be classified individually in different genres. Most of those who have addressed the genre of the Gospels, however, have tended to emphasize possible connections with the genre of Greco-Roman popular biography.

3. The Genre of the Gospels.

Proper consideration of the genre of the Gospels involves a variety of factors, and the variations among the four canonical accounts make it wise to treat them individually.

3.1. Basic Factors. There are, of course, formal features of the Gospels that must be considered. The Gospels are all narratives about Jesus that include examples of his deeds and sayings in a loose chronological framework that concentrates on the period between the beginning of his ministry and his death/resurrection. They are not impartial accounts; they all enthusiastically endorse Jesus and are quite negative in their treatment of any opposition to Jesus. In the case of Matthew and Luke, there are birth accounts attached that seem likewise intended to show dramatically the significance of Jesus (*see* Birth of Jesus).

The narrative mode of the canonical Gospels and their general shape as accounts of Jesus' ministry and death/resurrection set them apart from the surviving apocryphal Gospels (*see* Gospels [Apocryphal]). The latter form an assortment of writings about Jesus that include revelation/sayings collections (e.g., *Gospel of Thomas*), fanciful narratives of Jesus' childhood (the several so-called Infancy Gospels), and other writings that may be likened a bit more to the canonical Gospels but are also shaped by different religious interests (e.g., *Gospel of Peter*). The distinctive form of the Gospels in comparison with other early Christian literature justifies viewing them as a group or subgroup unto themselves in the literary history of early Christianity.

Though they exhibit distinguishing features as continuous narratives concerned with Jesus' ministry, the canonical Gospels can be likened to genres of Greco-Roman literature, particularly popular biography of that era (*see*, e.g., Aune 1987, 17-76). Indeed, in some cases there are specific formal features of a Gospel that directly reflect literary practices of the ancient setting (e.g., Luke's preface in 1:1-4 and the prefaces to Greco-Roman literary works).

In addition to the narrative form of the Gospels, however, we should consider their contents. Here also, the Gospels can be likened to other examples of

Greco-Roman biographical writings that promote a particular hero (*see*, e.g., Talbert, "Biographies"; and Tiede). But the NT Gospels also diverge from general Greco-Roman literary culture. For example, though the Gospels may often reflect Greco-Roman themes, values and literary motifs (e.g., Luke's presentation of Jesus' death as heroic martyrdom, the motif of important teaching and events set at meal scenes, or the motif of the teacher and his disciples), more fundamentally the Evangelists invoke the OT (e.g., the many allusions and citations) and specifically early Christian beliefs in their presentation of Jesus (e.g., Jesus as "Christ"). These distinguishing features did not render their narratives more meaningful or harmonious with the literary and cultural tastes of the Greco-Roman world, and this indicates that the Evangelists were by no means simply patterning their narratives after genres of contemporary literature. Likewise, if we take into account the compositional process that probably lies behind the Gospels, there are general similarities with some types of Greco-Roman writings but also significant differences.

The Gospel writers did not invent the idea of narrating Jesus' ministry. We must surely grant some (in some places considerable) authorial contribution to the finished products. But, both in many features of their form and in most of their contents (or all, depending on one's critical opinion), the Gospels reflect the Jesus tradition of Christian groups. That is, the immediate setting that shaped the work of the Evangelists was not the literary activities of the larger Greco-Roman era but the religious and social activities, needs and questions of early Christianity.

In the case of accounts of some figures associated with particular philosophical traditions (e.g., Socrates, Pythagoras), there may have been bodies of tradition about these individuals that were carried along in the groups that revered their memory. This would provide a general similarity to the Gospels' relationship to the Jesus tradition. Nevertheless, there appears to be no direct analogy to the rather considerable Jesus tradition available to the Evangelists, the massive preoccupation with proclaiming and teaching about Jesus, and the rather exclusive claims made on his behalf in the early Christian movement.

The popularity of biographical writings in the Greco-Roman era may have conditioned the Evangelists to find the writing of their books about Jesus a worthy task. But the major reason biography-like accounts of Jesus appeared is that the early Christian message from the first was focussed on Jesus as the personal vehicle of revelation and redemption (*see*, e.g., Stanton). The impetus, basic contents and

general narrative complexion of the Gospels reflect primarily the Jesus-centered proclamation of early Christianity.

That the Gospels do not explicitly name their authors is evidence of their highly traditional nature. Contrary to the frequent literary practice of the Greco-Roman era, the Gospels do not convey their author's identities (the present superscriptions were added after the Gospels began to be circulated, probably when they were circulated as a fourfold collection). With the exception of Luke-Acts, the Gospels do not have such common literary devices as prefaces either. These things suggest that in general the Evangelists did not see themselves primarily as authors writing for a general audience, but more likely as "servants [*hypēretai*] of the word" (Lk 1:2).

Furthermore, the intended and characteristic use of the Gospels is somewhat distinctive. As indicated already, the Evangelists did not write for the general public but for the Christian groups with which they were associated. Suggestions that the Gospels were composed to fit some fixed lectionary schedule have been judged implausible. But the Gospels were apparently intended for corporate reading and teaching within Christian groups and quickly found a role in their liturgical activities. Although some Greco-Roman biographical writings may have been intended primarily for followers of a particular philosophical tradition, the close association of the Gospels with early Christian worship and proclamation suggests that we should see them as church documents with a certain biographical character rather than as biographies with a religious tone.

Furthermore, in Greco-Roman biography the central figure is glorified in terms of values that do not really derive from the figure or rest on his authority. Instead, the biographer shows the main character to be a model who embodies the virtues (sometimes the vices) already recognized by the writer and expected readers. The biographer seeks to show the essence of the main figure by recounting incidents and sayings that display and prove his character.

Although the Evangelists portray Jesus in ways that seem intended to dispose the Christian readers to find encouragement and inspiration to live as his followers, we can hardly say that the Gospels focus on the essence of Jesus' character or emphasize Jesus primarily as a model of particular virtues. In fact, they supply surprisingly little about Jesus' personality or character. The Evangelists were mainly concerned to show Jesus' significance in the divine purpose, not his virtues. Thus, in emphasis and aim, as in several other respects, the Gospels exhibit distinctive features that

do not derive from Greco-Roman literary genres.

3.2. Mark. Commonly regarded today as the earliest of the NT Gospels and the major narrative source of Matthew and Luke, it is important to try to understand the features of Mark and the forces that shaped this influential narrative. Matthew and Luke are called "Synoptic" Gospels because of their strong resemblance to Mark, making the question of the genre of Mark at least partially relevant for these other two Gospels as well (*see* Synoptic Problem).

It has long been recognized that Mark and the other Synoptics are composed of traditions about Jesus that circulated in the early churches and that can be classified into broad types of Jesus material (e.g., parables,* miracle* stories, chreia* or pronouncement stories, passion narratives,* etc.). These all exhibit in various ways rhetorical features of popular-level oral narratives as these were adapted in the proclamation and life of early Christianity. In the general narrative style of Mark as well, there is evidence of the continuing impact of oral narration. This indicates that the Gospels are not simply literary works, but are constructed in close connection with the teaching and preaching activities of early Christianity.

Some have noted that the plot or shape of Mark's story of Jesus reflects the general structure of Greek tragedy (introduction, rising action, climax/crisis, falling action, catastrophe, denouement), and a few have suggested that the Evangelist was influenced directly by this form of literature (e.g., Bilezikian, Standaert). But most scholars (e.g., Aune 1987, 48-49) believe that the resemblances are to a large extent coincidental, and that Mark's plot reflects the broad narrative structure of pre-Markan Jesus tradition in which Jesus' ministry, death and resurrection were portrayed in terms of a general structure found in widespread literature of a variety of ancient cultures: a righteous person undergoes opposition, persecution and vindication. This judgment seems correct, for not only Matthew and Luke but also John's Gospel (which is not usually thought to have been directly dependent on the Synoptics) reflect essentially this basic plot (*see* Synoptics and John).

Some features of Mark (and of Matthew and Luke as well) are characteristic of ancient biography (e.g., anecdotal narrative style, absence of character growth), but there are no indications that the author was consciously shaping his work in the light of any literary precedents or patterns. If we ask, however, how the Evangelist came to compose a written narrative of Jesus in the form he did, it may be that very general literary influences can be included in the answer.

Surely the primary reasons Mark took pen in hand were the perceived needs of the Christians for whom he wrote, and the immediate influences on him stemmed from the religious circles in which the writer worked. But it may well be that the developing popularity of biography as a literary vehicle in the Greco-Roman era (see, e.g., Cox, Momigliano) helped make it seem logical or appropriate to the author to produce the first book narrating Jesus' ministry, though it is difficult to say whether such general influence was perceived consciously by the author. That is, the relevance of the genre of Greco-Roman biography for a historical explanation of Mark may be less in terms of direct or specific similarities and influence and more in terms of the general climate that contributed to the author's decision to serve Christ and Christians through his pioneering written work.

3.3. *Matthew and Luke.* In comparison with Mark, both Matthew and Luke reflect a somewhat higher literary level and exhibit more features that can be compared with characteristics of Greco-Roman biographical literature. Aune refers to Matthew and Luke as early stages of the "literaturization," the more direct appropriation of literary tastes, that went on in early Christianity in the first few centuries.

In addition to their birth accounts, additional features such as the genealogies* and post-resurrection appearance/vindication scenes, make Matthew and Luke seem closer to ancient biographies of figures described as sons of gods or divine. Also, both Matthew and Luke have a more refined Greek style in comparison to Mark. In short, Matthew and Luke allow more scope for positing influence of the Greco-Roman literary environment. Nevertheless, like Mark, Matthew and Luke seem to have taken their major stimuli from, and had their primary connections with, the religious life of early Christianity. And the Christian matrix of these works has produced a profound adaptation of whatever Greco-Roman literary influences we can detect.

In Matthew, for example, Jesus is presented largely in terms of ideas, values and issues that stem from the OT and the Jewish and early Christian setting. The genealogy links Jesus with great figures of the OT and with the history of Israel. Like other subjects of Greco-Roman biography, Jesus is presented in Matthew as the great teacher. But in Matthew Jesus' teaching is presented thoroughly in terms of the vocabulary and motifs of the Jewish and early Christian background, which are often noticeably different from those of the general literary culture. For example, the citation of numerous OT prophecies as fulfilled by Jesus proba-

bly reflects the narrative style of OT historical books (esp. 1 Sam—2 Kings), which likewise make fulfillment of the words of prophets a major device in their accounts.

Shuler has offered a definition of Matthew as a type of laudatory biography he calls "encomium biography," but this proposal is inadequate for several reasons. All ancient biographies were either laudatory and sought the same basic objectives as the rhetorical category of speeches called encomium or (occasionally) were condemnatory and critical. Shuler's category is not recognized in ancient sources and is too vague and broad to be of use. And Shuler is surely wide of the mark when he refers to Matthew as an attempt to relate the Evangelist's message "to the society in which he lived." The many indications that the Evangelist presumed an acceptance of the OT as Scripture and Christian beliefs and vocabulary as normative show that Matthew was written as an in-house document for the encouragement and edification of fellow Christians, not for the general public.

It is with Luke that scholars usually find the closest analogies to Greco-Roman literature. The author is believed to have drawn upon Mark as his major narrative source, but the use of a formal preface (Lk 1:1-4; cf. Acts 1:1) and chronologies (Lk 2:1-2; 3:1-2) are only two more obvious indications that this Evangelist consciously drew upon literary conventions of his time as well in composing his account. The scholarly attempt to categorize Luke in terms of a particular genre, however, has not resulted in agreement on what genre is preferable.

A major difficulty in reaching agreement is that one must take into account the second part of the Evangelist's work, the Acts of the Apostles. Talbert has proposed that the combined work, Luke-Acts, is an integral work and represents a particular type of biography designed to show the valid succession of a tradition, in this case the tradition of Jesus in the ministry of the apostles featured in Acts. Others who agree that the genre of Luke must be decided in light of Acts have argued (e.g., Aune) that the two-volume work is an example of Greco-Roman historiography, in this case a history of the Christian message that begins with Jesus and continues on through to the Pauline Gentile mission.

Praeder, however, analyzed Luke-Acts as a Christian adaptation of the Greco-Roman genre of novel. Indeed, she regards all four canonical Gospels similarly, though she grants that their contents, setting and intended uses require that they be taken as forming a separate sub-genre within the genre of "the ancient novel." Still others (e.g., Pervo) see as mis-

guided the attempt to categorize Luke by reference to Acts, and have urged that there is no reason why Luke and Acts cannot be linked to different genres. Pervo regards Acts as most closely related to the Greco-Roman genre of novel, but seems to consider Luke an example of popular biography.

In view of these disagreements among scholars with special competence in Greco-Roman literature, perhaps the wisest course is to recognize the limitations inherent in approaching the Gospels, even Luke with its clear appropriation of Greco-Roman literary devices and techniques, in terms of Greco-Roman literary genres alone. To be sure, the author of Luke seems to have had direct acquaintance with formal literary conventions of the Greco-Roman era and both unconsciously and consciously drew on them in producing Luke-Acts. But the same author also shows a rich familiarity with, and the influence of, other aspects of his more immediate background in early Christian circles, as shown in his linguistic style (which is much influenced by the LXX) and in various motifs drawn from the OT.

Also, in view of the fluidity in Greco-Roman literary genres and the influences of genres on one another, it is wise to be cautious about invoking a specific literary genre as the key to Luke (or Luke-Acts) on the basis of selected features of the work. For example, Greco-Roman historiography seems not to have conformed strictly to the standards espoused by the ancients who tried to define the literary genre. Popular historiography incorporated narrative features (such as fictional embroidering of events and dialogs) associated also with novels. Likewise, what may be termed historical novels affected a style like popular historiography. Biography too was not a tightly defined genre. Authors wishing to portray a great person had a variety of literary styles and approaches they could adapt.

In summary, Luke's appropriation of particular features of Greco-Roman literary practice can be demonstrated and our grasp of the literary texture of Luke-Acts has been enhanced as a result. In spite of the scholarly disagreement mentioned, given the author's expressed intention (Lk 1:1-4) and taking Luke-Acts as a work of unified intention, the closest broad genre with which to compare Luke-Acts is probably Greco-Roman historiography. But Luke-Acts is a historical account with a sizable biographical component (Luke) and a certain amount of authorial freedom exercised in portraying dramatic scenes; and the whole was governed primarily by the ethos and needs of the Christians for whom the Evangelist wrote.

3.4. John. Not nearly as much scholarly effort has been spent on John's relationship to Greco-Roman literature. Talbert has classified John (with Mk) as an innovative example of a biography intended to correct a misunderstanding of the central character. But Talbert's categories are his own rather than those recognized by ancient writers, and his view of John as advocating a corrective christology is not widely shared.

Most scholars tend to see John as written mainly to consolidate a particular Christian community's tradition and to guide the community in the aftermath of a bitter conflict with Jewish synagogue authorities. John is both broadly similar to the Synoptics and quite distinctive in features of contents, style and arrangement. In place of a birth account and genealogy, 1:1-14 makes Jesus' birth the personal, historical manifestation of the divine Word (*logos**). In place of the parables and pronouncement stories, there are extensive dialogs (e.g., 3:1-21; 4:4-26) and discourses (esp. chaps. 14—16) in which Jesus delivers teachings. The dialog was a well-established literary motif in Greco-Roman literature.

The narrative order exhibits differences from the Synoptics also (e.g., the Temple incident in chap. 2), and the overall arrangement is distinctive (e.g., linkage of Jesus' movements with Jewish feasts) as is the vocabulary (e.g., "signs," "eternal life"). Nevertheless, John is much more easily compared with the other canonical Gospels than with any other type of ancient literature, non-Christian or Christian.

There are also interesting similarities between John and the Synoptic accounts in particular incidents such as the feeding account. The similarities show that common features were shared by different streams of the Jesus tradition. John seems to show also that the idea of a written narrative of Jesus' ministry suggested itself to more than one Christian independently in the latter decades of the first century. And it is likely that common factors, such as the general situation of the Christian movement at that time, plus, perhaps, the general literary climate, helped make the composition of a written account of Jesus' ministry seem an appropriate service to provide.

4. Conclusion.

Although there are numerous differences among them, the four canonical Gospels exhibit a basically similar type of Jesus literature: (1) connected narratives of his ministry, death and resurrection; (2) composed out of the Jesus tradition; (3) reflecting and serving early Christian proclamation; (4) intended for Christian readers and presupposing their beliefs and

vocabulary. Their general formal characteristics and/or the beliefs they affirm set them apart from other early Christian literature, canonical and non-canonical, in varying ways and degrees. They thereby constitute a distinctive group of writings within early Christianity.

Similarities to other Greco-Roman narrative genres such as biography reflect the cultural setting in which the Gospels were written. The Greco-Roman genres provide partially analogous writings that help us understand better some particular features of the Gospels, and may certainly help us see the literary expectations and categories through which non-Christian readers in particular may have viewed the Gospels. It is likely that the Evangelists consciously and, perhaps more often, unconsciously reflected features of Greco-Roman popular literature.

The Gospels are not fully explainable, however, simply in terms of the Greco-Roman literary setting or by linking them with literary genres of that era. The impetus for the Gospels derives from the religious complexion and needs of early Christianity; and their contents, presuppositions, major themes and literary texture are all heavily influenced by their immediate religious setting as well. In very general terms, the Gospels can be likened to other examples of Greco-Roman popular biography, but they also form a distinctive group within that broad body of ancient writings.

See also GOSPELS (APOCRYPHAL).

BIBLIOGRAPHY. D. E. Aune, *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987); idem, ed., *Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1988); G. G. Bilezikian, *The Liberated Gospel: A Comparison of the Gospel of Mark and Greek Tragedy* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1977); P. Cox, *Biography in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California, 1983); R. Guelich, "The Gospel Genre," in *The Gospel and the Gospels*, ed. P. Stuhlmacher (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991) 173-208; R. N. Gundry, "Recent Investigations into the Literary Genre 'Gospel,'" in *New Dimensions in New Testament Study*, ed. R. N. Longenecker and M. C. Tenney (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974) 97-114; H. C. Kee, "Aretologies, Hellenistic 'Lives,' and the Sources of Mark," in *Colloquy 12, The Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture*, ed. W. Wuellner (Berkeley, 1975); A. Momigliano, *The Development of Greek Biography* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1971); F. Overbeck, "Über die Anfänge der patristischen Literatur," *HZ* 12 (1882) 417-72; R. I. Pervo, *Profit with Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987); S. M. Praeder, "Luke-

Acts and the Ancient Novel," in *SBSLAP* (1981) 269-92; K. L. Schmidt, "Die Stellung der Evangelien in der allgemeinen Literaturgeschichte," in *Eucharisterion*, ed. H. Schmidt (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923) 50-134; P. L. Shuler, *A Genre for the Gospels* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982); B. Standaert, *L'Évangile selon Marc: Composition et genre littéraire* (Brugge: Sint-Andriesabdij, 1978); G. N. Stanton, *Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching* (SNTSMS 27; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1974); C. H. Talbert, *What Is a Gospel?* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977); idem, "Biographies of Philosophers and Rulers as Instruments of Religious Propaganda in Mediterranean Antiquity," in *ANRW* 2. 16/2:1619-1651; D. L. Tiede, "Religious Propaganda and the Gospel Literature of the Early Christian Mission," in *ANRW* 2. 25/2:1705-29; C. W. Votaw, *The Gospels and Contemporary Biographies in the Greco-Roman World* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970; reprint from *AJT* 19 [1915], 45-73, 217-49).

L. W. Hurtado

GOSPEL (GOOD NEWS)

Gospel, or "good news," designates Jesus' message of the appearance of God's* kingdom (see Kingdom of God), a message entailing liberty for those held captive to any form of affliction and demonstrated most dramatically in acts of healing.* In some instances the term encompasses the whole story of the life, death* and resurrection* of Jesus.

1. Terminology, Distribution and Origins
2. Luke
3. Matthew and Mark

1. Terminology, Distribution and Origins.

Matthew (4 x) and Mark (8 x, including Mk 16:15) use the noun form *euangelion* (the message of "good news"), which is usually the object of the verb *hērussō* ("to preach"). Luke (10 x) makes exclusive use of the verb form *euangelizō* (the activity of "preaching good news"), except in Luke 7:22, a citation from Isaiah 61:1 (par. Mt 11:5). Neither term appears in John. The general usage of these terms appears to be consistent with their etymology: the *eu-* prefix meaning "well, good" and *angellō*, meaning "to proclaim news."

Each Evangelist uses these terms in a distinctive manner. In six of the eight instances of *gospel* in Mark (including Mk 16:15) it appears as a Markan expansion (Mk 1:1, 14-15; 8:35; 10:29; 16:15) which is not followed by either Matthew or Luke. Mark uses the term absolutely (i.e., without qualification), except in Mark 1:1 ("of Jesus Christ") and 1:14 ("of God," i.e., the kingdom of God; see Mk 1:15). Matthew, on the other hand, where he parallels Mark either omits