

35^A WORD BIBLICAL COMMENTARY

Luke 1-9:20

JOHN NOLLAND

General Editors: David A. Hubbard, Glenn W. Barker†
Editor, Old Testament: John D. W. Watts
Editor, New Testament: Ralph P. Martin

WORD

BIBLICAL

COMMENTARY

VOLUME 35A

Luke 1-9:20

JOHN NOLLAND

WORD BOOKS, PUBLISHER • DALLAS, TEXAS

General Editors

**David A. Hubbard
Glenn W. Barker †**

Old Testament Editor

John D. W. Watts

New Testament Editor

Ralph P. Martin

Word Biblical Commentary

LUKE 1-9:20

Copyright © 1989 by Word, Incorporated

All rights reserved. No portion of this book may be reproduced in any form without the written permission of the publisher.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Main entry under title:

Word biblical commentary.

Includes bibliographies.

1. Bible—Commentaries Collected Works.

BS491.2.W67 220.7'7 81-71768

ISBN 0-8499-0234-7 (vol. 35A) AACR2

Printed in the United States of America

The author's own translation of the Scripture text appears in italic type under the heading *Translation*.

89801239 AGF 987654321

*To my mother
and in memory of my father*

Contents

<i>Editorial Preface</i>	vii
<i>Author's Preface</i>	viii
<i>Abbreviations</i>	xi
INTRODUCTION	xxvii
The Perspectives of Modern Gospel Scholarship	xxvii
The Composition of the Lukan Gospel	xxviii
Why Did Luke Write His Gospel?	xxxii
Luke and Acts	xxxiii
Who Was Luke?	xxxiv
When Did Luke Write His Gospel?	xxxvii
How Good Is Our Surviving Text?	xxxix
An Outline of Luke 1:1–9:20	xli
Excursus: Modern Parables Research	xliii
COMMENTARY BIBLIOGRAPHY	xliv
GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY	1
TEXT AND COMMENTARY	1
Dedicatory Preface (1:1–4)	3
The Infancy Prologue (1:5–2:52)	13
John's Birth Announced (1:5–25)	13
Jesus' Birth Announced (1:26–38)	36
Mary Visits Elizabeth (1:39–56)	59
Birth, Circumcision, and Naming of John (1:57–66)	77
Zechariah's Prophecy (1:67–80)	81
The Birth of Jesus (2:1–21)	93
Presentation and Recognition in the Temple (2:22–40)	113
In the House of His Father (2:41–52)	126
Preparation for the Ministry of Jesus (3:1–4:13)	136
John the Baptist (3:1–6)	136
The Preaching of John (3:7–18)	145
The Imprisonment of John (3:19–20)	155
Jesus Endowed with the Spirit and Affirmed as Son (3:21–22)	157
The Genealogy of Jesus (3:23–38)	166
Temptations of the Son in the Wilderness (4:1–13)	174
Preaching in the Synagogues of the Jews (4:14–44)	184
Return to Galilee (4:14–15)	184
Preaching in Nazareth (4:16–30)	188
Preaching in Capernaum (4:31–37)	203
Healing Simon's Mother-in-Law (4:38–39)	209

CONTENTS

Healing Mary at Sundown (4:40–41)	212
Leaving Capernaum for a Wider Judean Ministry (4:42–44)	214
Making a Response to Jesus (5:1–6:16)	218
Fishing Associates for Jesus (5:1–11)	218
The Cleansing of a Leper (5:12–16)	224
The Forgiveness of a Paralyzed Man (5:17–26)	229
The New and the Old: The Call of Levi, Eating with Sinners, and the Question of Fasting (5:27–39)	239
Provision for the Sabbath by the Son of Man (6:1–5)	251
Doing Good on the Sabbath (6:6–11)	259
The Call of the Twelve Apostles (6:12–16)	262
A Sermon for the Disciples: The Status and Demands of Being the Eschatological People of God (6:17–49)	273
Disciples and People Come to Hear and Be Healed (6:17–19)	273
Beatitudes and Woes (6:20–26)	277
The Call to Love of Enemies and Nonjudgmental Generosity (6:27–38)	291
The Importance of What Jesus Teaches and the Need to Act upon It (6:39–49)	304
Something Greater than John Is Here (7:1–50)	312
The Authority of Jesus over Life and Death (7:1–10)	312
God Has Visited His People (7:11–17)	319
Are You the Coming One? (7:18–23)	325
What Was in the Wilderness? (7:24–28)	333
John and Jesus, and This Generation and the Children of Wisdom (7:29–35)	339
The Pharisee and the Sinful Woman (7:36–50)	349
Itinerant Preaching with the Twelve and the Women (8:1–9:20)	363
Itinerant Preaching with the Twelve and the Women (8:1–3)	363
Potent Seed and Varied Soils (8:4–8)	368
Knowing the Secrets of the Kingdom of God (8:9–10)	377
The Parable Explained (8:11–15)	381
Take Care What You Hear (8:16–18)	388
Jesus' Mother and Brothers (8:19–21)	392
The Stilling of the Storm (8:22–25)	395
The Healing of the Gerasene Demoniac (8:26–39)	402
Jairus' Daughter and the Woman with the Flow of Blood (8:40–56)	415
Sharing in Jesus' Ministry (9:1–6)	424
Who Then Is 'This? (9:7–9)	429
Feeding the Multitudes (9:10–17)	433
"[We Say You Are] the Christ of God" (9:18–20)	447

Editorial Preface

The launching of the *Word Biblical Commentary* brings to fulfillment an enterprise of several years' planning. The publishers and the members of the editorial board met in 1977 to explore the possibility of a new commentary on the books of the Bible that would incorporate several distinctive features. Prospective readers of these volumes are entitled to know what such features were intended to be; whether the aims of the commentary have been fully achieved time alone will tell.

First, we have tried to cast a wide net to include as contributors a number of scholars from around the world who not only share our aims, but are in the main engaged in the ministry of teaching in university, college, and seminary. They represent a rich diversity of denominational allegiance. The broad stance of our contributors can rightly be called evangelical, and this term is to be understood in its positive, historic sense of a commitment to Scripture as divine revelation, and to the truth and power of the Christian gospel.

Then, the commentaries in our series are all commissioned and written for the purpose of inclusion in the *Word Biblical Commentary*. Unlike several of our distinguished counterparts in the field of commentary writing, there are no translated works, originally written in a non-English language. Also, our commentators were asked to prepare their own rendering of the original biblical text and to use those languages as the basis of their own comments and exegesis. What may be claimed as distinctive with this series is that it is based on the biblical languages, yet it seeks to make the technical and scholarly approach to a theological understanding of Scripture understandable by—and useful to—the fledgling student, the working minister, and colleagues in the guild of professional scholars and teachers as well.

Finally, a word must be said about the format of the series. The layout, in clearly defined sections, has been consciously devised to assist readers at different levels. Those wishing to learn about the textual witnesses on which the translation is offered are invited to consult the section headed *Notes*. If the readers' concern is with the state of modern scholarship on any given portion of Scripture, they should turn to the sections on *Bibliography* and *Form/Structure/Setting*. For a clear exposition of the passage's meaning and its relevance to the ongoing biblical revelation, the *Comment* and concluding *Explanation* are designed expressly to meet that need. There is therefore something for everyone who may pick up and use these volumes.

If these aims come anywhere near realization, the intention of the editors will have been met, and the labor of our team of contributors rewarded.

General Editors: *David A. Hubbard*
Glenn W. Barker†

Old Testament: *John D. W. Watts*

New Testament: *Ralph P. Martin*

Author's Preface

In 1966 W. C. van Unnik wrote an article under the title "Luke-Acts, A Storm Center in Contemporary Scholarship" (In *Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn). It is probably fair to say that the intensity of the storm has since considerably abated, but there has continued to be an immense devotion of scholarly labor dedicated to the elucidation of the Lukan writings. And as some issues in dispute have clarified with the emergence of a good degree of scholarly consensus, other issues have come forward to take their place as matters in hot dispute.

A commentary such as the present one is partly a digest of the present state of this ongoing debate. In this guise it seeks to synthesize the insights that are scattered through the specialist literature and to evaluate in connection with the development of a coherent understanding of the whole Lukan enterprise the competing suggestions that have been offered in the literature for the understanding of individual items. It has, however, also been my intention to offer a fresh reading of each passage of the Gospel. In this guise the perusal of the literature has been a kind of apprenticeship or an initiation, entitling me to move on beyond the place where the accumulated discussion has taken us. Here my ambition has been to improve the answers that have been given to the issues thrown up by the particular features of the individual passages and at points to add my own questions to the scholarly agenda.

I have focused my engagement with the scholarly literature on the journal literature and the specialist monographs rather than upon the existing commentaries, largely because of the greater possibility there for exploring the detailed reasoning that stands behind the particular judgments which have been made. That said, I have learned much from the commentators. Schürmann and Fitzmyer have been constant companions. Marshall and Grundmann have also been of special use, as in different ways have the earlier works of Schlatter, Godet, and Loisy. Other commentators have periodically left their mark upon the present work. D. M. Goulder's recent work (*Luke: A New Paradigm* [2 vols., JSNTSS 20; Sheffield: JSOT, 1989]) did not appear before the manuscript left my hands in January 1989. I have tried to keep an eye constantly upon Luke's second volume, and the scholarship devoted to its elucidation, but here I have necessarily been much more selective.

While I have attempted to take something like comprehensive responsibility for all the issues involved in attempting to provide a modern reading of the ancient Lukan text, inevitably my own sense of the relative importance of things, as well as of my own areas of greater strength, will be reflected in the allocation of space (and of effort). The central paradigm for my work has been provided by seeing the Gospel text as an exercise in communication, deliberately undertaken by the Gospel writer with at least some focused sense of the actual or potential needs of his audience. I use "communication" here in a broad sense to encompass all the ways in which the Gospel may be intended to have an impact upon the reader.

To give one example that goes beyond what we might call the theological message of the book, there is a considerable sense of literature about Luke's work. Some of that will be due to Luke's instincts as artist and in that sense will be an expression of his own person as artist; some of that will be due to the fact that Luke stands heir (from the Old Testament, but also from his Christian context) to a narrative method of doing theology, along with which comes an investment in the artistry of story-telling; but for part of the explanation of this literary phenomenon we need to look in a totally nonliterary direction. Luke's ambition was not to make a name for himself in the literary world of the day (his work probably does not come up to that level). His efforts were directed towards being taken with a certain kind of seriousness in this attempt that he has made to commend and elucidate the Christian faith: Luke seeks to write at a level that would commend itself to the cultural level of his readers and implicitly make certain claims about how they as readers should orient themselves to his work. That is, Luke uses literary means to nonliterary ends. With an eye upon each of these roles for literary technique, I have sought to pay particular attention to the literary strategies of Luke at both the micro-level and the macro-level.

While the main paradigm for inquiry has been provided by a concern for the nexus of communication, the commentary also pays considerable attention to issues concerning the ultimate origin of the materials that Luke has used. Luke seems to have a concern to present his material as capable of standing up to "secular" scrutiny. He is the Gospel writer who is most clearly aware of a distance between his own reporting and the events that it is his concern to report (Luke 1:1-4), and he is the one Gospel writer who seems to work with a fairly clear conceptual distinction between the place for religious testimony and the role of "historical" evidence in commending the Christian faith. His own approach, therefore, invites our attention to the questions of origin.

The commentary may be accessed at various levels. Most readers will find the *Explanation* for each passage the best point of entry. Here the major results of the detailed work of the earlier sections are outlined in nontechnical language. Also important for keeping in view the overall thrust of the Lukan text are the brief summaries which begin each major section of the commentary, and which at the next level down constitute the opening paragraphs for both the *Form/Structure/Setting* and the *Comment* for each passage.

Libraries are finally what make humanistic scholarship possible, and I am deeply grateful for the library resources that have been made available to me at Regent College, Vancouver, the University of British Columbia; Tyndale House Cambridge, the University of Cambridge; and Trinity College Bristol. I am particularly grateful for the inter-library loan services which have given me access to a great many items not held by the particular libraries where I have worked from time to time. I wish to pay a particular tribute to the series of teaching assistants who in the early years of this project gathered library resources for me and to Su Brown, assistant librarian at Trinity College Bristol, who was of such assistance in the final stages of readying the manuscript for the press.

I owe a debt of gratitude to Regent College, for the year of sabbatical leave in which a considerable part of the manuscript was written.

Finally I pay tribute to my wife Lisa and son David who have borne with my having this project on my mind for many a year, and particularly to my wife who "journeyed [with me to] a foreign land" far "away from [her] country and [her] kindred and [her] father's house" in order that I might be able to stay in the kind of employment that would allow me to continue with this work.

October 1989
Trinity College, Bristol

JOHN NOLLAND

Abbreviations

A. General Abbreviations

A	Codex Alexandrinus	infra	below
<i>ad</i>	comment on	in loc.	<i>in loco</i> , in the place cited
Akkad.	Akkadian	Jos.	Josephus
℞	Codex Sinaiticus	lat	Latin
Ap. Lit.	Apocalyptic Literature	loc. cit.	the place cited
Apoc.	Apocrypha	LXX	Septuagint
Aq.	Aquila's Greek	M	Mishna
	Translation of the OT	masc.	masculine
Arab.	Arabic	mg.	margin
Aram.	Aramaic	MS(S)	manuscript(s)
B	Codex Vaticanus	MT	Masoretic text (of the Old Testament)
C	Codex Ephraemi Syri		
c.	<i>circa</i> , about	n.	note
cent.	century	n.d.	no date
cf.	<i>confer</i> , compare	Nestle	Nestle (ed.), <i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> ²⁶
chap(s).	chapter(s)		rev. by K. and B. Aland
cod., codd.	codex, codices	no.	number
contra	in contrast to	n.s.	new series
CUP	Cambridge University Press	NT	New Testament
D	Codex Bezae	obs.	obsolete
DSS	Dead Sea Scrolls	o.s.	old series
ed.	edited by, editor(s)	OT	Old Testament
e.g.	<i>exempli gratia</i> , for example	p., pp.	page, pages
et al.	<i>et alii</i> , and others	<i>pace</i>	with due respect to, but differing from
ET	English translation	//, par(s).	parallel(s)
EV	English Versions of the Bible	par.	paragraph
f., ff.	following (verse or verses, pages, etc.)	passim	elsewhere
fem.	feminine	pl.	plural
frag.	fragments	Pseudep.	Pseudepigrapha
FS	Festschrift, volume written in honor of	Q	Quelle ("Sayings" source for the Gospels)
ft.	foot, feet	q.v.	<i>quod vide</i> , which see
gen.	genitive	rev.	revised, reviser, revision
Gr.	Greek	Rom.	Roman
<i>hap. leg.</i>	<i>hapax legomenon</i> , sole occurrence	RVmg	Revised Version margin
Heb.	Hebrew	Sam.	Samaritan recension
Hitt.	Hittite	sc.	<i>scilicet</i> , that is to say
ibid.	<i>ibidem</i> , in the same place	Sem.	Semitic
id.	<i>idem</i> , the same	sing.	singular
i.e.	<i>id est</i> , that is	Sumer.	Sumerian
impf.	imperfect	s.v.	<i>sub verbo</i> , under the word
		sy	Syriac
		Symm.	Symmachus

Tg.	Targum	v, vv	verse, verses
Theod.	Theodotion	viz.	<i>videlicet</i> , namely
TR	Textus Receptus	vg	Vulgate
tr.	translator, translated by	<i>v.l.</i>	<i>varia lectio</i> , alternative reading
UBSGT	The United Bible Societies Greek Text	vol.	volume
Ugar.	Ugaritic	x	times (2x = two times, etc.)
UP	University Press		
u.s.	<i>ut supra</i> , as above		

For abbreviations of Greek MSS used in *Notes*, see Nestle²⁶.

B. Abbreviations for Translations and Paraphrases

AmT	Smith and Goodspeed, <i>The Complete Bible, An American Translation</i>	Moffatt	J. Moffatt, <i>A New Translation of the Bible</i> (NT 1913)
AB	Anchor Bible	NAB	The New American Bible
ASV	American Standard Version, American Revised Version (1901)	NEB	The New English Bible
AV	Authorized Version = KJV	NIV	The New International Version (1978)
GNB	Good News Bible = Today's English Version	NJB	New Jerusalem Bible (1985)
JB	Jerusalem Bible	Phillips	J. B. Phillips, <i>The New Testament in Modern English</i>
JPS	Jewish Publication Society, <i>The Holy Scriptures</i>	RSV	Revised Standard Version (NT 1946, OT 1952, Apoc. 1957)
KJV	King James Version (1611) = AV	RV	Revised Version, 1881-85
Knox	R. A. Knox, <i>The Holy Bible: A Translation from the Latin Vulgate in the Light of the Hebrew and Greek Original</i>	Wey	R. F. Weymouth, <i>The New Testament in Modern Speech</i>
		Wms	C. B. Williams, <i>The New Testament: A Translation in the Language of the People</i>

C. Abbreviations of Commonly Used Periodicals, Reference Works, and Serials

AAS	<i>Acta apostolicae sedis</i>		antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AARSR	American Academy of Religion Studies in Religion	AGSU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des Spätjudentums und Urchristentums
AASOR	Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research	AH	F. Rosenthal, <i>An Aramaic Handbook</i>
AB	Anchor Bible	AHR	<i>American Historical Review</i>
ABR	<i>Australian Biblical Review</i>	AHW	W. von Soden, <i>Akkadisches Handwörterbuch</i>
AbrN	<i>Abr-Nahrain</i>	AION	<i>Annali dell'istituto orientale di Napoli</i>
ACNT	Augsburg Commentary on the New Testament	AJA	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i>
AcOr	<i>Acta orientalia</i>	AJAS	<i>American Journal of Arabic Studies</i>
ACW	Ancient Christian Writers	AJBA	<i>Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology</i>
ADAJ	<i>Annual of the Department of Antiquities of Jordan</i>		
AER	<i>American Ecclesiastical Review</i>		
AfO	<i>Archiv für Orientforschung</i>		
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des		

<i>AJBI</i>	<i>Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute</i>	<i>ASS</i>	<i>Acta sanctae sedis</i>
<i>AJP</i>	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>	<i>AsSeign</i>	<i>Assemblées du Seigneur</i>
<i>AJSL</i>	<i>American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literature</i>	<i>ASSR</i>	<i>Archives des sciences sociales des religions</i>
<i>AJT</i>	<i>American Journal of Theology</i>	<i>ASTI</i>	<i>Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute</i>
<i>ALBO</i>	<i>Analecta Iovaniensia biblica et orientalia</i>	<i>ATAbh</i>	<i>Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen</i>
<i>ALGHJ</i>	<i>Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums</i>	<i>ATANT</i>	<i>Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments</i>
<i>ALUOS</i>	<i>Annual of Leeds University Oriental Society</i>	<i>ATD</i>	<i>Das Alte Testament Deutsch</i>
<i>AnBib</i>	<i>Analecta biblica</i>	<i>ATDan</i>	<i>Acta Theologica Danica</i>
<i>AnBoll</i>	<i>Analecta Bollandiana</i>	<i>ATJ</i>	<i>African Theological Journal</i>
<i>ANEP</i>	J. B. Pritchard (ed.), <i>Ancient Near East in Pictures</i>	<i>ATR</i>	<i>Anglican Theological Review</i>
<i>ANESTP</i>	J. B. Pritchard (ed.), <i>Ancient Near East Supplementary Texts and Pictures</i>	<i>AUSS</i>	<i>Andrews University Seminary Studies</i>
<i>ANET</i>	J. B. Pritchard (ed.), <i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts</i>	<i>BA</i>	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
<i>ANF</i>	<i>The Ante-Nicene Fathers</i>	<i>BAC</i>	<i>Biblioteca de autores cristianos</i>
<i>Ang</i>	<i>Anglicum</i>	<i>BAGD</i>	W. Bauer, <i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> , ET, ed. W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich; 2d ed. rev. F. W. Gingrich and F. W. Danker (University of Chicago, 1979)
<i>AnOr</i>	<i>Analecta orientalia</i>	<i>BAH</i>	<i>Bibliothèque archéologique et historique</i>
<i>ANQ</i>	<i>Andover Newton Quarterly</i>	<i>BangTF</i>	<i>Bangalore Theological Forum</i>
<i>ANRW</i>	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</i> , ed. H. Temporini and W. Haase, Berlin	<i>BAR</i>	<i>Biblical Archaeology Review</i>
<i>ANT</i>	<i>Arbeiten zur Neutestamentlichen Textforschung</i>	<i>BASOR</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
<i>Anton</i>	<i>Antonianum</i>	<i>BASP</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists</i>
<i>AOAT</i>	<i>Alter Orient und Altes Testament</i>	<i>BBB</i>	<i>Bonner biblische Beiträge</i>
<i>AOS</i>	<i>American Oriental Series</i>	<i>BCSR</i>	<i>Bulletin of the Council on the Study of Religion</i>
<i>AP</i>	J. Marouzeau (ed.), <i>L'année philologique</i>	<i>BDB</i>	F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, <i>Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament</i> (Oxford: Clarendon, 1907)
<i>APOT</i>	R. H. Charles (ed.), <i>Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament</i>	<i>BDF</i>	F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and R. W. Funk, <i>A Greek Grammar of the New Testament</i> (University of Chicago/University of Cambridge, 1961)
<i>ARG</i>	<i>Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte</i>		
<i>ARM</i>	<i>Archives royales de Mari</i>		
<i>ArOr</i>	<i>Archiv orientální</i>		
<i>ARSHLL</i>	<i>Acta Reg. Societatis Humaniorum Litterarum Lundensis</i>		
<i>ARW</i>	<i>Archiv für Religionswissenschaft</i>		
<i>ASNU</i>	<i>Acta seminarii neotestamentici upsaliensis</i>		

BDR	F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and F. Rehkopf, <i>Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch</i>	BRev	<i>Bible Review</i>
BeO	<i>Bibbia e oriente</i>	BS	Biblische Studien
BET	Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie	BSac	<i>Biblica Sacra</i>
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovanensium	BSO(A)S	<i>Bulletin of the School of Oriental (and African) Studies</i>
BEvT	Beiträge zur evangelischen Theologie	BSR	Bibliothèque de sciences religieuses
BFCT	Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie	BT	<i>The Bible Translator</i>
BGBE	Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese	BTB	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
BHH	<i>Biblisch-Historisches Handwörterbuch</i>	BU	Biblische Untersuchungen
BHK	R. Kittel, <i>Biblia hebraica</i>	BulCPE	<i>Bulletin du Centre Protestant d'Études (Geneva)</i>
BHS	<i>Biblia hebraica stuttgartensia</i>	BVC	<i>Bible et vie chrétienne</i>
BHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie	BW	<i>Biblical World</i>
Bib	<i>Biblica</i>	BWANT	Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom Alten und Neuen Testament
BibB	Biblische Beiträge	BZ	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BibLeb	<i>Bibel und Leben</i>	BZAW	Beihefte zur ZAW
BibNot	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>	BZET	Beihefte zur Evangelische Theologie
BibOr	<i>Biblica et orientalia</i>	BZNW	Beihefte zur ZNW
BibS(F)	Biblische Studien (Freiburg, 1895-)	BZRGG	Beihefte zur ZRGG
BibS(N)	Biblische Studien (Neukirchen, 1951-)	CAD	<i>The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago</i>
BiTod	<i>The Bible Today</i>	CAH	<i>Cambridge Ancient History</i>
BIES	<i>Bulletin of the Israel Exploration Society (= Yediot)</i>	CAT	Commentaire de l'Ancien Testament
BIFAO	<i>Bulletin de l'institut français d'archéologie orientale</i>	CB	<i>Cultura biblica</i>
BILL	Bibliothèque des cahiers de l'Institut de Linguistique de Louvain	CBG	<i>Collationes Brugenses et Gandavenses</i>
BJRL	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester</i>	CBQ	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
BJS	Brown Judaic Studies	CBQMS	CBQ Monograph Series
BK	<i>Bibel und Kirche</i>	CBVE	<i>Comenius Blätter für Volkerziehung</i>
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar: Altes Testament	CCath	Corpus Catholicorum
BL	<i>Book List</i>	CChr	Corpus Christianorum
BLE	<i>Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique</i>	CGTC	Cambridge Greek Testament Commentary
BLit	<i>Bibel und Liturgie</i>	CGTSC	Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools and Colleges
BLS	Bible and Literature Series	CH	<i>Church History</i>
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentaries	CHR	<i>Catholic Historical Review</i>
BO	<i>Bibliotheca orientalis</i>	CIG	<i>Corpus inscriptionum graecarum</i>
BR	<i>Biblical Research</i>	CII	<i>Corpus inscriptionum iudaicarum</i>
		CIL	<i>Corpus inscriptionum latinarum</i>

<i>CIS</i>	<i>Corpus inscriptionum semiticarum</i>	<i>EBib</i>	<i>Etudes bibliques</i>
<i>CJT</i>	<i>Canadian Journal of Theology</i>	<i>EBT</i>	<i>Encyclopedia of Biblical Theology</i>
<i>ClerRev</i>	<i>Clergy Review</i>	<i>EcR</i>	<i>Ecclesiastical Review</i>
<i>CLit</i>	<i>Christianity and Literature</i>	<i>ED</i>	<i>Euntes Docete (Rome)</i>
<i>CM</i>	<i>Cahiers marials</i>	<i>EE</i>	<i>Estudios Eclesiásticos</i>
<i>CNT</i>	<i>Commentaire du Nouveau Testament</i>	<i>EglT</i>	<i>Église et théologie</i>
<i>ComLit</i>	<i>Communautés et liturgies</i>	<i>EHAT</i>	<i>Exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament</i>
<i>ConB</i>	<i>Coniectanea biblica</i>	<i>EKKNT</i>	<i>Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament</i>
<i>Concil</i>	<i>Concilium</i>		
<i>ConNT</i>	<i>Coniectanea neotestamentica</i>	<i>EKL</i>	<i>Evangelisches Kirchenlexikon</i>
<i>CQ</i>	<i>Church Quarterly</i>	<i>Emman</i>	<i>Emmanuel</i>
<i>CQR</i>	<i>Church Quarterly Review</i>	<i>EncJud</i>	<i>Encyclopedia judaica (1971)</i>
<i>CRAIBL</i>	<i>Comptes rendus de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres</i>	<i>EnchBib</i>	<i>Enchiridion biblicum</i>
<i>CrQ</i>	<i>Crozier Quarterly</i>	<i>EpR</i>	<i>Epworth Review</i>
<i>CSCO</i>	<i>Corpus scriptorum christianorum orientalium</i>	<i>ER</i>	<i>Ecumenical Review</i>
<i>CSEL</i>	<i>Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum</i>	<i>ErJb</i>	<i>Eranos Jahrbuch</i>
<i>CTA</i>	<i>A. Herdner, Corpus des tablettes en cunéiformes alphabétiques</i>	<i>EstBib</i>	<i>Estudios biblicos</i>
<i>CTJ</i>	<i>Calvin Theological Journal</i>	<i>ETL</i>	<i>Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses</i>
<i>CTQ</i>	<i>Concordia Theological Quarterly</i>	<i>ETR</i>	<i>Etudes théologiques et religieuses</i>
<i>CurTM</i>	<i>Currents in Theology and Mission</i>	<i>ETS</i>	<i>Erfurter Theologische Studien</i>
<i>CV</i>	<i>Communio viatorum</i>	<i>EvK</i>	<i>Evangelische Kommentar</i>
		<i>EvQ</i>	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
		<i>EvT</i>	<i>Evangelische Theologie</i>
		<i>EW</i>	<i>Exegetisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament (EWNT), ed. H. Balz and G. Schneider, 3 vols. (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1980–83)</i>
<i>DACL</i>	<i>Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie</i>	<i>Exp</i>	<i>Expositor</i>
<i>DBSup</i>	<i>Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément</i>	<i>ExpTim</i>	<i>The Expository Times</i>
<i>Diak</i>	<i>Diakonia</i>		
<i>DISO</i>	<i>C.-F. Jean and J. Hoftijzer, Dictionnaire des inscriptions sémitiques de l'ouest</i>	<i>FB</i>	<i>Forschung zur Bibel</i>
<i>DJD</i>	<i>Discoveries in the Judean Desert</i>	<i>FBBS</i>	<i>Facet Books, Biblical Series</i>
<i>DL</i>	<i>Doctrine and Life</i>	<i>FC</i>	<i>Fathers of the Church</i>
<i>DOTT</i>	<i>D. W. Thomas (ed.), Documents from Old Testament Times</i>	<i>FM</i>	<i>Faith and Mission</i>
<i>DR</i>	<i>Downside Review</i>	<i>FRLANT</i>	<i>Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments</i>
<i>DS</i>	<i>Denzinger-Schönmetzer, Enchiridion symbolorum</i>	<i>FTS</i>	<i>Frankfurter Theologische Studien</i>
<i>DT</i>	<i>Deutsche Theologie</i>		
<i>DTC</i>	<i>Dictionnaire de théologie catholique</i>	<i>GAG</i>	<i>W. von Soden, Grundriss der akkadischen Grammatik</i>
<i>DTT</i>	<i>Dansk teologisk tidsskrift</i>	<i>GCS</i>	<i>Griechische christliche Schriftsteller</i>
<i>DunRev</i>	<i>Dunwoodie Review</i>	<i>GKB</i>	<i>Gesenius-Kautzsch-</i>

	Bergsträsser, <i>Hebräische Grammatik</i>	IBS	<i>Irish Biblical Studies</i>
GKC	Gesenius' <i>Hebrew Grammar</i> , ed. E. Kautzsch, tr. A. E. Cowley	ICC	International Critical Commentary
GNT	Grundrisse zum Neuen Testament	IDB	G. A. Buttrick (ed.), <i>Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</i>
GOTR	<i>Greek Orthodox Theological Review</i>	IDBSup	Supplementary volume to IDB
GRBS	<i>Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies</i>	IEJ	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
Greg	<i>Gregorianum</i>	IER	<i>Irish Ecclesiastical Record</i>
GThT	<i>Geformet Theologisch Tijdschrift</i>	ILS	H. Dessau (ed.), <i>Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae</i> (Berlin, 1892)
GTJ	<i>Grace Theological Journal</i>	Int	<i>Interpretation</i>
GuL	<i>Geist und Leben</i>	ISBE	<i>International Standard Bible Encyclopedia</i> , ed. G. W. Bromiley
HALAT	W. Baumgartner et al., <i>Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament</i>	ITQ	<i>Irish Theological Quarterly</i>
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament	ITS	<i>Indian Theological Studies</i>
HB	<i>Homiletica en Biblica</i>	JA	<i>Journal asiatique</i>
HDR	Harvard Dissertations in Religion	JAAR	<i>Journal of the American Academy of Religion</i>
HeyJ	<i>Heythrop Journal</i>	JAC	<i>Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum</i>
HibJ	<i>Hibbert Journal</i>	JAMA	<i>Journal of the American Medical Association</i>
HKAT	Handkommentar zum Alten Testament	JANESCU	<i>Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University</i>
HKNT	Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament	JAOS	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
HL	<i>Das heilige Land</i>	JAS	<i>Journal of Asian Studies</i>
HNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament	JBC	R. E. Brown et al. (eds.), <i>The Jerome Biblical Commentary</i>
HNTC	Harper's NT Commentaries	JBL	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
HR	<i>History of Religions</i>	JBR	<i>Journal of Bible and Religion</i>
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs	JCS	<i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</i>
HTKNT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament	JDS	<i>Judean Desert Studies</i>
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>	JEA	<i>Journal of Egyptian Archaeology</i>
HTS	Harvard Theological Studies	JEH	<i>Journal of Ecclesiastical History</i>
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>	JES	<i>Journal of Ecumenical Studies</i>
HUTH	Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie	JETS	<i>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</i>
IB	<i>Interpreter's Bible</i>	JHS	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
IBD	<i>Illustrated Bible Dictionary</i> , ed. J. D. Douglas and N. Hillyer	JIBS	<i>Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies</i>
		JIPh	<i>Journal of Indian Philosophy</i>
		JJS	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>

JMES	<i>Journal of Middle Eastern Studies</i>	LD	Lectio divina
JMS	<i>Journal of Mithraic Studies</i>	Leš	Lešonénu
JNES	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>	LingBib	Linguistica Biblica
JPOS	<i>Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society</i>	LLAVT	E. Vogt, <i>Lexicon linguae aramaicae Veteris Testamenti</i>
JQR	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>	LouvStud	Louvain Studies
JQRMS	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review Monograph Series</i>	LPGL	G. W. H. Lampe, <i>Patristic Greek Lexicon</i>
JR	<i>Journal of Religion</i>	LQ	<i>Lutheran Quarterly</i>
JRAS	<i>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society</i>	LR	<i>Lutherische Rundschau</i>
JRE	<i>Journal of Religious Ethics</i>	LSJ	Liddell-Scott-Jones, <i>Greek-English Lexicon</i>
JRelS	<i>Journal of Religious Studies</i>	LTK	<i>Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche</i>
JRH	<i>Journal of Religious History</i>	LTSB	<i>Lutheran Theological Seminary Bulletin</i>
JRomH	<i>Journal of Roman History</i>	LUÅ	Lunds universitets årsskrift
JRT	<i>Journal of Religious Thought</i>	LumVie	<i>Lumière et Vie</i>
JSJ	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>	LVit	<i>Lumen Vitae</i>
JSNT	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>	LW	<i>Lutheran World</i>
JSOT	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>	MC	<i>Modern Churchman</i>
JSOTSup	<i>JSOT Supplement Series</i>	McCQ	<i>McCormick Quarterly</i>
JSS	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>	MDOG	<i>Mitteilungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft</i>
JSSR	<i>Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion</i>	MelT	<i>Melita Theologica</i>
JTC	<i>Journal for Theology and the Church</i>	MeyerK	H. A. W. Meyer, <i>Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament</i>
JTS	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>	MM	J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, <i>The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament</i> (London: Hodder, 1930)
JTSA	<i>Journal of Theology for South Africa</i>	MNTC	Moffatt NT Commentary
Jud	<i>Judaica</i>	MPAIBL	<i>Mémoires présentés à l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres</i>
KAI	H. Donner and W. Röllig, <i>Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften</i>	MPG	<i>Patrologia Graeca</i> , ed. J. P. Migne, 1844 ff.
KAT	E. Sellin (ed.), <i>Kommentar zum Alten Testament</i>	MScRel	<i>Mélanges de science religieuse</i>
KB	L. Koehler and W. Baumgartner, <i>Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti libros</i>	MTS	Marburger theologische Studien
KD	<i>Kerygma und Dogma</i>	MTZ	<i>Münchener theologische Zeitschrift</i>
KEK	Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament	MUSJ	<i>Mélanges de l'université Saint-Joseph</i>
KIT	Kleine Texte	MVAG	<i>Mitteilungen der vorder-asiatisch-ägyptischen Gesellschaft</i>
KTR	<i>King's Theological Review</i> (London)	NAG	<i>Nachrichten von der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen</i>
LCC	Library of Christian Classics		
LCL	Loeb Classical Library		

<i>NB</i>	<i>New Blackfriars</i>	<i>NZM</i>	<i>Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft</i>
<i>NCB</i>	New Century Bible (new ed.)		
<i>NCCHS</i>	R. C. Fuller et al. (eds.), <i>New Catholic Commentary on Holy Scripture</i>	<i>OBO</i>	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
<i>NCE</i>	M. R. P. McGuire et al. (eds.), <i>New Catholic Encyclopedia</i>	<i>ÖBS</i>	Österreichische Biblische Studien
<i>NCIB</i>	New Clarendon Bible	<i>OCD</i>	<i>Oxford Classical Dictionary</i>
<i>NedTTs</i>	<i>Nederlands theologisch tijdschrift</i>	<i>OGI</i>	W. Dittenberger (ed.), <i>Orientis graeci inscriptiones selectae</i> (Leipzig: Hirzel, 1903-5)
<i>Neot</i>	<i>Neotestamentica</i>	<i>OIP</i>	Oriental Institute Publications
<i>NESTR</i>	<i>Near East School of Theology Review</i>	<i>OLP</i>	Orientalia Iovaniensia periodica
<i>NewDocs</i>	<i>New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity, A Review of Greek Inscriptions, etc.</i> , ed. G. H. R. Horsley, North Ryde, NSW, Australia	<i>OLZ</i>	<i>Orientalische Literaturzeitung</i>
	New Frontiers in Theology	<i>Or</i>	<i>Orientalia</i> (Rome)
<i>NFT</i>	New Gospel Studies	<i>OrAnt</i>	<i>Oriens antiquus</i>
<i>NGS</i>	Nag Hammadi Studies	<i>OrChr</i>	<i>Oriens christianus</i>
<i>NHS</i>	New International	<i>OrSyr</i>	<i>L'orient syrien</i>
<i>NICNT</i>	Commentary on the New Testament	<i>ÖTKNT</i>	Ökumenischer Taschenbuch-Kommentar zum NT
		<i>OTM</i>	Oxford Theological Monographs
<i>NieuwTT</i>	<i>Nieuw theologisch tijdschrift</i>	<i>OTS</i>	Oudtestamentische Studien
<i>NIGTC</i>	New International Greek Testament Commentary	<i>PAAJR</i>	<i>Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research</i>
<i>NJDT</i>	<i>Neue Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie</i>	<i>PC</i>	Proclamation Commentaries
<i>NKZ</i>	<i>Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift</i>	<i>PCB</i>	M. Black and H. H. Rowley (eds.), <i>Peake's Commentary on the Bible</i>
<i>NorTT</i>	<i>Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift</i>		
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>	<i>PEFQS</i>	<i>Palestine Exploration Fund, Quarterly Statement</i>
<i>NovTSup</i>	Supplement to <i>NovT</i>	<i>PEQ</i>	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
<i>NPNF</i>	Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers	<i>PFay</i>	Fayûm Papyri
<i>NRT</i>	<i>La nouvelle revue théologique</i>	<i>PG</i>	<i>Patrologia graeca</i> , ed. J. P. Migne
<i>NTA</i>	<i>New Testament Abstracts</i>	<i>PGM</i>	K. Preisendanz (ed.), <i>Papyri graecae magicae</i>
<i>NTAbh</i>	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen	<i>PhEW</i>	<i>Philosophy East and West</i>
<i>NTD</i>	Das Neue Testament Deutsch	<i>PhRev</i>	<i>Philosophical Review</i>
<i>NTF</i>	Neutestamentliche Forschungen	<i>PJ</i>	<i>Palästina-Jahrbuch</i>
<i>NTL</i>	New Testament Library	<i>PNTC</i>	Pelican New Testament Commentaries
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>	<i>PO</i>	<i>Patrologia orientalis</i>
<i>NTSR</i>	The New Testament for Spiritual Reading	<i>POxy</i>	Oxyrhynchus Papyri
		<i>ProcIBA</i>	<i>Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association</i>
<i>NTTS</i>	New Testament Tools and Studies	<i>PRS</i>	<i>Perspectives in Religious Studies</i>
<i>Numen</i>	<i>Numen: International Review for the History of Religions</i>	<i>PRU</i>	<i>Le Palais royal d'Ugarit</i>

<i>PSTJ</i>	<i>Perkins (School of Theology) Journal</i>	<i>RivB</i>	<i>Rivista biblica</i>
<i>PTMS</i>	<i>Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series</i>	<i>RM</i>	<i>Rheinisches Museum für Philologie</i>
<i>PTR</i>	<i>Princeton Theological Review</i>	<i>RNT</i>	<i>Regensburger Neues Testament</i>
<i>PVTG</i>	<i>Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti graece</i>	<i>RR</i>	<i>Review of Religion</i>
<i>PW</i>	<i>Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft</i>	<i>RSLR</i>	<i>Rivista di Storia Letteratura Religiosa (Turin)</i>
<i>PWSup</i>	<i>Supplement to PW</i>	<i>RSO</i>	<i>Rivista degli studi orientali</i>
<i>QDAP</i>	<i>Quarterly of the Department of Antiquities in Palestine</i>	<i>RSPT</i>	<i>Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques</i>
<i>RA</i>	<i>Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale</i>	<i>RSR</i>	<i>Recherches de science religieuse</i>
<i>RAC</i>	<i>Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum</i>	<i>RTL</i>	<i>Revue théologique de Louvain</i>
<i>RArch</i>	<i>Revue archéologique</i>	<i>RTP</i>	<i>Revue de théologie et de philosophie</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>	<i>RTR</i>	<i>Reformed Theological Review</i>
<i>RBén</i>	<i>Revue Benedictine</i>	<i>RUV</i>	<i>La Revue de l'Université Laval</i>
<i>RCB</i>	<i>Revista de cultura biblica</i>	<i>RUO</i>	<i>Revue de l'université Ottawa</i>
<i>RE</i>	<i>Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche</i>	<i>SacPag</i>	<i>Sacra Pagina</i>
<i>REA</i>	<i>Revue des Études Augustiniennes</i>	<i>SAH</i>	<i>Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften (phil.-hist. Klasse)</i>
<i>RechBib</i>	<i>Recherches bibliques</i>	<i>Sal</i>	<i>Salmanticensis</i>
<i>REg</i>	<i>Revue d'égyptologie</i>	<i>SANT</i>	<i>Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament</i>
<i>REJ</i>	<i>Revue des études juives</i>	<i>SAQ</i>	<i>Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen- und dogmengeschichtlicher Quellschriften</i>
<i>RelArts</i>	<i>Religion and the Arts</i>	<i>SAWB</i>	<i>Sitzungsberichte der (königlich preussischen) Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin (phil.-hist. Klasse)</i>
<i>RelS</i>	<i>Religious Studies</i>	<i>SB</i>	<i>Sources bibliques</i>
<i>RelSoc</i>	<i>Religion and Society</i>	<i>SBB</i>	<i>Stuttgarter biblische Monographien</i>
<i>RelSRev</i>	<i>Religious Studies Review</i>	<i>SBFLA</i>	<i>Studii biblici franciscani liber annuus</i>
<i>RES</i>	<i>Répertoire d'épigraphie sémitique</i>	<i>SBJ</i>	<i>La sainte bible de Jérusalem</i>
<i>RestQ</i>	<i>Restoration Quarterly</i>	<i>SBLASP</i>	<i>Society of Biblical Literature Abstracts and Seminar Papers</i>
<i>RevExp</i>	<i>Review and Expositor</i>	<i>SBLDS</i>	<i>SBL Dissertation Series</i>
<i>RevistB</i>	<i>Revista biblica</i>	<i>SBLMasS</i>	<i>SBL Masoretic Studies</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumrân</i>	<i>SBLMS</i>	<i>SBL Monograph Series</i>
<i>RevRel</i>	<i>Review for Religious</i>	<i>SBLSBS</i>	<i>SBL Sources for Biblical Study</i>
<i>RevScRel</i>	<i>Revue des sciences religieuses</i>	<i>SBLSCS</i>	<i>SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies</i>
<i>RevSém</i>	<i>Revue sémitique</i>		
<i>RevThom</i>	<i>Revue thomiste</i>		
<i>RGG</i>	<i>Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</i>		
<i>RHE</i>	<i>Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique</i>		
<i>RHPR</i>	<i>Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses</i>		
<i>RHR</i>	<i>Revue de l'histoire des religions</i>		

SBLTT	SBL Texts and Translations	SSS	Semitic Study Series
SBM	Stuttgarter biblische Monographien	ST	<i>Studia theologica</i>
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien	STÅ	<i>Svensk teologisk årsskrift</i>
SBT	Studies in Biblical Theology	StBibT	<i>Studia biblica et theologica</i>
SC	Source chrétiennes	STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
ScEccl	<i>Sciences ecclésiastiques</i>	STK	<i>Svensk teologisk kvartalskrift</i>
ScEs	<i>Science et esprit</i>	Str-B	H. Strack and P. Billerbeck, <i>Kommentar zum Neuen Testament</i> , 4 vols. (Munich: Beck'sche, 1926–28)
SCR	<i>Studies in Comparative Religion</i>	StudBib	<i>Studia biblica</i>
Scr	Scripture	StudNeot	<i>Studia neotestamentica</i>
ScrB	<i>Scripture Bulletin</i>	SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
SD	Studies and Documents	SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha
SE	<i>Studia Evangelica</i> 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 (= TU 73 [1959], 87 [1964], 88 [1964], 102 [1968], 103 [1968], 112 [1973])	SWJT	<i>Southwestern Journal of Theology</i>
SEÅ	<i>Svensk exegetisk årsbok</i>	SymBU	<i>Symbolae biblicae upsalienses</i>
Sef	<i>Sefarad</i>		
SeinSend	<i>Sein Sendung</i>		
Sem	<i>Semitica</i>		
SémiotBib	<i>Sémiotique et Bible</i>	TantY	<i>Tantur Yearbook</i>
SHAW	Sitzungsberichte heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften	TAPA	<i>Transactions of the American Philological Association</i>
SHT	Studies in Historical Theology	TB	<i>Theologische Beiträge</i>
SHVL	Skrifter Utgivna Av Kungl. Humanistika Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund	TBC	Torch Bible Commentaries
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity	TBl	<i>Theologische Blätter</i>
SJT	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>	TBü	Theologische Bücherei
SMSR	<i>Studi e materiali di storia delle religioni</i>	TC	Theological Collection (SPCK)
SNT	Studien zum Neuen Testament	TD	<i>Theology Digest</i>
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series	TDNT	G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, eds., <i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> , 10 vols., ET (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–76)
SNTU	<i>Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt</i>	TextsS	Texts and Studies
SO	Symbolae osloenses	TF	<i>Theologische Forschung</i>
SOTSMS	Society for Old Testament Study Monograph Series	TGl	<i>Theologie und Glaube</i>
SPap	<i>Studia papyrologica</i>	Th	<i>Theology</i>
SPAW	Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften	ThA	<i>Theologische Arbeiten</i>
SPB	<i>Studia postbiblica</i>	ThBer	<i>Theologische Berichte</i>
SR	<i>Studies in Religion/Sciences Religieuses</i>	THKNT	Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament
		ThViat	<i>Theologia Viatorum</i>
		TJ	<i>Trinity Journal</i>
		TJT	<i>Toronto Journal of Theology</i>
		TLZ	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
		TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentaries

TP	<i>Theologie und Philosophie (ThPh)</i>		<i>Konkordanz zum griechischen Neuen Testament</i>
TPQ	<i>Theologisch-Praktische Quartalschrift</i>	VoxEv	<i>Vox Evangelica (London)</i>
TQ	<i>Theologische Quartalschrift</i>	VS	<i>Verbum salutis</i>
TRev	<i>Theologische Revue</i>	VSpir	<i>Vie spirituelle</i>
TRu	<i>Theologische Rundschau</i>	VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
TS	<i>Theological Studies</i>	VTSup	<i>Vetus Testamentum, Supplements</i>
TSAJ	<i>Texte und Studien zum Antiken Judentum</i>	WA	<i>M. Luther, Kritische Gesamtausgabe (= "Weimar" edition)</i>
TSFB	<i>Theological Students Fellowship Bulletin</i>	WBC	<i>Word Biblical Commentary</i>
TSK	<i>Theologische Studien und Kritiken</i>	WC	<i>Westminster Commentary</i>
TT	<i>Teologisk Tidsskrift</i>	WD	<i>Wort und Dienst</i>
TTKi	<i>Tidsskrift for Teologi og Kirke</i>	WDB	<i>Westminster Dictionary of the Bible</i>
TToday	<i>Theology Today</i>	WF	<i>Wege der Forschung</i>
TTS	<i>Trier theologische Studien</i>	WHAB	<i>Westminster Historical Atlas of the Bible</i>
TTZ	<i>Trierer theologische Zeitschrift</i>	WMANT	<i>Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament</i>
TU	<i>Texte und Untersuchungen</i>	WO	<i>Die Welt des Orients</i>
TWAT	<i>G. J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren (eds.), Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament</i>	WTJ	<i>Westminster Theological Journal</i>
TWNT	<i>G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (eds.), Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament</i>	WUNT	<i>Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament</i>
TynB	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>	WW	<i>Word and World</i>
TZ	<i>Theologische Zeitschrift</i>	WZKM	<i>Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes</i>
UBSGNT	<i>United Bible Societies Greek New Testament</i>	WZKSO	<i>Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens</i>
UCL	<i>Universitas Catholica Lovaniensis</i>	ZA	<i>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie</i>
UF	<i>Ugaritische Forschungen</i>	ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
UFHM	<i>University of Florida Humanities Monograph</i>	ZDMG	<i>Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i>
UNT	<i>Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament</i>	ZDPV	<i>Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins</i>
US	<i>Una Sancta</i>	ZEE	<i>Zeitschrift für evangelische Ethik</i>
USQR	<i>Union Seminary Quarterly Review</i>	ZHT	<i>Zeitschrift für historische Theologie</i>
UT	<i>C. H. Gordon, Ugaritic Textbook</i>	ZKG	<i>Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte</i>
UUÅ	<i>Uppsala universitetsårsskrift</i>	ZKNT	<i>Zahn's Kommentar zum NT</i>
VC	<i>Vigiliae christianae</i>	ZKT	<i>Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie</i>
VCaro	<i>Verbum caro</i>	ZMR	<i>Zeitschrift für Missionskunde und Religionswissenschaft</i>
VD	<i>Verbum domini</i>		
VetC	<i>Vetera Christianorum</i>		
VF	<i>Verkundigung und Forschung</i>		
VKGNT	<i>K. Aland (ed.), Vollständige</i>		

<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>	<i>ZTK</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</i>
<i>ZRGG</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte</i>	<i>ZWT</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie</i>
<i>ZST</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie</i>		

D. Abbreviations for Books of the Bible, the Apocrypha, and the Pseudepigrapha

OLD TESTAMENT			NEW TESTAMENT	
Gen	2 Chr	Dan	Matt	1 Tim
Exod	Ezra	Hos	Mark	2 Tim
Lev	Neh	Joel	Luke	Titus
Num	Esth	Amos	John	Philem
Deut	Job	Obad	Acts	Heb
Josh	Ps(Pss)	Jonah	Rom	Jas
Judg	Prov	Mic	1 Cor	1 Peter
Ruth	Eccl	Nah	2 Cor	2 Peter
1 Sam	Cant	Hab	Gal	1 John
2 Sam	Isa	Zeph	Eph	2 John
1 Kgs	Jer	Hag	Phil	3 John
2 Kgs	Lam	Zech	Col	Jude
1 Chr	Ezek	Mal	1 Thess	Rev
			2 Thess	
APOCRYPHA				
1 Esd	1 Esdras	Ep Jer	Epistle of Jeremy	
2 Esd	2 Esdras	S Th Ch	Song of the Three Children (or Young Men)	
Tob	Tobit	Sus	Susanna	
Jdt	Judith	Bel	Bel and the Dragon	
Add Esth	Additions to Esther	Pr Man	Prayer of Manasseh	
Wis	Wisdom of Solomon	1 Macc	1 Maccabees	
Sir	Ecclesiasticus (Wisdom of Jesus the son of Sirach)	2 Macc	2 Maccabees	
Bar	Baruch			

E. Abbreviations of the Names of Pseudepigraphical and Early Patristic Books

<i>Adam and Eve</i>	Life of Adam and Eve	<i>T. 12 Patr.</i>	Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs
<i>Apoc. Abr.</i>	Apocalypse of Abraham (1st to 2nd cent. A.D.)	<i>T. Abr.</i>	Testament of Abraham
<i>2-3 Apoc. Bar.</i>	Syriac, Greek Apocalypse of Baruch	<i>T. Judah</i>	Testament of Judah
<i>Apoc. Mos.</i>	Apocalypse of Moses	<i>T. Levi</i>	Testament of Levi, etc.
<i>As. Mos.</i>	(See <i>T. Mos.</i>)	<i>Apoc. Pet.</i>	Apocalypse of Peter
<i>1-2-3 Enoch</i>	Ethiopic, Slavonic, Hebrew Enoch	<i>Gos. Eb.</i>	Gospel of the Ebionites
<i>Ep. Arist.</i>	Epistle of Aristeas	<i>Gos. Eg.</i>	Gospel of the Egyptians
<i>Ep. Diognetus</i>	Epistle to Diognetus	<i>Gos. Heb.</i>	Gospel of the Hebrews
<i>Jub.</i>	Jubilees	<i>Gos. Naass.</i>	Gospel of the Naassenes
<i>Mart. Isa.</i>	Martyrdom of Isaiah	<i>Gos. Pet.</i>	Gospel of Peter
<i>Odes Sol.</i>	Odes of Solomon	<i>Gos. Thom.</i>	Gospel of Thomas
<i>Pss. Sol.</i>	Psalms of Solomon	<i>Prot. Jas.</i>	Protevangelium of James
<i>Sib. Or.</i>	Sibylline Oracles	<i>Barn.</i>	Barnabas
		<i>1-2 Clem.</i>	1-2 Clement
		<i>Did.</i>	Didache

<i>Diogn.</i>	Diognetus	<i>Smyrn.</i>	Ignatius, Letter to the Smyrnaeans
<i>Herm. Man.</i>	Hermas, Mandates	<i>Trall.</i>	Ignatius, Letter to the Trallians
<i>Sim.</i>	Similitudes	<i>Mart. Pol.</i>	Martyrdom of Polycarp
<i>Vis.</i>	Visions	<i>Pol. Phil.</i>	Polycarp to the Philippians
<i>Ign. Eph.</i>	Ignatius, Letter to the Ephesians	<i>Adv. Haer.</i>	Irenaeus, Against All Heresies
<i>Magn.</i>	Ignatius, Letter to the Magnesians	<i>De Praesc. Haer.</i>	Tertullian, On the Proscribing of Heretics
<i>Phil.</i>	Ignatius, Letter to the Philadelphians		
<i>Pol.</i>	Ignatius, Letter to Polycarp		
<i>Rom.</i>	Ignatius, Letter to the Romans		

F. Abbreviations of Names of Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Texts

CD	Cairo (Genizah text of the) Damascus (Document)	1QM	<i>Milhāmāh</i> (War Scroll)
		1QS	<i>Serek hayyahad</i> (Rule of the Community, Manual of Discipline)
Hev	Nahal Hever texts	1QSa	Appendix A (Rule of the Congregation) to 1QS
Mas	Masada texts	1QSB	Appendix B (Blessings) to 1QS
Mird	Khirbet Mird texts	3Q15	Copper Scroll from Qumran Cave 3
Mur	Wadi Murabba'at texts	4QFlor	<i>Florilegium</i> (or <i>Eschatological Midrashim</i>) from Qumran Cave 4
p	Peshier (commentary)	4QMess ar	Aramaic "Messianic" text from Qumran Cave 4
Q	Qumran	4QPrNab	Prayer of Nabonidus from Qumran Cave 4
1Q, 2Q, 3Q, etc.	Numbered caves of Qumran, yielding written material; followed by abbreviation of biblical or apocryphal book	4QTestim	<i>Testimonia</i> text from Qumran Cave 4
QL	Qumran literature	4QTLevi	<i>Testament of Levi</i> from Qumran Cave 4
1QapGen	<i>Genesis Apocryphon</i> of Qumran Cave 1	4QPhyl	Phylacteries from Qumran Cave 4
1QH	<i>Hôdāyôt</i> (Thanksgiving Hymns) from Qumran Cave 1	11QMelch	<i>Melchizedek</i> text from Qumran Cave 11
1QIsa ^{a,b}	First or second copy of Isaiah from Qumran Cave 1	11QtgJob	<i>Targum of Job</i> from Qumran Cave 11
1QpHab	<i>Peshier on Habakkuk</i> from Qumran Cave 1		

G. Abbreviations of Targumic Material

<i>Tg. Onq.</i>	<i>Targum Onqelos</i>	<i>Tg. Ps.-J.</i>	<i>Targum Pseudo-Jonathan</i>
<i>Tg. Neb.</i>	<i>Targum of the Prophets</i>	<i>Tg. Yer. I</i>	<i>Targum Yerušalmi I</i> *
<i>Tg. Ket.</i>	<i>Targum of the Writings</i>	<i>Tg. Yer. II</i>	<i>Targum Yerušalmi II</i> *
<i>Frq. Tg.</i>	<i>Fragmentary Targum</i>	<i>Yem. Tg.</i>	<i>Yemenite Targum</i>
<i>Sam. Tg.</i>	<i>Samaritan Targum</i>	<i>Tg. Esth I, II</i>	<i>First or Second Targum of Esther</i>
<i>Tg. Isa.</i>	<i>Targum of Isaiah</i>		
<i>Pal. Tgs.</i>	<i>Palestinian Targums</i>		
<i>Tg. Neof.</i>	<i>Targum Neofiti I</i>		

* optional title

H. Abbreviations of Other Rabbinic Works

<i>ʾAbot</i>	<i>ʾAbot de Rabbi Nathan</i>	<i>Pesiq. Rab Kah.</i>	<i>Pesiqta de Rab Kahana</i>
<i>ʾAg. Ber.</i>	<i>ʾAggadat Berešit</i>	<i>Pirqe R. El.</i>	<i>Pirqe Rabbi Eliezer</i>
<i>Bab.</i>	<i>Babylonian</i>	<i>Rab.</i>	<i>Rabbah</i> (following abbreviation for biblical book: <i>Gen. Rab.</i> [with periods] = <i>Genesis Rabbah</i>)
<i>Bar.</i>	<i>Baraita</i>		
<i>Der. Er. Rab.</i>	<i>Derek Ereš Rabba</i>		
<i>Der. Er. Zuł.</i>	<i>Derek Ereš Zuła</i>		
<i>Gem.</i>	<i>Gemara</i>		
<i>Kalla</i>	<i>Kalla</i>	<i>Sem.</i>	<i>Semaḥot</i>
<i>Mek.</i>	<i>Mekilta</i>	<i>Sipra</i>	<i>Sipra</i>
<i>Midr.</i>	<i>Midraš; cited with usual abbreviation for biblical book; but Midr. Qoh. = Midraš Qohelet</i>	<i>Sipre</i>	<i>Sipre</i>
		<i>Sop.</i>	<i>Soperim</i>
		<i>S. ʿOlam Rab.</i>	<i>Seder ʿOlam Rabbah</i>
<i>Pal.</i>	<i>Palestinian</i>	<i>Talm.</i>	<i>Talmud</i>
<i>Pesiq. R.</i>	<i>Pesiqta Rabbati</i>	<i>Yal.</i>	<i>Yalquṭ</i>

I. Abbreviations of Orders and Tractates in Mishnaic and Related Literature

<i>ʾAbot</i>	<i>ʾAbot</i>	<i>Nazir</i>	<i>Nazir</i>
<i>ʿArak.</i>	<i>ʿArakin</i>	<i>Ned.</i>	<i>Nedarim</i>
<i>ʿAbod. Zar.</i>	<i>ʿAboda Zara</i>	<i>Neg.</i>	<i>Negaʿim</i>
<i>B. Bat.</i>	<i>Baba Batra</i>	<i>Nez.</i>	<i>Neziqin</i>
<i>Bek.</i>	<i>Bekorot</i>	<i>Nid.</i>	<i>Niddah</i>
<i>Ber.</i>	<i>Berakot</i>	<i>Ohol.</i>	<i>Oholot</i>
<i>Beša</i>	<i>Beša (= Yom Tob)</i>	<i>ʿOr.</i>	<i>ʿOrla</i>
<i>Bik.</i>	<i>Bikkurim</i>	<i>Para</i>	<i>Para</i>
<i>B. Meš.</i>	<i>Baba Mešiʿa</i>	<i>Peʿa</i>	<i>Peʿa</i>
<i>B. Qam.</i>	<i>Baba Qamma</i>	<i>Pesaḥ.</i>	<i>Pesaḥim</i>
<i>Dem.</i>	<i>Demai</i>	<i>Qinnim</i>	<i>Qinnim</i>
<i>ʿEd.</i>	<i>ʿEduyyot</i>	<i>Qidd.</i>	<i>Qiddušin</i>
<i>ʿErub.</i>	<i>ʿErubin</i>	<i>Qod.</i>	<i>Qodašin</i>
<i>Giṭ.</i>	<i>Giṭṭin</i>	<i>Roš. Haš.</i>	<i>Roš Haššana</i>
<i>Hag.</i>	<i>Hagiga</i>	<i>Sanh.</i>	<i>Sanhedrin</i>
<i>Ḥal.</i>	<i>Ḥalla</i>	<i>Šabb.</i>	<i>Šabbat</i>
<i>Hor.</i>	<i>Horayot</i>	<i>Šeb.</i>	<i>Šebiʿit</i>
<i>Hul.</i>	<i>Hullin</i>	<i>Šebu.</i>	<i>Šebuʿot</i>
<i>Kelim</i>	<i>Kelim</i>	<i>Šeqal.</i>	<i>Šeqalim</i>
<i>Ker.</i>	<i>Keritot</i>	<i>Soṭa</i>	<i>Soṭa</i>
<i>Ketub.</i>	<i>Ketubot</i>	<i>Sukk.</i>	<i>Sukka</i>
<i>Kil.</i>	<i>Kilʿayim</i>	<i>Taʿan.</i>	<i>Taʿanit</i>
<i>Maʿaš.</i>	<i>Maʿašerot</i>	<i>Tamid</i>	<i>Tamid</i>
<i>Mak.</i>	<i>Makkot</i>	<i>Tem.</i>	<i>Temura</i>
<i>Makš.</i>	<i>Makširin (= Mašqin)</i>	<i>Ter.</i>	<i>Terumot</i>
<i>Meg.</i>	<i>Megilla</i>	<i>Tohar.</i>	<i>Toharot</i>
<i>Meʿil.</i>	<i>Meʿila</i>	<i>T. Yom</i>	<i>Tebul Yom</i>
<i>Menah.</i>	<i>Menahot</i>	<i>ʿUq.</i>	<i>ʿUqšin</i>
<i>Mid.</i>	<i>Middot</i>	<i>Yad.</i>	<i>Yadayim</i>
<i>Miqw.</i>	<i>Miqwaʾot</i>	<i>Yebam.</i>	<i>Yebamot</i>
<i>Moʿed</i>	<i>Moʿed</i>	<i>Yoma</i>	<i>Yoma (= Kippurim)</i>
<i>Moʿed Qat.</i>	<i>Moʿed Qaṭan</i>	<i>Zabim</i>	<i>Zabim</i>
<i>Maʿas. S.</i>	<i>Maʿašer Seni</i>	<i>Zebaḥ.</i>	<i>Zebaḥim</i>
<i>Našim</i>	<i>Našim</i>	<i>Zer.</i>	<i>Zeraʿim</i>

J. Abbreviations of Nag Hammadi Tractates

<i>Acts Pet. 12</i>		<i>Melch.</i>	<i>Melchizedek</i>
<i>Apost.</i>	<i>Acts of Peter and the Twelve</i>	<i>Norea</i>	<i>Thought of Norea</i>
<i>Allogenes</i>	<i>Apostles</i>	<i>On Bap. A</i>	<i>On Baptism A</i>
<i>Ap. Jas.</i>	<i>Allogenes</i>	<i>On Bap. B</i>	<i>On Baptism B</i>
<i>Ap. John</i>	<i>Apocryphon of James</i>	<i>On Bap. C</i>	<i>On Baptism C</i>
<i>Apoc. Adam</i>	<i>Apocryphon of John</i>	<i>On Euch. A</i>	<i>On the Eucharist A</i>
<i>1 Apoc. Jas.</i>	<i>Apocalypse of Adam</i>	<i>On Euch. B</i>	<i>On the Eucharist B</i>
<i>2 Apoc. Jas.</i>	<i>First Apocalypse of James</i>	<i>Orig. World</i>	<i>On the Origin of the World</i>
<i>Apoc. Paul</i>	<i>Second Apocalypse of James</i>	<i>Paraph. Shem</i>	<i>Paraphrase of Shem</i>
<i>Apoc. Pet.</i>	<i>Apocalypse of Paul</i>	<i>Pr. Paul</i>	<i>Prayer of the Apostle Paul</i>
<i>Asclepius</i>	<i>Apocalypse of Peter</i>	<i>Pr. Thanks</i>	<i>Prayer of Thanksgiving</i>
<i>Auth. Teach.</i>	<i>Asclepius 21–29</i>	<i>Prot. Jas.</i>	<i>Protevangelium of James</i>
<i>Dial. Sav.</i>	<i>Authoritative Teaching</i>	<i>Sent. Sextus</i>	<i>Sentences of Sextus</i>
<i>Disc. 8–9</i>	<i>Dialogue of the Savior</i>	<i>Soph. Jes. Chr.</i>	<i>Sophia of Jesus Christ</i>
	<i>Discourse on the Eighth and Ninth</i>	<i>Steles Seth</i>	<i>Three Steles of Seth</i>
<i>Ep. Pet. Phil.</i>	<i>Letter of Peter to Philip</i>	<i>Teach. Silv.</i>	<i>Teachings of Silvanus</i>
<i>Eugnostos</i>	<i>Eugnostos the Blessed</i>	<i>Testim. Truth</i>	<i>Testimony of Truth</i>
<i>Exeg. Soul</i>	<i>Exegesis on the Soul</i>	<i>Thom. Cont.</i>	<i>Book of Thomas the Contender</i>
<i>Gos. Eg.</i>	<i>Gospel of the Egyptians</i>	<i>Thund.</i>	<i>Thunder, Perfect Mind</i>
<i>Gos. Phil.</i>	<i>Gospel of Philip</i>	<i>Treat. Res.</i>	<i>Treatise on Resurrection</i>
<i>Gos. Thom.</i>	<i>Gospel of Thomas</i>	<i>Treat. Seth</i>	<i>Second Treatise of the Great Seth</i>
<i>Gos. Truth</i>	<i>Gospel of Truth</i>	<i>Tri. Trac.</i>	<i>Tripartite Tractate</i>
<i>Great Pow.</i>	<i>Concept of our Great Power</i>	<i>Trim. Prot.</i>	<i>Trimorphic Protennoia</i>
<i>Hyp. Arch.</i>	<i>Hypostasis of the Archons</i>	<i>Val. Exp.</i>	<i>A Valentinian Exposition</i>
<i>Hypsiph.</i>	<i>Hypsiphron</i>	<i>Zost.</i>	<i>Zostrianos</i>
<i>Interp. Know.</i>	<i>Interpretation of Knowledge</i>		
<i>Marsanes</i>	<i>Marsanes</i>		

Note: The textual notes and numbers used to indicate individual manuscripts are those found in the apparatus criticus of *Novum Testamentum Graece*, ed. E. Nestle and K. Aland et al. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979²⁶). This edition of the Greek New Testament is the basis for the *Translation* sections.

Introduction

I propose here to offer only a modest engagement with the questions traditionally addressed in the introductory section of a commentary, concerning matters such as authorship, occasion, and purpose of writing. Considerations of various kinds lie behind this restriction, so I begin with some explanation for this limited taking up of the tasks of introduction.

If it were possible to provide answers to such questions which could be used as a confident basis for all that is to come in the main body of the commentary, then these questions of introduction would have a logical priority and a pressing urgency which would demand that they should be rigorously pursued and that this foundational study should precede any detailed attention to and exposition of the text itself. For the most part, however, the answering of these questions is not at all a straightforward matter, and usually turns, in the end, on the same analysis of the actual text which is the task of the body of the commentary. This means, first, that the two tasks, of seeking answers to questions of introduction and of seeking to understand the actual text, are inextricably bound up in each other and, second, that the proposed answers to questions of introduction are only more or less likely suggestions whose adequacy needs to be constantly reassessed in light of each feature of each particular section of text in the Gospel. The brevity of treatment is designed in part to suggest the lightness with which the conclusions of this section should be held as one moves on to the actual examination of the text.

My own procedure has been to work on the sections of the commentary with a minimum of assumption (or at least a minimum of precision of assumption) about the answers to be given to questions of introduction. The process of the work has produced increasing confidence in some areas and has left others relatively untouched. With the issue now of volume 1 the time has not yet come for the introduction to be able to function as an overview of the whole endeavor. At this point it is still a work in progress.

For the reader who wishes to pursue these questions of introduction further, a number of excellent studies exist (among these are to be noted Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 35–80, 122–51; Fitzmyer, 1:1–283; Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian*). It would seem to me to be a pity to repeat here what others have done in greater detail than would be possible here, and what others have no doubt done better than I would because of their specific interests and the orientation of their scholarship. I would prefer to restrict myself to a minimum of orientation for the reader, and for the most part to allow the commentary work proper to generate its own perspectives.

THE PERSPECTIVES OF MODERN GOSPEL SCHOLARSHIP

Modern biblical study has changed the way that the synoptic Gospels are read and studied to a degree that is not paralleled in the study of the Epistles, or even of the Gospel of John. The latter have always been read as concerned with expressing theological conviction (indeed, one of the gains of modern study has been to move the focus away from a narrow concern with doctrinal

systems and to recognize the need to look beyond theological expression to the faith and life and social dynamic which gives that theological expression much of its significance). The former have tended to be read as biographies of Jesus which are not of primary theological significance. They have had an importance for Christian devotion and have served supremely as an access point to the historical Jesus.

Modern study does not take away these classical functions of the synoptic Gospels (though it does require us to recognize that the way in which the Gospels are able to perform such roles is rather more complicated than has been generally recognized). Modern study does, however, add new dimensions to the reading of the Gospels which probably, at least at certain points, take us much closer to the manner in which the evangelists themselves anticipated that their works would be read. Most pointedly, modern study has demonstrated that the evangelists were in their own right theologians, that just as important to them as the task of preserving and propagating the memory of Jesus was the need to interpret him and all that his coming implied in the light of the resurrection and into the ongoing context of life within which they as Christians knew and served Jesus as the living Lord. The evangelists were engaged in proclamation and not just reporting; their concern was so to tell the story of the historical Jesus that their readers might encounter the living Christ.

A late-twentieth-century reader of the Gospel texts may be excused for having modern reporting techniques unconsciously in mind when coming to a Gospel text: television cameras, interviews with eyewitnesses, news-gathering networks, etc. Or for some, it may be the patterns of historical research techniques which create the background assumptions of the reader. Such assumptions are not entirely wrong, but they can, at points, be quite unhelpful for a rich and insightful engagement with a Gospel text; they need to be replaced as far as possible with perspectives that come from discovering what we can about how Luke actually produced the Gospel text we have before us.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE LUKAN GOSPEL

We will set to one side for the moment the question of the identity of Luke. The name at the top of our texts is not an actual part of the document, and we will look later at the basis for attributing the Gospel to the Luke who is mentioned in the New Testament. Our first focus will be on what we can find out about the production of the Gospel simply from what we may deduce from what we actually have in the text (and in Acts).

In the dedicatory preface (Luke 1:1–4), Luke identifies himself as belonging to the third phase of the transmission of the Christian gospel. First there were the eyewitnesses of the foundational events. These transmitted what they knew into the life of the early church. In turn, Luke, and the other Gospel writers whom he mentions, took what was known in the church and formulated it for the sake of their intended readership. Luke neither claims eyewitness status in relation to the Gospel events, nor even that he has them directly from the eyewitnesses. Rather, what Luke reflects is a situation in which it is the early church, as a collective whole, which has the testimony from the eyewit-

nesses. Luke picks this testimony up from within the life of the church (as himself part of that life).

This is not to say that Luke never met an eyewitness, since almost certainly he did, but it is to say that he quite consciously takes up the material he uses from its place and role in the life of the church. In fact, again and again, the actual form of the materials he gives us reflects the economy of expression, the roundedness of form, and the unity of focus which repeated use has given to them. This is the fundamental insight of form criticism. There is a considerable oral phase separating the Gospel materials as we have them from the original events, and in this oral phase these accounts were shaped and formed to meet the ongoing needs of the church and to function in its life of worship and obedience. (More recent sociological study of the Gospel tradition has opened up new areas of awareness as to how this living function of the materials relates to the earliest social setting of primitive Christianity and the whole range of social realities that functioned in the lives of the earliest Christians.) Luke clearly believed that these oral forms were well grounded in eyewitness testimony, and in his day they probably coexisted with the continuing presence of original eyewitnesses. But it is not unimportant that Luke bases his account, for the most part, on the oral forms that functioned in the life of the church.

Luke makes it quite clear that he is not the first to write a Gospel. He seems to suggest that it had become quite a popular exercise. How many would there need to have been for Luke to say "many"? Only the canonical Gospels remain to provide us with any clues as to the writings to which Luke refers. There have been those who have regarded each of the other Gospels as predating Luke and, therefore, as potentially having a place among the "many." Equally, each of the other Gospels has been regarded as later than Luke and as, therefore, to be excluded from the "many."

Luke does not say that he depended on any written Gospels at all; only that their existence created a precedent for what he was intending to do. Not Luke's statement about his relationship to these preexisting Gospels, but the patterns of similarity and dissimilarity between the synoptic Gospels as we have them, have convinced the world of scholarship that there is dependence, almost certainly of a literary kind, between the three Gospels. Many views exist as to the nature of this relationship.

The majority view is that Mark is the earliest of the synoptic Gospels; that Mark was in turn used by both Matthew and Luke, who also both had access to, and made use of, an additional body of material which is designated by the letter Q. Variation on this basic view concerning the use of Mark would allow for a second edition of Mark to be the underlying text, or involve intermediate documents of one kind or another, or suggest a composition in more than one stage, where, for example, the Markan material might have been added to a Gospel that already had been shaped without it.

There is less agreement about the precise form and content of the Q "document." Some scholars are so confident about this document that they are able to analyze the precise theological viewpoints expressed by the writer of this Q Gospel. At the other extreme are those who see it as only the non-Markan material that Luke extracted from the Gospel of Matthew, which Gospel, on

this view, Luke used. Here again the majority opinion is that neither Matthew nor Luke extracted the Q material from the other. The main basis for this judgment is that the material sometimes seems to be in a more original form in Matthew, and sometimes it seems to be closer to the original form in Luke. Such judgments can be rather subjective. Readers are invited to make their own assessment of judgments of this kind which appear from time to time in this commentary. Pinning down Q is made even more complicated by two other matters. The first is that the level of agreement in exact wording between Matthew and Luke in Q material is enormously variable. This would not create a problem if the divergences corresponded with any consistency to Matthean or Lukan special interests or preferred idioms. But such is not the case. This has suggested that we may be dealing with more than one edition of Q, perhaps reflecting different translations of a Semitic original. The second complication is that there are good reasons for suspecting that there may have been some, or even considerable, overlap between the contents of Mark and Q. Deciding about the nature of Q is made much more difficult if we must be quite imprecise about its boundaries.

A vigorous assault on the assumption that Mark was used by Matthew and Luke is particularly to be associated with the name of W. R. Farmer (see *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis*, and various articles). He and a vocal minority of other scholars have argued freshly for a view that had some currency in the last century. He too points to the common material that has caused almost all scholars to recognize that Mark is a middle term between Matthew and Luke; but he rightly insists that this middle-term identity for Mark could equally be caused by Mark's having in fact come into being as a conflation and abbreviation of the other two Gospels. Farmer has proceeded to argue that this second alternative is to be preferred. I am not persuaded that this is at all likely, for two main reasons. The first comes from the strange editorial policies that must be attributed to Mark in order to produce his Gospel out of canonical Matthew and Luke; I point especially to the highly artificial way in which Mark is supposed to have so valued the concurrent testimony of Matthew and Luke in respect to exact wording that in producing his own version of an item he proceeded by identifying all the words that Matthew and Luke have in common and weaving his own version around this skeleton of verbal fragments. The second reason for hesitation is the observation that the assumption of Markan priority has with some consistency produced scholarly work that has cumulated an increasingly credible analysis of the Matthean and, especially, of the Lukan text. The assumption of Markan priority produces a Luke who used this Markan source with a consistency of relationship to concerns that he clearly has, and these concerns come more clearly into focus on the basis of just this assumption.

The present work proceeds on the general assumption that Luke had available the Gospel of Mark, or something very like it, and that he shared additional common source material with Matthew, but that about the particular form of this shared material we cannot be too confident.

Luke clearly has a considerable body of additional material that is not based on the two sources already discussed, and is distinct from the material he shares via these two sources with the Gospel of Matthew. For this other material

the source discussion proceeds item by item. I have no confidence that we are in any position to identify collections within, or a collection containing all or most of, this additional material. There may indeed be a "family likeness" reflected in much of this material, but that "family likeness" comes too close to Lukan interests to be very useful for source separation. Lukan editing, Lukan selection on the basis of congeniality, and genuine source similarity come too close together to be readily separated.

Luke does not, with any consistency, closely follow the wording of his sources. He tends, however, to be more conservative in the reproduction of the words of Jesus than in the rendering of narrative. He makes considerable use of the Markan ordering, but always in connection with his own structuring of the material. Also with the Q material, the degree of common ordering in Matthew and Luke suggests that Luke has tended to insert this material in blocks that preserve the sequences of his source. (Because the question of Matthean practice is also involved, it is more difficult to make a confident judgment about Luke's respect for the larger shape of the ordering of the Q materials.) In doing this he has at times allowed the Q material to be the basis of structural units, while at other times the material has taken its place in a structure built on the Markan materials. Beyond this general respect for the order of his sources, Luke is happy, on particular occasions, to relocate individual items and to reorder materials on a small scale to fit in with his own sense of a logical presentation.

Luke is not particularly interested in the chronology of Jesus' ministry (though its broadest shape certainly belongs to what Luke is concerned to impart). His claim to offer a well-ordered account (1:3) points rather to a presentation in which the parts are reported and organized from the perspective of Luke's own coherent understanding of the whole. Luke is implicitly presenting a message and arguing a case, and he organizes his material in relation to these ends.

The Gospel of Luke not only has a relationship to other Gospel texts; it also has a relationship to other writings of the period. As the life story of a revered figure, the Gospel invites comparison with other ancient biographical writings. It may be that the interest in the infancy of Jesus in Luke 1-2 is to be related to this genre and that an experience of ancient biographies would naturally constitute certain of the reader-expectation with which Luke would need to reckon. We should, however, be wary of exaggerating the adequacy of this genre for accounting for Luke's production, and in any case the biography genre was so diverse (see Barr and Wentling, "The Conventions of Classical Biography") that to liken Luke to a classical biographer leaves the major part of the question about what he was writing and why unanswered.

Luke provides his Gospel with a preface which is clearly in the style of Hellenistic literary prologues. Biographies and rhetorical works had such prefaces, but Luke's invites particular comparison with those attached to historical works and those attached to treatises on various subjects. By means of such a preface, Luke is making some kind of literary claim for his work beyond what may be gleaned from the specific information contained in the preface. The sophistication he aims for in the level of language he chooses to use points in the same direction.

WHY DID LUKE WRITE HIS GOSPEL?

The usual and indeed the long-standing traditional assumption is that Luke was a Gentile Christian who wrote his Gospel for the Gentile church of the late first century; that it was a pastoral document concerned with issues within the church; and that the time of Christian outreach to the Jews was long past, even if some Jewish Christians continued to play an important role in the ongoing life of the church. If, however, there is an identifiable customary assumption, there is not a clear consensus. Perhaps already the studied secularity of the preface (1:1–4) should make us wonder whether this is quite such an inner-church document.

A little more than a decade ago, I argued in a doctoral dissertation (“Luke’s Readers”) that Luke made considerable use in his argumentation of reader-assumptions which could only be true for people whose religious values had been considerably shaped by first-century Judaism, and that he was vigorously engaged apologetically in responding to Jewish polemic against the Christian movement, polemic of a kind which, once again, would be effective only for those whose value structure was coming essentially from Judaism.

Indeed, I thought then, and think now, that the ideal first-century reader for much of the Gospel of Luke (and of Acts) is a God-fearer; one whose birth is not Jewish and whose background culture is Hellenistic, but who had been attracted to Judaism, drawn to the God of Israel and the worship of the synagogue; one who had taken on from his Jewish mentors many of the ethical and religious values of the faith on whose threshold he stood; but one who had not yet taken the final step of circumcision and full incorporation into the national and cultural life of the Jews.

Such a God-fearer would have experienced the ambiguity of his situation in Judaism: welcomed, but at the crucial divide still considered to be an outsider to the promises of God. Luke’s God-fearer will have been no stranger to the Christian gospel; perhaps he has been reached in an evangelistic itineration like those attributed to Paul in Acts. Luke’s God-fearer is also, however, no stranger to Christianity’s detractors (whose form he will also recognize in the Acts material). He has not fully found his way into Judaism, and now he stands at the crossroads. On the one hand Christianity is being offered to him as the completion and fulfillment of the Judaism to which he has been drawn, a version of Judaism which can embrace him in his Gentile identity, while itself holding dear all from Judaism that he has come to hold dear. On the other hand there are his Jewish friends who consider Christianity to be a dangerous perversion of their Jewish heritage, and who urge our God-fearer to make the break and to abandon his Gentile identity once and for all and to come all the way into Judaism, to become a Jew.

Others have, in various ways, also been impressed by the considerable Jewishness of aspects of Luke’s work. (Conzelmann, in his classic study *The Theology of St. Luke*, limited the Jewishness by failing to consider Luke 1–2 as part of the work that he was setting out to investigate.) Luke has even, on occasion, been claimed as a Jew or as a former God-fearer. Jervell’s important studies (*Luke and the People of God*, and elsewhere) worked from a recognition of the extremely positive relationship that Luke was wanting to set up between Chris-

tianity and traditional Judaism. The more recent study by Brawley (*Luke-Acts and the Jews*) argues "that Luke responds to Jewish antagonism apologetically" (155) and "draws what he considers to be authentic Jews towards Christianity and authentic Christians towards Judaism" (159). In my judgment the whole picture comes together more clearly if we move a step further than these suggestions to that proposed above.

The preface suggests that the Gospel is for a certain Theophilus, who is greeted under the honorific title *κράτιστε* ("most excellent"). That he is actually addressed in the preface, and that no wider readership is identified there, are both unusual features for ancient dedications and may suggest that we should take rather seriously the apparent claim to focused attention on Theophilus' needs. We know nothing further of such a Theophilus, and we cannot rule out the possibility that the real recipient is here being addressed under a pseudonym. If this were to be the case, then the etymology of the name, "friend of God," would suit very well a God-fearer audience.

It is not unlikely that Luke's agenda is wider than the God-fearer focus which I propose; or, at least, that Luke thinks in terms of giving his addressee a Gospel that not only concerns itself with the issues that pertain to his entry into the faith but will also be of comprehensive service for a Theophilus who moves on and comes to have the needs of Luke's own immediate contemporaries in the church. Or, indeed, it is not unlikely that Luke, in going to all the trouble to produce such a Gospel, would want his work to be serviceable for a range of people alongside its more precise focus on his target audience. Either way, the suggestion here proposed should not be taken in a limiting way but should only be considered to the degree that it provides focus for important strands within Luke's project.

LUKE AND ACTS

The Acts of the Apostles clearly presents itself as a continuation of the Gospel of Luke (see Acts 1:1-5), and is so accepted by almost all scholars. There are important differences in vocabulary and idiom; there are some differences of theological focus; there are some tensions between the two accounts, especially at the point of overlap concerning the postresurrection meetings with Jesus and the ascension. Nonetheless, there is so much that unites the two works in theological conception, in overall structure, in the repetition of motifs, and in the literary foreshadowings in the Gospel of matters which only come into their own in Acts, that it is only reasonable to agree with the claim made by the writer of Acts that he is there writing a sequel to a Gospel which he himself had penned.

To say that we have part one and part two of a single work would, however, be an exaggeration and would do less than justice to the evident differences between the works. Luke himself marks an important distinction between the time of the ministry of Jesus and the time of the church. Indeed, so important for Luke is this distinction that he is preoccupied to a considerable degree with the question of how we may be confident that all of what had come onto the scene with the coming of Jesus may be without loss transferred on into the ongoing life of the church. Luke negotiates this crisis point by means

of the role of the apostles, the coming of the Spirit, the continuing role of the Jesus who is now enthroned in heaven, the power of the name of Jesus, and the repetition in the lives of Christians of patterns generated by the life of Jesus, and specifically by his suffering and resurrection.

In the two works Luke is working with quite different kinds of information. For the second volume he does not, as he does for the first, bother to delineate the track of his own acquaintance with what he writes (except for the occasional “we” in Acts, which I still think is best explained as indicating the personal presence of the author). This is not because the same track is involved. In virtue of the kinds of information involved, it cannot be thought of, for the most part, as coming along the same track, and it cannot be thought of, at least to the same degree, as belonging to the sacred deposit entrusted to the life of the church (what concerns the emergence of the Gentile mission could be seen as having such a quality).

There is every reason to think that the Gospel was issued first and was freestanding. Indeed, part of what creates the tension between the end of the Gospel and the beginning of Acts comes from the way in which the Gospel ending (Luke 24:44–53) serves in a very compressed form for the lack of a volume two at the time of issue. The Gospel account has its own completeness.

All of this is, however, no excuse for reading the Gospel text in isolation from that of Acts. The Gospel account may have its own completeness, but Luke did not write it without having Acts already in mind. He is preparing for volume two already in 2:32 where Simeon’s words provide what will be the undergirding structure for his later work. Only the reader who already has Acts in hand will do full justice to the subtle literary foreshadowings which Luke from time to time employs. At least in broad outline, Luke already knew as he completed the Gospel what he planned to do in the subsequent volume. In another way also Acts provides us with an invaluable aid to working out how Luke would have us read his Gospel text. The disciples and crowds in Luke, who actually hear the teaching of Jesus and interact with him as they experience his ministry, are separated from the reader of the Gospel by the gulf created at least by the death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus; they are not in the same situation and cannot engage with what comes to them in the same terms. Acts shows us people who share that gulf with the reader, and in this way models the appropriate adjustments which enable an account of a (largely) pre-Easter ministry to be appropriated to a post-Easter situation.

WHO WAS LUKE?

The actual text of the Third Gospel offers no indication of authorship. This does not, however, mean that it was an anonymous work. The presence of a dedicatory preface (Luke 1:1–4) suggests that the one addressed would be aware of who it was that he was being addressed by. A review of the ancient practice of dedication supports this impression, since wherever one is in a position to check, ancient works with dedications were not in fact anonymous.

The earliest surviving attributions of the Third Gospel cluster in the late second and early third centuries. The title *εὐαγγέλιον κατὰ Λουκᾶν* (“Gospel according to Luke”) is found at the end of the text of the oldest extant copy

of the Gospel, P⁷⁵, which is to be dated to the period A.D. 175–225. What is probably the second most ancient witness to Lukan authorship is to be found in the Muratorian Canon, which is normally dated to around 170–180 (but has been occasionally dated to the fourth century). It must be reconstructed from a rather corrupt eighth-century text, but there is no doubt about its attributing the Third Gospel to Luke, and also identifying him as a physician, as one who had not himself seen the Lord, and as a companion of Paul. Also from the end of the second century is the testimony of Irenaeus (*Adversus haereses* 3.1.1). He speaks of Luke, the companion of Paul, setting forth in a book the gospel as preached by Paul. This is developed in 3.14.1 where it becomes clear that the “we” passages in Acts are the basis for Irenaeus’ claim for an intimate association between Paul and Luke. Irenaeus has an apologetic interest in a link that serves to provide an apostolic origin for the Gospel of Luke. Any careful comparison of Luke’s theology with Paul’s makes it impossible to accept Irenaeus’ claim for the link between Paul’s gospel and the Lukan text.

A more problematical late-second-century witness to the authorship of the Third Gospel is the set of so-called “Anti-Marcionite Prologues” (see Aland, *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*, 2nd ed. [Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1965] 532–33, for the Greek and related Latin text). The prologues appear to have separate origins, the dating is disputed, and even the individual prologues are probably composite. Though the generous range of new information which the Lukan prologue proposes to offer must be viewed with suspicion, there is at least a good chance that we have reflected here another second-century witness to the Lukan authorship of the Gospel.

The last in this set of early witnesses is Tertullian, who, writing in the first decade of the third century (*Adversus Marcionem* 4.2.2; 4.2.5; 4.5.3), comments on Luke as author of the Third Gospel. Tertullian shares Irenaeus’ concern with apostolic origin, and as does Irenaeus, compensates for Luke’s not being an apostle by emphasizing the link with Paul and suggesting that the Gospel is a digest of Paul’s gospel. There is a steady stream of later tradition which continues to affirm the Lukan authorship, and no competing tradition connecting the Gospel to any other figure.

How do we evaluate this traditional ascription? The role attributed to Luke in the NT is quite modest. In Philem 24 he occurs in a list of Paul’s fellow workers. In Col 4:14 Luke the beloved physician sends greetings (and is normally thought to be of non-Jewish origin on the basis of v 11, though this can be read in other ways). In 2 Tim 4:11 he is said to be Paul’s sole companion. That is all, unless we identify this Luke with the Lucius (Λούκιος) who is said to be kinsman of Paul in Rom 16:21. The tradition has certainly exploited these texts to maximize the link with Paul; but this is clearly in the context of the sub-apostolic standing of Luke, which itself constituted a problem for the recognition of this text as Scripture and canon.

One could argue that the Gospel preface (1:1–4) necessitated attribution to a non-apostolic figure, and that given this constraint, Luke offered a figure with attested apostolic links. Cadbury (“The Tradition,” 2:260–61) and Haenchen (*Acts*, 14) go further and argue that Lukan authorship was probably inferred from a comparison of the information of the “we” passages in Acts

with the information to be gleaned about Paul's companions from the letters and from Acts. This would not be impossible but does seem more like the kind of exegetical activity which came only later. I remain impressed by the degree to which the Lukan authorship comes through in the tradition as a problem to be met, rather than as a piece of good fortune (which would, for that reason, be suspected of being only the product of wishful thinking). Though the Gospel preface clearly plays a role in the tradition, it would seem that the tradition begins from the attribution to Luke and expounds on that, partly in the light of the material of the preface, rather than the material of the preface serving as the beginning point for the growth of the tradition. In the end the argument is not decisive, and further considerations have been offered both in favor of and against Lukan authorship.

Could a companion of Paul have captured so little of Paul's theology and made it his own? Could he have confused or telescoped events in his Acts narratives, as is often suggested, if he was as close to the source as he would have been as a companion of Paul? The difficulties here are real, but they have been frequently exaggerated. Luke's theology has certainly been quite separately forged from that of Paul, but the sharp antithesis which is at times claimed comes from a rather narrow exposition of Paul and from what is, at some points, a quite ungenerous reading of Luke. Luke was only one of many colleagues who were associated with Paul from time to time. If we are to be guided by the "we" passages, then the time Luke spent with Paul may not have been at all extensive. His own Christian foundations probably had nothing to do with Paul, and he was Paul's colleague and not his disciple. Work colleagues, then as now, were no doubt often in the situation of knowing much less than even they realized about each other; the focus of the association is in such cases outside the actual personal relationship between the people involved.

No doubt we do get a somewhat Lukanized Paul emerging from the pages of Acts, but Vielhauer ("On the 'Paulinism' of Acts," *Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn, 33-50) has driven an excessively large wedge between the Paul of the letters and the Paul of Acts. Luke has simplified Paul and has shifted the center of gravity of the theology of the Paul he depicts in the direction of his own theology and probably of an "average" Christian theology of his own environment, but he has not falsified Paul. If we go back to the Pauline letters with the perspective that Luke creates, then there are features in those letters which come freshly into focus against just such a background.

One needs also to say that Luke was making no attempt to tell all that he knew. The presentation in Acts is highly schematized and involves the illustrative use of events in relation to a framework that carries much of the weight of the Lukan intention. The Luke who was not particularly interested in chronological sequence in the Gospel narrative may have felt quite at liberty to reorder events in Acts, where to do so fitted better his thematic developments.

A number of scholars have attempted to support Lukan authorship on the basis of a claim that the medical background of the author was evident in his writing. The argument takes its rise from the study of Hobart (*The Medical Language of St. Luke*) published in 1882. Hobart compared the language and style of Luke with that of ancient medical writing in Greek and found many

similarities. The argument is not finally persuasive because Hobart focused on the distinctiveness of Luke over against Mark but failed to take any benchmarks from other literature of the period of a nonmedical nature. What distinguishes Luke from Mark is a use of language that is slightly more literary. As Cadbury has demonstrated (*The Style and Literary Method of Luke*, 50–51; *JBL* 52 [1933] 55–65), we may find the same sort of language use in the LXX, in the works of ancient Greek veterinarians, and indeed we should expect to find it in any reasonably large body of literature written by a well-educated Greek writer with some modest literary pretension for what he is writing. Luke's writing is certainly consistent with experience as a physician, but it cannot be claimed that only a physician would write as Luke does.

The case for Lukan authorship is not clear-cut. There are, however, no decisive arguments against it. In such a situation it would seem best to assume that the early tradition is based on a continuity of memory that goes back to the first readers' undoubted knowledge of who it was who had produced this Gospel for their use.

WHEN DID LUKE WRITE HIS GOSPEL?

There is very little hard evidence upon which to date most of the writings of the NT. Individual works are dated in relationship to an overall dating structure that has been pieced together on the basis of a complex web of fact and hypothesis. One's overall understanding of the emergence of early Christianity and developments into the early patristic period will influence particular judgments.

Working backwards we may say that the attempts to place Acts in the second century on the basis, among other things, of alleged similarity with the writing of Justin Martyr have not proved persuasive. Luke belongs in an earlier time-period than that. His work also needs to be dated earlier than the gathering into a single corpus of the Pauline letters and their general dissemination in the church (even if Goulder is right [*PRS* 13 (1986) 97–112] to find reflected in the Gospel of Luke a knowledge of 1 Corinthians and 1 Thessalonians). There is no firm date for this, but it certainly happened quite early.

Judgments made about the situation reflected in Luke-Acts as to the state of Christian missionary outreach to Jews and the proportions of Jews and Gentiles to be found in the church will bear significantly on the date to be proposed. Clearly the church moved from being dominantly Jewish to being dominantly Gentile in the course of the first century. How late we may claim a major Jewish influence is a matter of dispute; but we may say in general that the greater the importance we judge Jews to have had in Luke's context of writing, the earlier we will be inclined to date the Gospel. It has become clear above that I place myself among those who see a very significant Jewish setting for the Lukan writings.

Coming from the other end, Luke must be dated later than Mark, which is generally dated in the late sixties of the first century. Luke clearly writes from and/or into a situation significantly different from that reflected by Mark, but this need not be related particularly to the passage of time. The difference may be much more one of situation. Those who posit a radical difference in

the realm of eschatology between Mark and Luke seem to me to have both over-eschatologized Mark and to have under-eschatologized Luke. The difference is real, but it may reflect difference of personality and purpose quite as much or more than any fundamental difference of theology.

It seems reasonable to assume that there is no large passage of time between the dates of composition of the Gospel and of Acts. This being the case, then we can make use of the date to which Luke's account reaches chronologically in Acts. The narrative in Acts probably takes us to A.D. 62. The Gospel cannot, therefore, be dated much earlier than this date. (The argument that Acts must have been written prior to the outcome of Paul's trial, because if Luke had known of the outcome he certainly would have reported it, fails through its failure to take full account of the role of schematization in Luke's editorial process. For Luke, Paul's journey to arrest in Jerusalem and his shipwreck and rescue constitute the repetition in Paul's life of the pattern of Jesus' going to suffering in Jerusalem and his subsequent resurrection. Paul's unhindered ministry in Rome is Luke's final note. Neither a death sentence nor a release and departure from Rome would have served any purpose for Luke. In any case Luke betrays his awareness that the situation depicted in Acts 28:30–31 had its terminus by reporting the two-year duration of this opportunity.)

The one other fixed point to which we should relate this attempt to date the Gospel is the destruction of Jerusalem. Is this event reflected in any way in the Gospel text? It is certainly predicted there (Luke 19:41–44; 21:20–24), and for those whose starting point is the impossibility of prophetic prediction, that is the end of the matter. But even for those who do not feel restricted in this way, there are questions raised by the shift in emphasis from Mark to Luke from the destruction of the temple to the destruction of the city. Is this change wisdom after the event? I have argued elsewhere ("Luke's Readers," 129–240) that a considerable part of the Lukan editing is under the influence of the need to respond apologetically to a Jewish polemical characterization of Christianity as hostile to foundational Jewish loyalties, such as to the Jerusalem temple. The move from temple to city is part of a more complex orchestration which suggests that what Jesus, and thence the Christians, had anticipated was God's judgment upon the Jewish nation for its failure to respond appropriately to the ministry of Jesus; what was anticipated was a judgment in history in much the way that Jeremiah had anticipated a judgment in history. This anticipation implied no criticism of the temple loyalty of the Jewish faith. Indeed this temple loyalty was exhibited by Jesus and continued by the Christian movement. The temple has a very positive function in Luke, and by restating the anticipation of judgment with a focus on Jerusalem and not so much on the temple, Luke can allow this positive temple loyalty to appear more unambiguously. Hindsight is, then, not the only possible motivation for Lukan alterations here. In this context Dodd's argument ("The Fall of Jerusalem and the 'Abomination of Desolation,'" *JRS* 37 [1947] 47–54), that the Lukan wording of 19:42–44 and 21:20–24 is composed entirely from the language of the OT, gains fresh importance.

Now, if temple loyalty was something that disappeared after A.D. 70 with the destruction of the temple with the city, then this would give, on my understanding, a latest date for the Lukan texts. But while temple loyalty became theoretical after the temple's destruction, in that it was no longer possible

properly to enact the cult requirements, temple loyalty continued to be an important strand in Jewish faith. The tragedy of the loss of the temple continued and, indeed, continues to play a significant role in Jewish faith. Luke's Christians can share in that sense of tragedy (if Luke writes after A.D. 70), or they (at least the Jewish ones) have a demonstrated loyalty to the temple (if Luke writes before the destruction of the temple). The Christian movement has the best of Jewish credentials! It may be that the degree of focus on the temple counts for a date not too much later than the time of its destruction.

Taken together, the considerations that we have reviewed encourage a date for the Gospel between the late sixties and the late seventies of the first century, although it is not possible to be rigid even about the limits of this range.

The considerable discussion about the place of composition is, in my judgment, quite indecisive. Luke is certainly a man of cosmopolitan outlook, but further than that I hesitate to go. There seems to be weight in the suggestion that we should identify him as a native of Philippi, and also in the arguments that would locate his origins in Syrian Antioch (this view has the best ancient support).

HOW GOOD IS OUR SURVIVING TEXT?

The Greek text that is the basis of the present commentary is that represented in Nestle-Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 26th ed., ed. K. Aland et al. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, revised printing, 1983). The editors' readings have not in every case been followed, but the number of divergences is relatively few. Use has also been made of the United Bible Society's text, *The Greek New Testament*, 3rd ed., ed. K. Aland et al. (Stuttgart: Biblia-Druck, 1983); of the *New Testament in Greek. III. The Gospel according to St. Luke*, Part 1 and Part 2 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1984, 1987); and of the *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum*, ed. K. Aland, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1965).

Modern access to the text Luke actually wrote is by means of a long copying tradition. The oldest surviving copy of most of the Gospel text is the already mentioned P^{75} from the late second or early third century. This is the earliest of a small set of surviving papyrus texts, all fragmentary to a greater or lesser extent. Several of these date from the third century, and the remainder are from the fourth to the seventh or eighth centuries. Papyrus is quite fragile, so it is only with the beginning of the use of parchment for Bible texts that we get surviving texts which are not at least somewhat fragmented. The earliest parchment texts are from the fourth century: Codex Sinaiticus, designated \aleph , and Codex Vaticanus, designated B. From the fifth century there are texts designated A, C, and T. Additional texts date from the sixth to the ninth centuries. The sixth-century Codex Bezae (designated D) is worthy of special note, because similar readings are made use of by patristic writers and are reflected by the Old Latin versions and the Curetonian Syriac version. This means that we should in effect count it as reflecting a text that goes back probably to the time of our earliest witnesses. The mention here of patristic writers and of early translations introduces two additional important areas of evidence for reconstructing the text. A third that should be mentioned is the body of surviving lectionary texts. These consist, naturally, of extracts rather than whole texts, and sometimes, in the interests of lectionary use, there have been minor

editorial changes at the beginning or end of these extracts to make them self-contained for reading; but used with care these can provide valuable evidence. Surviving lectionaries are from the sixth century on.

Copying by hand of any quantity of text always produces errors, no matter how committed to care the copyist is. The text of Luke is no exception. No two copies are quite identical, and a large number of (mostly minor) variations are to be found. By comparison, however, with the basis on which almost all other ancient texts are reconstructed, we are enormously well supplied for reproducing an accurate text. A whole science of textual reconstruction has been developed over some centuries in order to produce the most accurate text possible out of all this evidence.

Several modes of inquiry are used for tracing back to the original form of the Lukan text. There is first the identification of textual families. Existing copies of the Greek text of Luke seem to be based on a limited number of forms of the text that had developed in the early centuries. The shared readings of a family represent the original of that form of the text. In this way later copying errors are eliminated. To some extent a character can be identified for these early text forms which will encourage us to give greater or lesser credence to their distinctive readings. (For example, the text family represented by Codex Bezae is characterized by periodically having, especially in Acts, quite lengthy additional pieces of a distinctive style which is rather different from Luke's normal style. These are not normally considered to be part of the original text.) Study of the papyri texts has shown that this kind of family analysis cannot bear the weight that it has at times been asked to bear (though so early, the papyri texts are not pure family texts). The approach, however, continues to play an important part in the reconstruction of the original text.

The second mode of inquiry involves an investigation into scribal activity. Scribes can make mistakes in what they see, in what they hear, in what they remember, and in judgment. Their readings can be based on attempts to correct what was clearly an error in the text being copied, or on conflation of readings from more than one text. Scribes sometimes "improved" (e.g., Greek grammar); they sometimes harmonized with other parts of the Bible text; they sometimes completed what seemed to be deficient; they sometimes clarified what seemed to be obscure; they sometimes "corrected" in a doctrinal sense. If we assemble the range of readings at a particular point, the question can be asked against the background of known scribal tendencies: What original best accounts for the range of readings represented?

The third main track of inquiry involves getting to know the habits of the particular NT author: his style of writing, his interests, his use of grammatical constructions, his literary structuring techniques, and the flow of thought in the immediate context of disputed readings. Where there are variant readings, then, in light of the known patterns of the author, the question can be asked: Which reading fits in best with what this writer is most likely to have written?

Different scholars attach different weight to each of these approaches. The conclusions are clearly most secure when there is a convergence of results from the three approaches. While there is no totally agreed text, the areas of disagreement are tiny by comparison with the agreement that exists about the overwhelming majority of the text.

An Outline of Luke 1:1–9:20

DEDICATORY PREFACE 1:1–4

THE INFANCY PROLOGUE 1:5–2:52

John's Birth Announced 1:5–25

Jesus' Birth Announced 1:26–38

Mutual Greeting of the Mothers 1:39–56

Birth, Circumcision, and Naming of John 1:57–66

Recognition of John by Zechariah 1:67–80

Birth, Circumcision, and Naming of Jesus 2:1–21

Recognition of Jesus by Simeon and Anna 2:22–40

In the House of His Father 2:41–52

PREPARATION FOR THE MINISTRY OF JESUS 3:1–4:13

John the Baptist 3:1–6

The Preaching of John 3:7–18

The Imprisonment of John 3:19–20

Jesus Endowed with the Spirit and Affirmed as Son 3:21–22

The Genealogy of Jesus 3:23–38

Temptations of the Son in the Wilderness 4:1–13

PREACHING IN THE SYNAGOGUES OF THE JEWS 4:14–44

Return to Galilee 4:14–15

Preaching in Nazareth 4:16–30

Preaching in Capernaum 4:31–37

Healing Simon's Mother-in-law 4:38–39

Healing Many at Sundown 4:40–41

Leaving Capernaum for a Wider Ministry 4:42–44

MAKING A RESPONSE TO JESUS 5:1–6:16

Fishing Associates for Jesus 5:1–11

The Cleansing of a Leper 5:12–16

The Forgiveness of a Paralyzed Man 5:17–26

The New and the Old: The Call of Levi, Eating with Sinners, and the
Question of Fasting 5:27–39

Provision for the Sabbath by the Son of Man 6:1–5

Doing Good on the Sabbath 6:6–11

The Call of the Twelve 6:12–16

A SERMON FOR DISCIPLES: THE STATUS AND DEMANDS OF BEING THE ESCHATOLOGICAL PEOPLE OF GOD 6:17–49

Disciples and People Come to Hear and Be Healed 6:17–19

Beatitudes and Woes 6:20–26

The Call to Love of Enemies and Nonjudgmental Generosity 6:27–38

The Importance of What Jesus Teaches and the Need to Act upon
It 6:39–49

SOMETHING GREATER THAN JOHN IS HERE 7:1–50

The Authority of Jesus over Life and Death 7:1–10

God Has Visited His People 7:11–17

Are You the Coming One? 7:18–23

What Was in the Wilderness? 7:24–28

John and Jesus, and This Generation and the Children of Wisdom 7:29–35

The Pharisee and the Sinful Woman 7:36–50

ITINERANT PREACHING WITH THE TWELVE AND THE WOMEN 8:1–9:20

Itinerant Preaching with the Twelve and the Women 8:1–3

Potent Seed and Varied Soils 8:4–8a

Knowing the Secrets of the Kingdom of God 8:8b–10

The Parable Explained 8:11–15

Take Care How You Hear! 8:16–18

Jesus' Mother and Brothers 8:19–21

The Stilling of the Storm 8:22–25

The Healing of the Gerasene Demoniac 8:26–39

Jairus' Daughter and the Woman with the Flow of Blood 8:40–56

Sharing in Jesus' Ministry 9:1–6

Who Then Is This? 9:7–9

Feeding the Multitudes 9:10–17

"[We Say You Are] the Christ of God" 9:18–20

Excursus: Modern Parables Research

The Gospel of Luke is a major repository of the parables of Jesus, and while it is not possible here to review modern parables research with more than the broadest of strokes, it does seem to be of some importance to provide some minimal interaction with work on the parables in the last hundred years, as a background for treatment of the parables we find in the Gospel of Luke.

Jülicher's work (*Gleichnisreden*, 1888, 1889) continues to be the point of departure for modern study of the parables. Jülicher divided the parables corpus into similitudes (extended comparisons based on repeatable typical events [e.g., Luke 15:8–9]), parables (where some interesting particular situation is in view [e.g., Luke 15:11–32]), and example stories (which, unlike similitudes and parables, are not really about something that lies quite outside the literal meaning of the narrative [e.g., Luke 10:30–37]). The distinction remains serviceable, though there have been serious attempts made to remove all Gospel parables from the third category.

Jülicher attacked the widespread allegorical interpretation of parables according to which individual elements of the narrative are taken as coded references, and the art of reading a parable devolves into the task of producing the "real" narrative by replacing each cipher in the narrative with that for which it is the code. Jülicher opposed this approach with the demand for an interpretation of each parable as making a single point: the parable narrative and that upon which Jesus is indirectly commenting by telling the parable are connected by means of a single point of comparison.

While Jülicher's influence swept away a great deal of parable interpretation that was artificial and somewhat arbitrary, to tease apart allegory and parable has proved more difficult than Jülicher allowed for. Despite its long and distinguished ancestry, allegorical interpretation as a standard method of understanding religious texts has been rightly discredited in the modern period. But an allegory should be read as an allegory precisely to the degree that it was composed as an allegory (see especially Klauck, *Allegorie und Allegorese*); and it cannot really be denied that at least the considerable use in the Gospel parables of fixed metaphors (e.g., sowing and reaping, mustard seed, the king) represents an allegorical element in the parables which cannot be eliminated as early church imposition upon the parables of Jesus. Rather than attempting a separation of allegory and parable, we should recognize the distribution of the Gospel parables across a spectrum ranging from parables that are quite free from allegorical elements to parables in which allegorical elements play a key role (cf. Black, *BJRL* 42 [1960] 273–87; Tinsey, *CQ* 3 [1970] 32–39; R. E. Brown, *NovT* 5 [1962] 36–45).

A large part of Jülicher's protest was really about the failure of interpreters to allow the internal dynamic and literary cohesion of the parable narrative to come into clear focus and to direct interpretation. At this level, all modern interpreters would share Jülicher's concern. But Jülicher himself had only a limited sensitivity to the communicative powers of language and literature. Recent parables research is passionately committed to remedying that defect. The desire to bring to bear on the reading of the parables a fully developed literary sensitivity has largely focused upon an analysis of metaphor, on the basis that a parable is something like a metaphor expanded into a narrative (e.g., Wilder, *Jesus' Parables and the War of Myths*; Ricoeur, *Semeia* 4 [1975] 29–148; Funk, *Parables and Presence*; Via, *The Parables*; Crossan, *In Parables*; Perrin, *Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom*; Weder, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu als Metaphern*; Harnisch, *Die Gleichniserzählungen Jesu*; TeSelle, *JAAR* 42 [1974] 630–45; B. B. Scott, *Jesus, Symbol-Maker for the Kingdom*).

The distinction is drawn between that use of metaphor which is only an ornament

of speech, perhaps used to express more winsomely a thought that can be equally, but more abstractly, expressed without the service of the metaphor (this is the only kind of metaphor of which Jülicher was aware) and the use of metaphor to forge new insight and to express what has hitherto been unnoticed and unexpressed. The parables are regularly aligned with this more profound use of metaphor. As extended metaphors, parables share in the visionary and creative power of poetic speech (Wilder, *Early Christian Rhetoric; Jesus' Parables and the War of Myths*). This sort of insight certainly brings to the study of the parables an extra dimension of depth, but there does seem to be an element of extremism in the implied denial that Jesus' parables ever function simply as argumentative illustrations.

As with metaphor, a parable is not really saying what the words literally express. This kind of phenomenon of nonliteralism raises complex questions about the way such a use of language has meaning, about what kind of meaning it may have, and about the manner in which the reader/hearer may gain or experience access to the meaning. These questions merge into more general questions about the nature and meanings of religious language. As well, they are inseparable from the questions posed by the philosophical tradition, and, in particular, from the post-Kantian assumption of "the death of God in any supernaturalistic sense" (Ricoeur, *Semeia* 4 [1975] 139) and from the modern recognition (in, e.g., Marxism, existentialism, and other phenomenological approaches) of the inescapable subjectivity introduced into the process of understanding by the fact that the knower is, and must be, personally engaged with that which he seeks to understand (otherwise we may have perception and formal thinking but not understanding [cf. D. E. Klemm, *Hermeneutical Inquiry* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1986) 1:1–32]).

Observations will be offered below in connection with some of these matters, but an adequate discussion is not possible here. It is, however, important to signal the fact that the modern reading of the parables is rather more heavily influenced by competing theories offered in connection with such questions than is the reading of other types of text in the Gospel record.

The first step toward understanding a parable is, clearly, the recognition that we are not merely being offered the simple story that the parable, on the surface, recounts. We rightly look for contextual clues for our metaphorical interpretation of parables, such as links with other parables, with other aspects of the teaching of Jesus, or with other features of his reported ministry; but within a parable itself, the immediate clues to nonliteralism are (i) a normalcy of the story which would cause us to judge the telling of the story to be pointless or trivial if there is no symbolic meaning and (ii) an element of extravagance which breaks through the everyday realism of the story and introduces a note of oddness into the parable (Ricoeur, *Semeia* 4 [1975] 99–100, 114–18). For some of the parables, the dynamics created by the juxtaposition of the realistic everyday and the extravagantly odd seems to be the key to the manner in which the parable effects its communication. But this is not true for all of the Gospel parables, and we do well not to try to fit them all into one mold. For many of the parables "all is true to nature and to life" (Dodd, *Parables*, 20) and the parables, precisely on the basis of this naturalness, entice the hearer to a judgment upon the situation depicted (Dodd, *Parables*, 23). Here the metaphorical step involves seeing that the judgment evoked in the sphere of nature and life is equally valid in a second sphere. There does, however, seem to be a certain amount of unjustified romanticism in Dodd's claim (*Parables*, 22) that this realistic appeal to nature and to life involves on Jesus' part the recognition of "the divineness of the natural order." A third clue to the nonliteralism is the presence of terms which in the Jewish world of the day had currency as established metaphors in religious speech (e.g., the king is a standard figure for God).

Directed away from the literal sense by whatever cues, we look to the parables to

generate insight into something quite different. Broadly speaking, Jesus' parables are about the Kingdom of God (see the foundational work in Dodd, *Parables*, and Jeremias, *Parables*), but this should not be taken too narrowly. Some are directly about the Kingdom of God, as is some of Jesus' nonparabolic teaching, but many are only to be related to Jesus' central focus on the Kingdom of God in the way that nonparabolic teaching not directly on the Kingdom is to be so related. Existentialist interpreters obscure the analysis of the parables through failing to allow for such a distinction.

Because parabolic communication, by its very nature, stands against any separation of understanding and application, there are difficulties in the way of an objective statement of what a parable means. Parables are concerned with the transformation of perspective rather than with the delineation of an idea or set of ideas. Furthermore, innovative and not merely illustrative metaphorical language (as above) is not translatable: it forges insight that it is not possible to express by means of the normal resources of the descriptive and analytical powers of language. As well, creative metaphorical language is polyvocal, not univocal, and communicates to the individual in connection with the horizons of life that exist for that individual.

Given this array of difficulties, should we simply leave a parable to "happen" to each individual, and have no expectation of a communicable sense that may be reported to another? No interpreter does, though some (e.g., Crossan, *In Parables*, 72, 74, 114) are aware of the precarious standing which their own theoretical basis allows for their proffered interpretations. In my view, the points of the preceding paragraph are often made or applied in an exaggerated manner. Sympathetic imagination might not be as good as personal conviction in developing the insight that comes from engagement, but it is possible by sympathetic imagination to feel the impact of a religious tradition to a considerable degree, to trace the contours of its own coherence with considerable accuracy, and, in this way, to respect the nexus of understanding and application. No doubt there is a plus for the reader/hearer whose own existence is challenged and transformed by parabolic utterance, but one may suspect that rather inflated language is sometimes used to describe the impact of the parables (cf. Boucher, *Mysterious Parable*, 42).

Metaphorical language may not be translatable, but it is so because it is preconceptual, not because it is anticonceptual. Perceptual thresholds first crossed by poetic imagination in metaphor are regularly thereafter explored in a more objective and conceptual manner. No doubt there are losses as well as gains in the process but its legitimacy is not to be doubted. Immediacy and engagement are the province of the metaphor, exactitude the province of conceptual thought. Metaphor is polyvocal, but not indefinitely so. The claim has been made that any reading of a parable which is true to all the features of the original story is a correct reading (e.g., Tolbert, *Perspectives on the Parables*), but is this sufficient? Can we be content with viewing a parable as some kind of evocative dynamic floating free and able to be locked onto whatever the issues of life are for a particular hearer (or for his intellectual tradition), in order to effect some totally unpredictable sort of catalytic transformation? As true as it is that one engages with a metaphor by explaining its possibilities out of one's own experience, it is surely just as true that the originating context also is intended to circumscribe the metaphoric possibilities. And if it were the case that radically different horizons of experience separated the hearer of a parable entirely from what the proposer of a parable anticipated that its impact would be, the parable producer would no doubt wish his parable withdrawn from circulation! Appropriate transformation of an originally intended thrust is not infinitely elastic.

These reflections draw us into the sphere of the nature and function of religious language. Here there is broad agreement that religious language is symbolic language and, perhaps, metaphorical language. Now, there can be no doubt that the function-

ing of symbolic language needs to be seen in closest connection with the existential significance of the language use. However, in the dualistic ontology of existentialism, the objective world (as manipulable) is too quickly relegated to existential irrelevance in favor of what Ricoeur calls "the life-world of non-manipulable being-in-the-world" (following Husserl and Heidegger; Ricoeur, *Semeia* 4 [1975] 97). Without in any way wanting to minimize the importance attributed here to personal orientation, I must dispute the sharpness of this dualism. It is not a matter of attempting to reinstate a thorough-going objectivity to suggest that a recognition of the actual shape of the world (past and future as well as present) may indeed have a legitimate part to play in the formation of an authentic life-world. While the challenge of Kant may not yet have been adequately met on the philosophical level, the actual functioning of religious language in a context of living faith is much more full-orbed than the narrowed focus of Christian existentialism can allow.

In earlier existentialist hermeneutics (e.g., Bultmann) language was considered to have an intrinsic tendency to distort the understanding of existence that is seeking to come to expression in it, because language was seen as that which objectifies and represents as external and observable. The work of G. Ebeling (*God and Word* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967]; *Introduction to a Theological Theory of Language* [London: Collins, 1973]) and E. Fuchs (*Hermeneutik* [Tübingen: Mohr, 1968]; "The Hermeneutical Problem," in *The Future of Our Religious Past*, FS R. Bultmann, ed. J. M. Robinson [London: SCM, 1971] 267-78) involves a fresh evaluation of language from an existentialist perspective. Language now comes to be seen in a much more positive light. Now it is not that we struggle with language to get past its intrinsic tendency to distort. Rather, language itself creates the possibility of understanding. Language brings with it that about which it is speaking. This fresh appreciation for language can be seen in close connection with the role and power of metaphorical language discussed above.

The existential approach to the parable has been reinforced by the literary focus of recent American study of the parables. Some of this study has drawn heavily on structuralist approaches. These approaches have been developed for the most part among French scholars. Their point of departure is the recognition that no humanly meaningful activity takes place in perfect freedom. The possibilities and their significance are controlled by structured patterns of relationship that already exist, of which we are generally unconscious but which come to expression in every human articulation. Every actual articulation is a rendering of the underlying structural code. The approach has transformed modern linguistics (Saussure) and has been very productive in anthropology (Lévi-Strauss). Sometimes under the name of semiotics, the approach is being applied to the study of literary texts to investigate the underlying signifying systems of which particular texts are an expression (for an introduction see D. Patte, *What is Structural Exegesis?* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976]; also Ricoeur, *Semeia* 4 [1975] 37-73).

Inasmuch as this study focuses on the underlying codes (patterns) that make possible the telling of such stories as parables, it has opened up a fresh area of study, of interest in its own right but thus far productive of very little insight into the parables themselves. Ricoeur (*Semeia* 4 [1975] 37-73) has rightly called for a subordination of structuralist consideration to the surface meaning of the text. In this way the structuralist uncovering of the rules that govern modes of discourse (the codes) has the potential of functioning as a higher level "grammar" by means of which the message can be more clearly delineated. The work of E. Güttgemanns (e.g., "Narrative Analyse") is somewhat along these lines.

A variety of other approaches to literature have influenced recent parables research. Via (*The Parables*) is among those who have been influenced by literary theories that consider all aesthetic objects, and so the parables, to be quite autonomous

from their originating context. This means that the proper approach to them is not to set them into any special relationship with their author or historical setting, but simply to explore them for their own sake as inwardly organized structures without referential concern. Here there can be no concern about an author's intended meaning.

The basic insight underlying such an approach is the recognition that great art transcends time and place in its capacity to move people who may be completely removed from the life-setting in which the art was generated. This important insight should not, however, be given an exaggerated significance. Literature in an unknown language communicates to no one! While there are certainly important nonreferential aspects to a literary piece, it is doubtful whether any literature is totally nonreferential, and it is certain that the parables of Jesus have an important referential aspect to them. At the very least the parables of Jesus belong in connection with other aspects of his teaching and with the actions of his life. On the other side, it remains important to do justice to the aesthetic aspect of the parables, and also to their capacity, as with other literature, to address people and situations remote from their place of origin.

In *Raid on the Articulate*, Crossan, whose work has been consistently marked by a deep literary sensitivity, abandons his earlier approach to parables as extended metaphors and develops a fresh approach in which the fundamental definition of a parable becomes "a paradox formed into a story." Crossan now finds in the parables of Jesus a radical iconoclasm. He compares Jesus' parables to the stories of Borges, and sees both Jesus and Borges as arguing against the idolatry of imprisoning reality in the words that we use. According to Crossan, we live out our lives in relation to a set of game rules which have been established on a purely conventional basis. The parables of Jesus enable us to see the foolishness of attributing any kind of ultimate reality to these arbitrary conventions by which we operate. They warn us against identifying God in any way with these game rules which we have. A parable creates a moment of reality in which the ultimacy of our conventions is shattered and we are sent out into that chaos where alone we can encounter a God who is not just our own projected vanity.

Crossan's new approach has strong links to the deconstructionism of such figures as J. Derrida (see *Semeia* 23 [1982]). Deconstructionism focuses attention on the inherent ambiguity and even undecidability of narrative texts and goes on to suggest that there is something inherently arbitrary about all interpretive attempts. I see Derrida's deconstructionism as involving, finally, a radical linguistic nihilism. Despite the undoubted intellectual sophistication of the approach, and without denying that particular insights do emerge from Crossan's comparison of the parables of Jesus with the stories of Borges, I see the Jesus who emerges from such an approach as in such radical discontinuity with every aspect of his environment and with the church that developed in response to him as to make this Jesus quite historically improbable.

Many other important studies deserve comment but perhaps enough has been said at a general level to identify the main lines along which investigation has proceeded. Thus far, comment has been focused on the attempts that have been made to understand the parables. I will conclude by drawing attention to one study that addresses the question of the authenticity of the Gospel parables.

Critical scholarship has regularly assumed that the parables have undergone a certain amount of development before incorporation in the Gospel texts and that some few of the parables may not be traceable to the historical Jesus. It has been left to M. D. Goulder (*JTS* 19 [1968] 51-69) to argue forcefully that very few of the Gospel parables (the Markan parables only) go back to the historical Jesus and that in all likelihood the writers of Matthew and of Luke are the true authors of

most of the parables their respective Gospels contain. Goulder argues effectively on two fronts. First, he shows that the parables grouped in each particular Gospel share certain family characteristics that separate them from the parables of the other Gospels. Second, he reminds us that the parables in each particular Gospel stress the same doctrinal content that can be found elsewhere in that Gospel. To move from these points to his conclusion Goulder makes use of a set of possibilities that are too rigidly identified as competing alternatives, but he clearly demonstrates the importance of considering the role of the evangelists in producing the form in which the parables are reproduced in the respective Gospels. Over against Goulder's commendation of the simplicity of his suggestion, I would prefer the complexity of a view that combines the origin of the parables with the historical Jesus, their development through use in the church's life prior to the production of our canonical Gospels, a selection by the evangelists made possible both by the range of parables and by the emergence of different forms of the same parable in the course of church use, and development of the parables by the different evangelists for the purpose of maximizing their effectiveness in their particular Gospel texts.

Commentary Bibliography

Barclay, W. *The Gospel of Luke*. Daily Study Bible Series. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1956. **Caird, G. B.** *The Gospel of St. Luke*. London: Penguin, 1963. **Creed, J. M.** *The Gospel according to St. Luke*. London: Macmillan, 1942. **Danker, F. W.** *Jesus and the New Age according to St. Luke*. St. Louis: Clayton, 1972. ———. *Luke*. Proclamation Commentaries, 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987. **Easton, B. S.** *The Gospel according to St. Luke: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary*. New York: Scribner, 1926. **Ellis, E. E.** *The Gospel of Luke*. 2nd ed. London: Oliphants, 1974. **Ernst, J.** *Das Evangelium nach Lukas, übersetzt und erklärt*. RNT. Regensburg: Pustet, 1977. **Fitzmyer, J. A.** *The Gospel according to Luke*. AB 28, 28A. 2 vols. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981–85. **Geldenhuis, N.** *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition, and Notes*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951. **Gilmour, S. M.** "The Gospel according to St. Luke." *Interpreter's Bible*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1952. 8:1–434. **Godet, F.** *A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke*. Tr. E. W. Shelders. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, repr. 1976 (1887, 1889). **Gooding, D.** *According to Luke: A New Exposition of the Third Gospel*. Grand Rapids/Leicester, UK: Eerdmans/Inter-Varsity, 1987. **Grundmann, W.** *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. THKNT 3. 2nd ed. East Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961. **Harrington, W. J.** *The Gospel according to St. Luke: A Commentary*. Westminster, MD/Toronto: Newman, 1967. **Hauck, F.** *Das Evangelium des Lukas*. Leipzig: Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1934. **Kealy, S. P.** *The Gospel of Luke*. Denville, NJ: Dimension Books, 1979. **Klostermann, E.** *Das Lukasevangelium*. HNT 5. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1975 = 1929. **Lagrange, M.-J.** *Évangile selon Saint Luc*. 2nd ed. Paris: Gabalda, 1921. **Leaney, A. R. C.** *A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke*. BNTC. London: A. & C. Black, 1958. **Lenski, R. C. H.** *The Interpretation of St. Mark's and St. Luke's Gospel*. Columbus, OH: Lutheran Book Concern, 1934. **Loisy, A.** *L'évangile selon Luc*. Paris: E. Nourry, 1924. **Luce, H. K.** *The Gospel according to St. Luke*. CGTSC. Cambridge: University Press, 1949. **Manson, W.** *The Gospel of Luke*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1930. **Marshall, I. H.** *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Exeter: Paternoster, 1978. **Morris, L.** *The Gospel according to St. Luke: An Introduction and Commentary*. TNTC. London: Inter-Varsity, 1974. **Müller, P.-G.** *Lukas-Evangelium*. Stuttgarter kleiner Kommentar, Neues Testament 3. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1984. **Osty, E.** *La Sainte Bible traduite en français sous la direction de l'École Biblique de Jérusalem. L'évangile selon Saint Luc. Traduction, introduction et notes*. Paris: Cerf, 1961. **Plummer, A.** *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Luke*. ICC. 5th ed. New York: Scribner, 1922. **Rengstorff, K. H.** *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. NTD 3. 9th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962. **Rienecker, F.** *Das Evangelium des Lukas*. Wuppertaler Studienbibel. 4th ed. Wuppertal: Brockhaus, 1972. **Sabourin, L.** *L'évangile de Luc: Introduction et commentaire*. Rome: Gregorian University, 1985. **Schlatter, A. von.** *Das Evangelium des Lukas aus seinen Quellen erklärt*. Stuttgart: Calwer, 1931. **Schmid, J.** *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. RNT 3. 4th ed. Regensburg: Pustet, 1960. **Schmithals, W.** *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. Zürcher Bibelkommentar NT 3.1. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1980. **Schneider, G.** *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. 2 vols. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1977. **Schürmann, H.** *Das Lukasevangelium: Erster Teil: Kommentar zu Kap. 1,1–9, 50*. HTKNT 3/1. Freiburg/Basel/Vienna: Herder, 1969. **Schweizer, E.** *The Good News according to Luke*. Tr. D. E. Green. London: SPCK, 1984. **Talbert, C. H.** *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel*. New York: Crossroad, 1982. **Thompson, G. H. P.** *The Gospel according to Luke in the Revised Standard Version*. The New Clarendon Bible. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972. **Tinsley, E. J.** *The Cambridge Bible Commentary in the New English Bible: The Gospel according to Luke*. New York/London: Cambridge University, 1965. **Wellhausen, J.** *Das Evangelium Lucae, übersetzt und erklärt*. Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1904. **Zahn, T. von.** *Das Evangelium des Lukas ausgelegt*. 4th ed. Leipzig: Deichert, 1930.

General Bibliography

- Achtemeier, P. J.** "Towards the Isolation of Pre-Markan Miracle Catenae." *JBL* 89 (1970) 265–91. ———. "The Lukan Perspective on the Miracles of Jesus: A Preliminary Sketch." *JBL* 94 (1975) 547–62. ———. "Carlston's Parables: A Review Article." *ANQ* 16 (1976) 227–31. **Arai, S.** "Individual- und Gemeindeethik bei Lukas." *AJBI* 9 (1983) 88–127. **Argyle, A. W.** "'Hypocrites' and the Aramaic Theory." *ExpTim* 75 (1963–64) 113–14. ———. "Evidence for the View That St. Luke Used St. Matthew's Gospel." *JBL* 83 (1964) 390–96. ———. "The Greek of Luke and Acts." *NTS* 20 (1974) 441–45. **Asante, E.** "The Theological Jerusalem of Luke-Acts." *ATJ* 15 (1986) 172–82. **Asting, R.** *Die Verkündigung des Wortes im Urchristentum, dargestellt an den Begriffen "Worte Gottes," "Evangelium" und "Zeugnis."* Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1939. **Baasland, E.** "Zum Beispiel der Beispielerzählungen. Zur Formenlehre der Gleichnisse und zum Methodik der Gleichnisauslegung." *NovT* 28 (1986) 193–219. **Bachmann, M.** *Jerusalem und der Tempel. Die geographisch-theologischen Elemente in der lukanischen Sicht des jüdischen Kultzentrums.* BWANT 6/9. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1980. **Baer, H. von.** *Der heilige Geist in den Lukas-schriften.* BWANT 3/3. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1926. **Bailey, J. A.** *The Tradition Common to the Gospels of Luke and John.* NovTSup 7. Leiden: Brill, 1963. **Bailey, K. E.** *Poet and Peasant: A Literary-Cultural Approach to the Parables in Luke.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976. ———. *Through Peasant Eyes: More Lukan Parables, Their Culture and Style.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980. **Baird, J. A.** "A Pragmatic Approach to Parable Exegesis: Some New Evidence on Mark 4:11, 33–34." *JBL* 76 (1957) 201–7. **Baker, J.** "Luke, the Critical Evangelist." *ExpTim* 68 (1957) 123–25. **Baltzer, K.** "The Meaning of the Temple in the Lukan Writings." *HTR* 58 (1965) 263–77. **Bammel, E.** "The Baptist in Early Christian Tradition." *NTS* 18 (1971–72) 95–128. **Barr, D. L.** "Speaking in Parables: A Survey of Recent Research." *TSFB* 6 (1983) 8–10. **Barr, D. L., and Wentling, J. L.** "The Conventions of Classical Biography and the Genre of Luke-Acts: A Preliminary Study." In *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives*, ed. C. H. Talbert, 63–88. **Barraclough, R.** "A Reassessment of Luke's Political Perspective." *RTR* 38 (1979) 10–18. **Barrett, C. K.** *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition.* London: SPCK, 1947. ———. *Luke the Historian in Recent Study.* FBBS 24. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1970. ———. *The Gospel according to St. John: An Introduction with Commentary and Notes on the Greek Text.* 2nd ed. London: SPCK, 1978. **Bartsch, H.-W.** *Wachet aber zu jeder Zeit!* Hamburg/Bergstedt: Reich, 1963. ———. "Die stehenden Bilder in den Gleichnissen als Beispiel für eine existentielle Interpretation des Bildes." In *Kerygma und Mythos*, vol. 6.2, ed. H. W. Bartsch. TF 31. Hamburg/Bergstedt: Reich, 1964. 103–17. ———. "Early Christian Eschatology in the Synoptic Gospels (A Contribution to Form-Critical Research)." *NTS* 11 (1965) 387–97. **Bauer, J. B.** "Evangelium und Geschichtlichkeit: Vom heutigen Stand der Erforschung des Neuen Testaments." In *Evangelienforschung: Ausgewählte Aufsätze deutscher Exegeten*, ed. J. B. Bauer. Graz: Verlag Styria, 1968. 9–32. ———. "Gleichnisse Jesu und Gleichnisse der Rabbinen." *TPQ* 119 (1971) 297–307. **Bauernfeind, O.** *Die Worte der Dämonen im Markusevangelium.* BWANT 3/8. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1927. **Baumbach, G.** *Das Verständnis des Bösen in den synoptischen Evangelien.* East Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1963. ———. "Gott und die Welt in der Theologie des Lukas." *BLit* 45 (1972) 241–55. **Bayer, H. F.** *Jesus' Predictions of Vindication and Resurrection: The Provenance, Meaning, and Correlation of the Synoptic Predictions.* WUNT 2/20. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1986. **Beardslee, W. A.** "Parable Interpretation and the World Disclosed by the Parable." *PRS* 3 (1976) 123–39. ———. "Parable, Proverb, and Koan." *Semeia* 12 (1978) 151–77. **Beare, F. W.** *The Gospel according to Matthew.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1981. **Beasley-Murray, G. R.** *Baptism in the New Testament.* Exeter: Paternoster, 1972 = 1962. **Beck, B. E.** "The Common Authorship of Luke and Acts." *NTS* 23 (1977) 346–52. **Becker, J.** *Johannes der Täufer und Jesus von Nazareth.* BS 63. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1972. **Behm, J. M.** *Die Handauflegung im Urchristentum: Nach Verwendung, Herkunft und Bedeutung in religionsgeschichtlichem Zusammenhang untersucht.* Darmstadt:

- Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1968. **Beilner, W.** *Christus und die Pharisäer: Exegetische Untersuchung über Grund und Verlauf der Auseinandersetzungen*. Vienna: Herder, 1959.
- Benoit, P.,** and **Boismard, M.-E.** *Synopse des Quatre Évangiles en français: Tome 2, Commentaire*. Paris: Cerf, 1972. **Berchmans, J.** "Some Aspects of Lukan Christology." *Bible-bhashyam* 2 (1976) 5–22. **Berger, K.** "Zum traditionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund christologischer Hoheitstitel." *NTS* 17 (1970–71) 391–425. ———. "Materialen zu Form- und Überlieferungsgeschichte neutestamentlicher Gleichnisse." *NovT* 15 (1973) 1–37.
- Bergquist, J. A.** "Good News to the Poor—Why Does This Lukan Motif Appear to Run Dry in the Book of Acts?" *BangTF* 18 (1986) 1–16. **Bernadicou, P. J.** "The Lukan Theology of Joy." *ScEs* 25 (1973) 75–98. **Betz, O.** "The Kerygma of Luke." *Int* 22 (1968) 131–46. **Beyer, K.** *Semitische Syntax im Neuen Testament*. Vol. 1. SUNT 1. 2nd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968. **Black, M.** *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1946. ———. "The Parables as Allegory." *BJRL* 42 (1960) 273–87. **Blackman, E. C.** "New Methods of Parable Interpretation." *CJT* 15 (1969) 3–13. **Blass, F.** *Philology of the Gospels*. London: Macmillan, 1898. **Block, D. L.** *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lukan Old Testament Christology*. Sheffield: JSOT, 1985. **Blomberg, C. L.** "New Horizons in Parable Research." *TJ* 3 (1982) 3–17. ———. "The Law in Luke-Acts." *JSNT* 22 (1984) 53–80. ———. "When Is a Parallel Really a Parallel? A Test Case in the Lukan Parables." *WTJ* 46 (1984) 78–103. **Böcher, O.** *Dämonenfurcht und Dämonenabwehr: Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte der christlichen Taufe*. BWANT 90. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1970. **Borg, M. J.** *Conflict, Holiness, and Politics in the Teaching of Jesus*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 5. New York/Toronto: Edwin Mellen, 1984. **Borgen, P.** "From Paul to Luke: Observations towards Clarification of the Theology of Luke-Acts." *CBQ* 31 (1969) 168–82. **Boring, M. E.** *Sayings of the Risen Jesus: Christian Prophecy in the Synoptic Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1982. **Boucher, M.** *The Mysterious Parable: A Literary Study*. CBQMS 6. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1977. **Bouttier, M.** "L'humanité de Jésus selon Saint Luc." *RSR* 69 (1981) 33–44. **Bouwman, G.** *Das dritte Evangelium: Einübung in die formgeschichtliche Methode*. Tr. H. Zulauf. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1968. **Bovon, F.** *Luc le théologien: Vingt-cinq ans de recherches (1950–1975)*. Le Monde de la Bible. Neuchâtel/Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1978. ———. "Le salut dans les écrits de Luc: Essai." *RTP* 23 (1973) 296–307. ———. "L'importance des médiations dans le projet théologique de Luc." *NTS* 21 (1974) 23–39. ———. "Orientations actuelles des études lucanien-nes." *RTP* 26 (1976) 161–90. ———. "Luc: portrait et projet." *LVit* 30 (1981) 9–18. ———. "Du côté de chez Luc." *RTP* 115 (1983) 175–89. ———. "Israel, die Kirche und die Völker im lukanischen Doppelwerk." *TLZ* 108 (1983) 403–14. **Boys, M. C.** "The Parabolic Ways of Teaching." *BTB* 13 (1983) 82–89. **Braumann, G.** "Das Mittel der Zeit: Erwägungen zur Theologie des Lukasevangeliums." *ZNW* 54 (1963) 117–45. ———. ed. *Das Lukas-Evangelium: Die redaktions- und kompositionsgeschichtliche Forschung*. WF 280. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1974. **Braun, H.** *Qumran und das Neue Testament*. Vol. 1. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1966. **Brawley, R. L.** *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation*. SBLMS 33. Atlanta: Scholars, 1987. **Breech, E.** "Kingdom of God and the Parables of Jesus." *Semeia* 12 (1978) 15–40. **Breech, J.** *The Silence of Jesus: The Authentic Voice of the Historical Man*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983. **Brown, F. B.,** and **Malbon, E. S.** "Parables as a *Via Negativa*: A Critical Review of the Work of John Dominic Crossan." *JR* 64 (1984) 530–38. **Brown, R. E.** *The Gospel according to John*. AB 29, 29A. 2 vols. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1966–70. ———. "Parable and Allegory Reconsidered." *NovT* 5 (1962) 36–45. **Brown, S.** *Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke*. AnBib 36. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1969. ———. "Precis of Eckhard Plümacher, *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller*." In *Society of Biblical Literature. Seminar Papers*, 1974, ed. G. MacRae. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA: Society of Biblical Literature, 1974. 103–13. ———. "'Water Baptism' and 'Spirit Baptism' in Luke-Acts." *ATR* 59 (1977) 135–51. **Brox, N.** *Zeuge und Märtyrer:*

- Untersuchungen zur frühchristlichen Zeugnis-Terminologie.* SANT 5. Munich: Kösel-Verlag, 1961. **Bruce, F. F.** *The Acts of the Apostles.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951. **Bruners, W.** "Lukas-Literat und Theologe. Neue Literatur zum lukanischen Doppelwerk." *BK* 35 (1980) 110-12, 141-51. **Büchele, A.** *Der Tod Jesu im Lukasevangelium.* Theologische Studien 26. Frankfurt am Main: Joseph Knecht, 1978. **Bultmann, R.** *Theology of the New Testament.* Tr. K. Grobel. 2 vols. London: SCM, 1952-55. ———. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition.* Tr. J. Marsh. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell, 1972. **Bundy, W. E.** *Jesus and the First Three Gospels. An Introduction to the Synoptic Tradition.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1955. **Busse, U.** *Die Wunder des Propheten Jesus: Die Rezeption, Komposition und Interpretation der Wundertradition im Evangelium des Lukas.* FB 24. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1977. ———. *Das Nazareth-Manifest: Eine Einführung in das lukanische Jesusbild nach Lk 4:16-30.* SBS 91. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1978. **Buzy, D.** *Les Parables: Traduites et commentées.* VS 6. Paris: Beauchesne, 1932. **Cadbury, H. J.** *The Style and Literary Method of Luke.* HTS 6. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1919-20. ———. "The Tradition." In *Beginnings*, ed. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake, 2:209-64. ———. *The Making of Luke-Acts.* New York: Macmillan, 1927. ———. "Four Features of Lucan Style." In *Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn. ———. "Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts: II. Recent Arguments for Medical Language." *JBL* 45 (1926) 190-209. ———. "Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts: V. Luke and the Horse-Doctors." *JBL* 52 (1933) 55-65. ———. "Soluble Difficulties in the Parables." In *New Testament Sidelights*, FS A. C. Purdy, ed. H. K. McArthur. Hartford: Hartford Seminary Foundation, 1960. 118-23. **Cadoux, A. T.** *The Parables of Jesus: Their Art and Use.* London: Clarke, 1930. **Cambe, M.** "La ΧΑΡΙΣ chez Saint Luc: Remarques sur quelques textes, notamment le κεχαρισμένῃ." *RB* 70 (1963) 193-207. ———. "Bulletin de Nouveau Testament: Études lucaniennes." *ETR* 56 (1981) 159-67. **Carlston, C.** *The Parables of the Triple Tradition.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975. ———. "Changing Fashions in Interpreting the Parables." *ANQ* 14 (1974) 227-33. ———. "Proverbs, Maxims, and the Historical Jesus." *JBL* 99 (1980) 87-105. ———. "Parable and Allegory Revisited: An Interpretive Review." *CBQ* 43 (1981) 228-42. **Cassidy, R. J.** *Society and Politics in the Acts of the Apostles.* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1987. **Cassidy, R. J., and Scharper, P. J.,** eds. *Political Issues in Luke-Acts.* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1983. **Cave, C. H.** "The Parables and the Scriptures." *NTS* 11 (1964-65) 374-87. **Charlesworth, J. H.,** ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha.* 2 vols. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983-85. **Chevallier, M.-A.** *L'Esprit et le Messie dans le bas-judaïsme et le Nouveau Testament.* Études d'histoire et de philosophie religieuse 49. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1958. ———. "Luc et l'Esprit saint." *RSR* 56 (1982) 1-16. **Chilton, B. D.** *God in Strength: Jesus' Announcement of the Kingdom.* SNTU B, 1. Freistadt: Plöchl, 1979. **Christ, F.** *Jesus Sophia: Die Sophia-Christologie bei den Synoptikern.* ATANT 57. Zürich: Zwingli, 1970. **Conzelmann, H.** *The Theology of St. Luke.* Tr. G. Buswell. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960. ———. *An Outline of the Theology of the New Testament.* NTL. Tr. J. Bowden. London: SCM, 1969. ———. *Die Apostelgeschichte.* Tübingen: Mohr, 1972. **Cook, D. E.** "A Gospel Portrait of the Pharisees." *RevExp* 84 (1987) 221-33. **Cosgrove, C. H.** "The Divine Δεῖ in Luke-Acts: Investigations into the Lukan Understanding of God's Providence." *NovT* 26 (1984) 168-90. **Cranfield, C. E. B.** *The Gospel according to Saint Mark.* CGTC. Cambridge: University Press, 1959. **Crehan, J. H.** "The Purpose of Luke in Acts." *SE* 2 [=TU 87] (1964) 354-68. **Crossan, J. D.** *In Parables: The Challenge of the Historical Jesus.* New York: Harper & Row, 1973. ———. *Raid on the Articulate: Comic Eschatology in Borges and Jesus.* New York: Harper & Row, 1976. ———. *Finding Is the First Act: Trove Folktales and Jesus' Treasure Parables.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979. ———. *Cliffs of Fall: Paradox and Polyvalence in the Parables of Jesus.* New York: Seabury, 1980. ———. "Parable as Religious and Poetic Experience." *JR* 53 (1973) 330-58. ———. "The Servant Parables of Jesus." *Semeia* 1 (1974) 17-62. ———.

- "Parable and Example in the Teaching of Jesus." *Semeia* 1 (1974) 63–104. ———. "Structuralist Analysis and the Parables of Jesus." *Semeia* 1 (1974) 192–221. ———. "Paradox Gives Rise to Metaphor: Paul Ricoeur's Hermeneutics and the Parables of Jesus." *BR* 24–25 (1979–80) 20–37. **Crump, D. M.** "Jesus the Intercessor: Prayer and Christology in Luke-Acts." Ph.D. diss., University of Aberdeen, 1988. **Cullmann, O.** *The Christology of the New Testament*. Tr. S. C. Guthrie and C. A. M. Hall. 2nd ed. London: SCM, 1963. **Culpepper, R. A.** "Paul's Mission to the Gentile World: Acts 13–19." *RevExp* 71 (1974) 487–97. **Dahl, N. A.** "The Purpose of Luke-Acts." *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church: Essays*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1976. 87–98. **Dalman, G.** *Orte und Wege Jesu*. BFCT 2/1. 3rd ed. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1924. **Danker, F. W.** "Theological Presuppositions of St. Luke." *CurTM* 4 (1977) 98–103. **Daube, D.** *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*. London: Athlone, 1956. **Davies, W. D.** *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*. Cambridge: University Press, 1964. **Dawsey, J. M.** *The Lukan Voice: Confusion and Irony in the Gospel of Luke*. Macon, GA: Mercer University, 1986. ———. "What's in a Name? Characterization in Luke." *BTB* 16 (1986) 143–47. ———. "The Temple-Theme in Luke." *MelT* 38 (1987) 26–32. ———. "The Unexpected Christ: The Lukan Image." *ExpTim* 98 (1987) 296–300. **Degenhardt, H.-J.** *Lukas Evangelist der Armen. Besitz und Besitzverzicht in den lukanischen Schriften. Eine traditions- und redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1965. **Delebecque, É.** *Études grecques sur l'évangile de Luc*. Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1976. **Delobel, J.,** ed. *Logia: Les paroles de Jésus—The Sayings of Jesus*. FS J. Coppens. BETL 59. Leuven: Peeters/University Press, 1982. **Delorme, J.,** and **Duplacy, J.,** eds. *La parole de grâce: Études lucaniennes*. FS A. George. Paris: Recherches de Science Religieuse, 1981. **Diamond, G.** "Reflections upon Recent Developments in the Study of Parables in Luke." *ABR* 29 (1981) 1–9. **Dibelius, M.** *Die urchristliche Überlieferung von Johannes dem Täufer*. FRLANT 15. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911. ———. *From Tradition to Gospel*. Tr. B. L. Woolf. London: Ivor Nicholson & Watson, 1934. ———. *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, ed. H. Greeven. Tr. M. Ling. London: SCM, 1956. **Dietrich, W.** *Das Petrusbild der lukanischen Schriften*. BWANT 94. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1972. **Dihle, A.** "Die Evangelien und die biographische Tradition der Antike." *ZTK* 80 (1983) 33–49. **Dillon, R. J.** *From Eye-witnesses to Ministers of the Word*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978. **Dodd, C. H.** *The Parables of the Kingdom*. 3rd ed. New York: Scribner's, 1961. **Dömer, M.** *Das Heil Gottes: Studien zur Theologie des lukanischen Doppelwerkes*. BBB 51. Cologne/Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1978. **Domeris, W. R.** "The Holy One of God as a Title of Jesus." *Neot* 19 (1985) 9–17. **Downing, F. G.** "Freedom from the Law in Luke-Acts." *JSNT* 26 (1986) 49–52. **Drury, J.** *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel: A Study in Early Christian Historiography*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1976. ———. *The Parables in the Gospels: History and Allegory*. New York: Crossroads, 1985. ———. "The Sower, the Vineyard, and the Place of Allegory in the Interpretation of Mark's Parables." *JTS*, n.s., 24 (1973) 367–79. **Dubois, J.-D.** "La figure d'Elie dans la perspective lucanienne." *RHPR* 53 (1973) 155–76. **Dumais, M.** "Ministères, charismes et esprit dans l'oeuvre de Luc." *EglT* 9 (1978) 413–53. ———. "L'évangélisation des pauvres dans l'oeuvre de Luc." *ScEs* 36 (1984) 297–321. **Dunn, J. D. G.** *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*. London: SCM, 1970. ———. *Jesus and the Spirit: A Study of the Religious and Charismatic Experience of Jesus and the First Christians as Reflected in the New Testament*. London: SCM, 1975. **Dupont, J.** *Les actes des Apôtres*. Paris: Cerf, 1953. ———. *Le discours de Milet: Testament pastoral de saint Paul (Actes 20, 18–36)*. LD 32. Paris: Cerf, 1962. ———. "Die individuelle Eschatologie im Lukasevangelium und in der Apostelgeschichte." In *Orientierung an Jesus*, FS J. Schmid, ed. P. Hoffmann et al., 37–47. ———. *Pourquoi des paraboles? La méthode parabolique de Jésus*. Lire la Bible. Paris: Cerf, 1977. ———. *Études sur les évangiles synoptiques*. BETL 70. 2 vols. Leuven: University Press/Peeters, 1985. ———. "Le salut des Gentiles et la signification théologique

- du Livre des Actes." *NTS* 6 (1959-60) 132-55. ———. "Le chapitre des paraboles." *NRT* 89 (1967) 800-820. ———. "L'après mort dans l'oeuvre de Luc." *RTL* 3 (1972) 3-21. ———. "La prière et son efficacité dans l'évangile de Luc." *RSR* 69 (1981) 45-56. **Easton, B. S.** "The Purpose of Acts." *Early Christianity: "The Purpose of Acts" and Other Papers*, ed. F. C. Grant. London: Seabury, 1955. 33-118. **Ebertz, M. N.** *Das Charisma des Gekreuzigten: Zur Soziologie der Jesusbewegung*. WUNT 1/45. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1987. **Ehrhardt, A.** "The Construction and Purpose of the Acts of the Apostles." *ST* 12 (1958) 45-79. **Ehrhardt, E.** *The Framework of the New Testament Stories*. Manchester: University Press, 1964. **Eichholz, G.** *Einführung in die Gleichnisse*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1963. **Ellis, E. E.** "Present and Future Eschatology in Luke." *NTS* 12 (1965-66) 27-41. ———. "'Those of the Circumcision' and the Early Christian Mission." *SE* 4 [TU102] (1968) 390-99. **Eltester, W.** "Israel im lukanischen Werk und die Nazarethperikope." In *Jesus in Nazareth*, ed. W. Eltester. 76-147. ———. ed. *Jesus in Nazareth*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972. **Enslin, M. S.** "Luke, the Literary Physician." In *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature*, FS A. P. Wikgren, ed. D. E. Aune. NovTSup 33. Leiden: Brill, 1972. 135-43. **Ernst, J.** *Herr der Geschichte: Perspektiven der lukanischen Eschatologie*. SBS 88. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1978. ———. *Lukas: Ein theologisches Portrait*. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1985. ———. "Das Evangelium nach Lukas—kein soziales Evangelium." *TG* 67 (1977) 415-21. **Esler, P. F.** *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*. SNTSMS 57. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press, 1987. **Evans, C. A.** "Luke's Use of the Elijah/Elisha Narratives and the Ethic of Election." *JBL* 106 (1987) 75-83. **Farmer, W. R.** *The Synoptic Problem: A Critical Analysis*. Macon, GA: Mercer University, 1976. ———. "Luke's Use of Matthew: A Christological Inquiry." *PSTJ* 40 (1987) 39-50. **Feldkämper, L.** *Der betende Jesus als Heilsmittler nach Lukas*. Veröffentlichung des Missionspriesterseminars 29. St. Augustin bei Bonn: Steyler, 1978. **Fiebig, P.** "Jesu Gleichnisse im Lichte der rabbinischen Gleichnisse." *ZNW* 13 (1912) 192-211. **Fiedler, W.** *Antiker Wetterzauber*. Würzburger Studien zur Altertumswissenschaft 1. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1931. **Finegan, J.** *The Archaeology of the New Testament: The Mediterranean World of the Early Christian Apostles*. Boulder, CO: Westview, 1981. **Fitzmyer, J. A.** "The Priority of Mark and the 'Q' Source in Luke." In *Jesus and Man's Hope*, ed. D. G. Miller. Perspective Books. 2 vols. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1970. 1:131-70. ———. *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*. Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1974. ———. "Jesus in the Early Church through the Eyes of Luke-Acts." *ScrB* 17 (1987) 26-35. **Fitzmyer, J. A.**, et al. *A cause de l'Évangile: Études sur les Synoptiques et les Actes*, FS J. Dupont. LD 123. Paris: Cerf, 1985. **Flender, H.** *St. Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History*. Tr. R. H. and I. Fuller. London: SPCK, 1967. **Foakes-Jackson, F. J.**, and **Lake, K.**, eds. *The Beginnings of Christianity*. Part 1, *The Acts of the Apostles*. 5 vols. London: Macmillan, 1920-33. **Ford, J. M.** *My Enemy Is My Guest: Jesus and Violence in Luke*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1984. **France, R. T.** *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission*. London: Tyndale, 1971. **Francis, F. O.** "Eschatology and History in Luke-Acts." *JAAR* 37 (1969) 49-63. **Frankemölle, H.** "Hat Jesus sich selbst verkündet? Christologische Implikationen in den vormarkinischen Parabeln." *BibLeb* 13 (1972) 184-207. ———. "Kommunikatives Handeln in Gleichnissen Jesu. Historisch-kritische und pragmatische Exegese. Eine kritische Sichtung." *NTS* 28 (1982) 61-90. **Franklin, E.** *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975. **Freire, C. E.** "Jesús profeta, libertador del hombre: Vision lucana de su ministerio terrestre." *EE* 51 (1976) 463-95. **Fridrichsen, A.** *Le problème du miracle dans le Christianisme primitif*. Strasbourg/Paris: Istra. 1925. ———. "Jesu Kampf gegen die unreinen Geister." In *Der Wunderbegriff im Neuen Testament*, ed. A. Suhl. WF 295. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1980. 248-65. **Fuchs, A.** *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zum Matthaeus und Lukas: Ein Beitrag zur Quellenkritik*. AnBib 49. Rome: Pontifical Institute, 1971. **Fuchs, E.** "Bemerkungen zur Gleichnisauslegung."

- Zur Frage nach dem historischen Jesus: Gesammelte Aufsätze II.* 2nd ed. Tübingen: Mohr, 1960. 136–42. ———. “Die Analogie.” In *Die neutestamentliche Gleichnisforschung*, ed. W. Harnisch, 1–19. **Fuller, R. H.** *Interpreting the Miracles*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963. **Funk, R. W.** “The Narrative Parables: The Birth of a Language Tradition.” In *God’s Christ and His People*, ed. J. Jervell and W. A. Meeks. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1977. 42–50. ———. *Parables and Presence: Forms of the New Testament Tradition*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982. ———. “Critical Note.” *Semeia* 1 (1974) 182–91. ———. “Structure in the Narrative Parables of Jesus.” *Semeia* 2 (1974) 51–73. ———. “Parable, Paradox, Power: The Prodigal Samaritan.” *JAAR* 48 (1981) 83–97. ———. “From Parable to Gospel: Domesticating the Tradition.” *Forum* 1 (1985) 3–24. **Gaechter, P.** *Maria im Erdleben: Neutestamentliche Mariestudien*. 3rd ed. Innsbruck: Tyrolia, 1955. **Gärtner, B. E.** “The Person of Jesus and the Kingdom of God.” *TToday* 27 (1970) 32–43. **Gasque, W. W.** *A History of the Criticism of the Acts of the Apostles*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975. **Gaston, L.** *No Stone on Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels*. NovTSup 22. Leiden: Brill, 1970. **Gaventa, B. R.** “The Eschatology of Luke-Acts Revisited.” *Encounter* 43 (1982) 27–42. **Geiger, R.** “Gesprächspartner Jesu im Lukasevangelium.” In *Biblische Randbemerkungen*, FS R. Schnackenburg, ed. H. Merklein and J. Lange. Würzburg: Echter, 1974. 150–56. **George, A.** “Miracles dans le monde hellénistique.” In *Les miracles de Jésus*, ed. X. Léon-Dufour, 95–108. ———. “Le miracle dans l’oeuvre de Luc.” In *Les miracles de Jésus*, ed. X. Léon-Dufour, 249–68. ———. *Études sur l’oeuvre de Luc*. SB. Paris: Gabalda, 1978. ———. “La royauté de Jésus selon l’évangile de Luc.” *ScEcl* 14 (1962) 57–69. ———. “Jésus Fils de Dieu dans l’évangile selon Saint Luc.” *RB* 72 (1965) 185–209. ———. “Tradition et rédaction chez Luc: La construction du troisième évangile.” *ETL* 43 (1967) 100–129. ———. “Israël dans l’oeuvre de Luc.” *RB* 75 (1968) 481–525. ———. “L’emploi chez Luc du vocabulaire de salut.” *NTS* 23 (1977) 308–20. ———. “L’Esprit-Saint dans l’oeuvre de Luc.” *RB* 85 (1978) 500–542. **Gerhardsson, B.** “The Narrative Meshalim in the Synoptic Gospels.” *NTS* 34 (1988) 339–63. **Gewalt, D.** “Das ‘Petrusbild’ der lukanischen Schriften als Problem einer ganzheitlichen Exegese.” *LingBib* 34 (1975) 1–22. **Gibbs, J. M.** “Mark 1.1–15, Matthew 1.1–4.16, Luke 1.1–4.30, John 1.1–51. The Gospel Prologues and Their Function.” [= TU 112] (1973) 154–88. **Giblin, C. H.** *The Destruction of Jerusalem according to Luke’s Gospel: A Historical-Typological Moral*. AnBib 107. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1985. ———. “Discerning Gospel Genre.” *Thought* 47 (1972) 225–52. **Giet, S.** “Un procédé littéraire d’exposition: l’anticipation chronologique.” *REA* 2 (1956) 243–53. **Giles, K.** “Salvation in Lukan Theology (1).” *RTR* 42 (1983) 10–16. **Gils, F.** *Jésus prophète d’après les évangiles synoptiques*. Orientalia et Biblica Lovaniensia 2. Louvain: Université de Louvain, 1957. **Glen, J. S.** *The Parables of Conflict in Luke*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962. **Glöckner, R.** *Die Verkündigung des Heils beim Evangelisten Lukas*. Walberger Studien der Albertus-Magnus-Akademie. Theologische Reihe 9. Mainz: Grünewald, n.d. (1976). **Glover, W. W.** “The Kingdom of God’ in Luke.” *BT* 29 (1978) 231–37. **Gnilka, J.** *Die Verstockung Israels: Isaias 6, 9–10 in der Theologie der Synoptiker*. SANT 3. Munich: Kösel, 1961. **Gombitza, O.** “Die Titel διδάσκαλος und ἐπιστάτης für Jesus bei Lukas.” *ZNW* 49 (1958) 275–78. **Goudoever, J. van.** “The Place of Israel in Luke’s Gospel.” *NovT* 8 (1966) 111–23. **Goulder, M. D.** *Midrash and Lection in Matthew*. London: SPCK, 1974. 452–71. ———. *The Evangelists’ Calendar*. London: SCM, 1978. ———. “Characteristics of the Parables in the Several Gospels.” *JTS*, n.s., 19 (1968) 51–69. ———. “On Putting Q to the Test.” *NTS* 24 (1978) 218–34. ———. “Did Luke Know Any of the Pauline Letters?” *PRS* 13 (1986) 97–112. **Grässer, E.** *Das Problem der Parusieverzögerung in den synoptischen Evangelien*. BZNW 22. 2nd ed. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1960. **Grelot, P.** “Miracles de Jésus et la démonologie juive.” In *Les miracles de Jésus*, ed. X. Léon-Dufour, 59–72. **Grundmann, W.** *Das Evangelium nach Markus*. THKNT 2. 2nd ed. East Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1959. ———. “Weisheit im Horizont des Reiches Gottes: Eine Studie zur Verkündigung Jesu nach der Spruch-

- überlieferung Q." In *Die Kirche des Anfangs*, FS H. Schürmann, ed. R. Schnackenburg, J. Ernst, and J. Wanke. Freiburg/Basel/Vienna: Herder, 1978. 175–200. **Gundry, R. H.** *Matthew: A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982. **Güttgemanns, E.** "Narrative Analyse synoptischer Texte." In *Die neutestamentliche Gleichnisforschung*, ed. W. Harnisch, 179–223. **Hadidan, D. Y.**, ed. *Signs and Parables*. PTMS 23. Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1978. **Haenchen, E.** *Der Weg Jesu: Eine Erklärung des Markus-Evangeliums und der kanonischen Parallelen*. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1966. ———. *Die Bibel und wir: Gesammelte Aufsätze*. 2 vols. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1968. ———. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*. Tr. B. Noble and G. Shinn. Oxford: Blackwell, 1971. ———. "Historie und Verkündigung bei Markus und Lukas." In *Das Lukas-Evangelium*, ed. G. Braumann, 287–316. ———. "Petrus-Probleme." *NTS* 7 (1960–61) 187–97. **Hahn, F.** *The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity*. Tr. H. Knight and G. Ogg. London: Lutterworth, 1969. **Hamm, D.** "Sight to the Blind: Vision as Metaphor in Luke." *Bib* 67 (1986) 457–77. **Hammer, R. A.** "Elijah and Jesus: A Quest for Identity." *Judaism* 19 (1970) 207–18. **Hanford, W. R.** "Deutero-Isaiah and Luke-Acts: Straightforward Universalism?" *CQR* 168 (1967) 141–52. **Harnack, A. von.** *Luke the Physician: The Author of the Third Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles*. New Testament Studies 1. Tr. J. R. Wilkinson. New York: Putnam, 1907. ———. *The Acts of the Apostles*. New Testament Studies 3. Tr. J. R. Wilkinson. London/New York: Williams & Norgate/G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1909. ———. "Ich bin gekommen': Die ausdrücklichen Selbstzeugnisse Jesu über den Zweck seiner Sendung und seines Kommens." *ZTK* 22 (1912) 1–30. **Harnisch, W.** *Die Gleichniserzählungen Jesu: Eine hermeneutische Einführung*. Unitaschenbücher 1343. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1985. ———. "Die Ironie als Stilmittel in Gleichnisse Jesu." *EvT* 32 (1972) 421–36. ———. "Die Sprachkraft der Analogie. Zur These vom 'argumentativen Character' der Gleichnisse Jesu." *ST* 28 (1974) 1–20. ———. "Die Metaphor als heuristisches Prinzip: Neuer-scheinungen zur Hermeneutik der Gleichnisreden Jesu." *VF* 24 (1979) 53–89. ———, ed. *Die neutestamentliche Gleichnisforschung im Horizont von Hermeneutik und Literaturwissenschaft*. WF 575. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1982. ———, ed. *Gleichnisse Jesu: Positionen der Auslegung von Adolf Jülicher bis zur Formgeschichte*. WF 366. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1982. **Hartman, L.** *Testimonium Linguae. Participial Constructions in the Synoptic Gospels. A Linguistic Examination of Luke 21,13*. ConNT 19. Lund: Gleerup, 1963. **Hasler, V. Amen.** Zürich/Stuttgart: Gotthelf-Verlag, 1969. **Hastings, A.** *Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem*. Baltimore: Helicon, 1958. **Hauerwas, S.** "The Politics of Charity." *Int* 31 (1977) 251–62. **Hawkins, J. C.** *Horae Synopticae: Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1909. **Heinemann, J.** "The Triennial Lectionary Cycle." *JJS* 19 (1968) 41–48. **Hengel, M.** *The Charismatic Leader and His Followers*. Tr. J. C. G. Greig. New York: Crossroads, 1981. **Hennecke, E.** *New Testament Apocrypha*. Ed. W. Schneemelcher. Tr. R. McL. Wilson. 2 vols. London: Lutterworth, 1963–65. **Heutger, N.** "Münzen im Lukasevangelium." *BZ* 27 (1983) 97–101. **Hiers, R. H.** *The Kingdom of God in the Synoptic Tradition*. UFHM 33. Gainesville: University of Florida, 1970. ———. "The Problem of the Delay of the Parousia in Luke-Acts." *NTS* 20 (1974) 145–55. **Higgins, A. J. B.** *Jesus and the Son of Man*. London/Philadelphia: Lutterworth/Fortress, 1964. **Hirsch, E.** *Die Auferstehungsgeschichten und der christliche Glaube*. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1940. **Hobart, W. K.** *The Medical Language of St. Luke: A Proof from Internal Evidence that "The Gospel according to St. Luke" and "The Acts of the Apostles" Were Written by the Same Person, and that the Writer Was a Medical Man*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1954 = 1882. **Hoehner, H. W.** *Herod Antipas*. SNTSMS 17. Cambridge: University Press, 1972. **Hoffmann, J. C.** "Story as Mythoparabolic Medium: Reflections on Crossan's Interpretation of the Parables of Jesus." *USQR* 37 (1983) 323–33. **Hoffmann, P.** *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle*. Münster: Aschen-dorff, 1972. **Hoffmann, P.**, et al., ed. *Orientierung an Jesus: Zur Theologie der Synoptiker*. FS J. Schmid. Freiburg/Basel/Vienna: Herder, 1973. **Hollenbach, P. H.** "From Parable

- to Gospel: A Response Using the Social Sciences." *Forum* 2 (1986) 67–75. **Holtz, T.** *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas*. TU 104. Berlin: Akademie, 1968. **Holtzmann, H. J.** *Die Synoptiker*. HKNT. 3rd ed. Tübingen: Mohr, 1901. **Hooker, M. D.** *The Son of Man in Mark: A Study of the Background of the Term "Son of Man" and Its Use in St. Mark's Gospel*. Montreal: McGill University, 1967. **Houlden, J. L.** "The Purpose of Luke." *JSNT* 21 (1984) 53–65. **Hubbard, B. J.** "Commissioning Stories in Luke-Acts: A Study of Their Antecedents, Form, and Content." *Semeia* 8 (1977) 103–26. **Huffman, N. A.** "Atypical Features in the Parables of Jesus." *JBL* 97 (1978) 207–20. **Hull, J. M.** *Hellenistic Magic and the Synoptic Tradition*. SBT 2/28. London: SCM, 1974. **Hultgren, A. J.** "Interpreting the Gospel of Luke." *Int* 30 (1976) 353–65. **Hunkin, J. W.** "'Pleonastic' ἀρχαί in the New Testament." *JTS*, o.s., 25 (1924) 390–402. **Hunter, A. M.** *The Parables for Today*. London: SCM, 1983. ———. "Interpreting the Parables." *Int* 14 (1960) 70–84; 167–85; 315–54. **Jeremias, J.** *Jesus' Promise to the Nations*. SBT 24. Tr. S. H. Hooke. London: SCM, 1958. ———. *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969. ———. *New Testament Theology*. Vol. 1. London: SCM, 1971. ———. *The Parables of Jesus*. Tr. S. H. Hooke et al. 3rd ed. London: SCM, 1972. ———. *Die Sprache des Lukasevangeliums: Redaktion und Tradition im Nicht-Markusstoff des dritten Evangeliums*. KEK, Sonderband. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1980. ———. "Pericopen-Umstellungen bei Lukas?" *NTS* 4 (1958) 115–19. **Jervell, J.** *Imago Dei*. FRLANT 58. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960. ———. *Luke and the People of God*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972. ———. *The Unknown Paul: Essays on Luke-Acts and Early Christian History*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984. **Johnson, L. T.** *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*. SBLDS 39. Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1977. **Johnston, R. M.** "The Study of Rabbinic Parables: Some Preliminary Observations." *Society of Biblical Literature. 1976 Seminar Papers*. Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1976. 337–57. **Jones, C. P. M.** "The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Lukan Writings." In *Studies in the Gospels*, FS R. H. Lightfoot, ed. D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Blackwell, 1955. 113–43. **Jones, G. V.** *The Art and Truth of the Parables*. London: SPCK, 1964. **Jonge, M. de**, ed. *The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*. Leiden: Brill, 1978. **Jonge, M. de**, and **Woude, A. S. van der**. "11 Q Melchizedek and the New Testament." *NTS* 12 (1965–66) 301–26. **Jörns, K. P.** "Die Gleichnisverkündigung Jesu: Reden von Gott als Wort Gottes." In *Der Ruf Jesu und die Antwort der Gemeinde*, FS J. Jeremias, ed. E. Lohse. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970. 157–77. **Judge, E. A.** "The Social Identity of the First Christians." *JRomH* 11 (1980) 201–17. **Juel, D.** *Luke-Acts: The Promise of History*. Atlanta: John Knox, 1983. **Jülicher, A.** *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*. 2 vols. 2nd ed. Tübingen: Mohr, 1910. **Jüngel, E.** *Paulus und Jesus: Eine Untersuchung zur Präzisierung der Frage nach dem Ursprung der Christologie*. HUT 2. 4th ed. Tübingen: Mohr, 1972. 71–215. **Kahlefeld, H.** *Gleichnisse als Lehrstücke im Evangelium*. 2 vols. 2nd ed. Frankfurt: Knecht, 1964–65. **Kampling, R.** "Jesus von Nazaret—Lehrer und Exorzist." *BZ* 30 (1986) 237–48. **Karris, R. J.** "The Lukan Sitz im Leben: Methodology and Prospects." *Society of Biblical Literature. 1976 Seminar Papers*. Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1976. 219–33. ———. *Luke: Artist and Theologian*. New York: Paulist, 1985. ———. "Missionary Communities: A New Paradigm for the Study of Luke-Acts." *CBQ* 41 (1979) 80–97. **Käsemann, E.** *Essays on New Testament Themes*. SBT 41. London: SCM, 1964. **Keck, L. E.**, and **Martyn, J. L.**, eds. *Studies in Luke-Acts*. FS P. Schubert. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980 = 1966. **Kellner, W.** *Der Traum vom Menschensohn: Die politisch-theologische Botschaft Jesu*. Munich: Kösel, 1985. **Kelly, J. F.** "The Patristic Biography of Luke." *BiTod* 74 (1974) 113–19. **Kelly, J. G.** "Lucan Christology and the Jewish-Christian Dialogue." *JES* 21 (1984) 688–708. **Kertelge, K.** *Die Wunder Jesu im Markusevangelium: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. SANT 33. Munich: Kösel, 1970. ———. "Die Wunder Jesu in der neueren Exegese." *TBl* 5 (1976) 71–105. **King, N. Q.** "The 'Universalism' of the Third Gospel." *SE* 1 [= TU 73] (1959) 199–205. **Kingsbury, J. D.** "Ernst Fuchs' Existentialist Interpretation of the Parables." *LQ* 22 (1970) 380–95. ———. "Major

- Trends in Parable Interpretation." *CTM* 42 (1971) 579–96. ———. "The Parables of Jesus in Current Research." *Dialog* 11 (1972) 101–7. **Kirchschläger, W.** *Jesu exorzistisches Wirken aus der Sicht des Lukas: Ein Beitrag zur lukianischen Redaktion*. OBS 3. Klosterneuburg: Österreichisches Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1981. **Kissinger, W. S.** *The Parables of Jesus: A History of Interpretation and Bibliography*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow and ATLA, 1979. **Kistemaker, S. J.** *The Parables of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980. **Klauck, H.-J.** *Allegorie und Allegorese in synoptischen Gleichnistexten*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1978. ———. "Neue Beiträge zur Gleichnisforschung." *BibLeb* 13 (1972) 214–30. ———. "Die Armut der Jünger in der Sicht des Lukas." *Claretianum* 26 (1986) 5–47. ———. "Die heilige Stadt: Jerusalem bei Philo und Lukas." *Kairos* 28 (1986) 129–51. **Klein, H.** "Zur Frage nach dem Abfassungsort der Lukasschriften." *EvT* 32 (1972) 467–77. **Klinghardt, M.** *Gesetz und Volk Gottes: Das lukianische Verständnis des Gesetzes nach Herkunft, Funktion und seinem Ort in der Geschichte des Urchristentums*. WUNT 2/32. Tübingen: Mohr, 1988. **Klostermann, E.** *Das Markusevangelium*. HNT 3. Tübingen: Mohr, 1926. **Knox, W. L.** *The Sources of the Synoptic Gospels*. Vol. 2, *St. Luke and St. Matthew*. Ed. H. Chadwick. Cambridge: University Press, 1957. **Koch, R.** "Die Wertung des Besitzes im Lukasevangelium." *Bib* 38 (1957) 151–69. **Kodell, J.** "The Theology of Luke in Recent Study." *BTB* 1 (1971) 115–44. **Koenig, J.** "Occasions of Grace in Paul, Luke, and First Century Judaism." *ATR* 64 (1982) 562–76. **Kopas, J.** "Jesus and Women: Luke's Gospel." *TToday* 43 (1986) 192–202. **Kraybill, D. B.** "Possessions in Luke-Acts: A Sociological Perspective." *PRS* 10 (1983) 215–39. **Kremer, J.**, ed. *Les Actes des Apôtres: Traditions, rédaction, théologie*. BETL 48. Gembloux: Duculot, 1979. **Kühshelm, R.** *Jüngerverfolgung und Geschick Jesu: Eine exegetisch-bibeltheologische Untersuchung der synoptischen Verfolgungsankündigungen Mk 13, 9–13 par und Mt 23, 29–36 par*. OBS 5. Klosterneuburg: Österreichisches Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1983. **Kümmel, W. G.** "Noch einmal: Das Gleichnis von der selbstwachsenden Saat. Bemerkungen zur neuesten Diskussion um die Auslegung der Gleichnisse Jesu." In *Orientierung an Jesus*, FS J. Schmid, ed. P. Hoffmann et al., 220–37. ———. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Tr. H. C. Kee. 2nd ed. London: SCM, 1975. ———. "Futurische und präsentische Eschatologie im ältesten Christentum." *NTS* 5 (1958–59) 113–26. ———. "Current Theological Accusations against Luke." *ANQ* 16 (1975) 131–45. **Kurz, W. S.** "Narrative Approaches to Luke-Acts." *Bib* 68 (1987) 195–220. **Ladd, G. E.** "The Life-Setting of the Parables of the Kingdom." *JBR* 31 (1963) 193–99. **Lambrecht, J.** "Les paraboles dans les synoptiques." *NRT* 102 (1980) 672–91. **Lampe, G. W. H.** "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke." In *Studies in the Gospels*, FS R. H. Lightfoot, ed. D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Blackwell, 1955. 159–200. ———. "The Lukan Portrait of Christ." *NTS* 2 (1956) 160–75. **Lane, W. L.** *The Gospel according to Mark*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974. **Lategan, B. C.** "Tradition and Interpretation—Two Methodological Remarks." *Neot* 7 (1973) 95–103. **Laufen, R.** *Die Doppelüberlieferung der Logienquelle und des Markusevangeliums*. BBB 54. Königstein/Bonn: Hanstein, 1980. **LaVerdiere, E.** "The Gospel of Luke." *BiTod* 18 (1980) 226–35. **LaVerdiere, E. A.**, and **Thompson, W. G.** "New Testament Communities in Transition: A Study of Matthew and Luke." *TS* 37 (1976) 567–97. **Légasse, S.** *Jésus et l'enfant: "Enfant," "petits" et "simple" dans la tradition synoptique*. Paris: Gabalda, 1969. **Legrand, L.** "The Parables of Jesus Viewed from the Dekkan Plateau." *ITS* 23 (1986) 154–70. **Léon-Dufour, X.** *Études d'évangile. Parole de Dieu*. Paris: Seuil, 1965. ———. ed. *Les miracles de Jésus selon le Nouveau Testament*. Paris: Seuil, 1977. **Levy, J.** *Neuhebräisches und chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim*. 4 vols. Leipzig: Brockhaus, 1876–89. **Lightfoot, R. H.** *Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1938. **Lindars, B.** "Elijah, Elisha, and the Gospel Miracles." In *Miracles: Cambridge Studies in Their Philosophy and History*, ed. C. F. D. Moule. London: Mowbray, 1965. 63–79. ———. *Jesus Son of Man: A Fresh Examination of the Son of Man Sayings in the Gospels in the Light of Recent Research*. London: SPCK, 1983. **Lindeboom, G. A.** "Luke the Evangelist and the Ancient Greek Writers on Medicine." *Janus: Revue internati-*

- onale de l'histoire des sciences, de la médecine, de la pharmacie et de la technique 52 (1965) 143–48. **Lindemann, A.** "Erwägungen zum Problem einer 'Theologie der synoptischen Evangelien.'" ZNW 77 (1986) 1–33. **Lindeskog, G.** "Johannes der Täufer: Einige Randbemerkungen zum heutigen Stand der Forschung." ASTI 12 (1983) 55–83. **Lindsey, R. L.** "A Modified Two-Document Theory of the Synoptic Dependence and Interdependence." NovT 6 (1963) 239–63. **Linnemann, E.** *Parables of Jesus*. Tr. J. Sturdy. New York: Harper & Row, 1966. **Linton, O.** "Coordinated Sayings and Parables in the Synoptic Gospels: Analysis versus Theories." NTS 26 (1980) 139–63. **Little, J. C.** "Parable Research in the Twentieth Century." ExpTim 87 (1975–76) 356–60; 88 (1976–77) 40–44, 71–75. **Lohfink, G.** *Die Sammlung Israels: Eine Untersuchung zur lukanischen Ekklesiologie*. SANT 34. Munich: Kösel, 1975. **Lohmeyer, E.** *Das Evangelium des Markus*. KEK. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1953. **Lohse, E.** "Missionarisches Handeln Jesu nach dem Evangelium des Lukas." TZ 10 (1954) 1–13. ———. "Lukas als Theologe der Heilsgeschichte." EvT 14 (1954) 256–75. **Loisy, A.** *Les évangiles synoptiques*. Vol. 1. Cliffonds: Chez l'auteur, 1907. **Loos, H. van der.** *The Miracles of Jesus*. NovTSup 9. Leiden: Brill, 1965. **Lövestam, E.** *Son and Saviour. A Study of Acts 13,32–37. With an Appendix: 'Son of God' in the Synoptic Gospels*. ConNT 18. Tr. M. J. Petry. Lund: Gleerup, 1961. **Luck, U.** "Kerygma, Tradition, und Geschichte Jesu bei Lukas." ZTK 57 (1960) 51–66. **Luz, U., and Weder, H., eds.** *Die Mitte des Neuen Testaments: Einheit und Vielfalt neutestamentlicher Theologie*. FS E. Schweizer. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983. **Magass, W.** "Die magistralen Schluss-signale der Gleichnisse Jesu." LingBib 36 (1976) 1–20. **Mánek, J.** "Das Aposteldekret im Kontext der Lukastheologie." CV 15 (1972) 151–60. **Mangatt, G.** "The Gospel of Salvation." Biblehashyam 2 (1976) 60–80. **Manson, T. W.** *The Sayings of Jesus*. London: SCM, 1949. ———. *The Teaching of Jesus: Studies in Its Form and Content*. Cambridge: University Press, 1959 = 1935. **Manson, W.** *Jesus the Messiah: The Synoptic Tradition of the Revelation of God in Christ, with Special Reference to Form-Criticism*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1943. **Marin, L.** "Pour une théorie du texte parabolique." In *Le récit évangélique*, ed. C. Chabrol and C. Marin. BSR. Paris: Aubrier Montagne/Delachaux et Niestlé/Cerf/Brouwer, 1974. 165–92. **Marshall, I. H.** *Eschatology and the Parables*. London: Tyndale, 1963. ———. *Luke: Historian and Theologian*. Exeter: Paternoster, 1970. ———. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1980. ———. ed. *New Testament Interpretation: Essays on Principles and Methods*. Exeter: Paternoster, 1977. **Martin, R. A.** *Syntactical Evidence of Semitic Sources in Greek Documents*. SBLSCS 3. Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1974. ———. *Syntax Criticism of the Synoptic Gospels*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity 10. Lewiston, NY/Queenston, Ont.: Mellen, 1987. **Martin, R. P.** "Salvation and Discipleship in Luke's Gospel." Int 30 (1976) 366–80. **Marx, W. G.** "Luke, the Physician, Re-examined." ExpTim 91 (1980) 168–72. **Marxsen, W.** *Der "Frühkatholizismus" im Neuen Testament*. BibS(N) 21. Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1958. **März, C.-P.** *Das Wort Gottes bei Lukas: Die lukanische Worththeologie als Frage an die neuere Lukaforschung*. ETS 11. Leipzig: St. Benno, 1974. **Masson, C.** *Vers les sources d'eau vive: Études d'exégèse et de théologie du Nouveau Testament*. Publication de la Faculté de théologie, Université de Lausanne 2. Lausanne: Librairie Payot, 1961. **Matthey, J.** "Puissance et pauvreté: Notes sur la mission de l'Eglise à partir de la théologie de Luc." BulCPE 30 (1978) 47–54. **Mattill, A. J., Jr.** "The Purpose of Acts: Schneckenburger Reconsidered." In *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays*, FS F. F. Bruce, ed. W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin. Exeter/Grand Rapids: Paternoster/Eerdmans, 1970. 108–22. ———. *Luke and the Last Things: A Perspective for the Understanding of Lukan Thought*. Dillsboro, NC: Western North Carolina, 1979. ———. "Naherwartung, Fernerwartung, and the Purpose of Luke-Acts: Weymouth Reconsidered." CBQ 34 (1972) 276–93. ———. "The Jesus-Paul Parallels and the Purpose of Luke-Acts: H. H. Evans Reconsidered." NovT 17 (1975) 15–46. **McLoughlin, S.** "Les accords mineurs Mt-Lc contre Mc et le problème synoptique: Vers la théorie des deux sources." ETL 43 (1967) 17–40. **McPolin, J.** "Holy Spirit in Luke and John." ITQ 45 (1978)

- 117–31. **Mellon, C.** "La parabole, manière de parler, manière d'entendre." In *Le récit évangélique*, ed. C. Chabrol and L. Marin. Paris: Aubrier-Montaigne/Delachaux et Niestlé/Cerf/Brouwer, 1974. 147–61. **Menoud, P.-H.** *Jésus-Christ et la foi: Recherches néotestamentaires*. Bibliothèque théologique. Neuchâtel/Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1975. ———. "Jésus et ses témoins: Remarques sur l'unité de l'oeuvre de Luc." *EglT* 23 (1960) 7–20. **Merk, O.** "Das Reich Gottes in den lukanischen Schriften." In *Jesus und Paulus*, FS W. G. Kümmel, ed. E. E. Ellis and E. Grässer. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975. 201–20. **Meyer, A.** *Jesu Muttersprache: Das galiläische Aramäisch in seiner Bedeutung für die Erklärung der Reden Jesu und der Evangelien überhaupt*. Freiburg i. B./Leipzig: Mohr (Siebeck), 1896. **Meyer, B. F.** *The Aims of Jesus*. London: SCM, 1979. **Meyer, E.** *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*. 3 vols. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1962 = 1921–23. **Meynet, R.** *Quelle est donc cette parole? Lecture "rhétorique" de l'évangile de Luc (1–9, 22–24)*. LD 99. 2 vols. Paris: Cerf, 1979. ———. "Crie de joie, stérile!" *Christus* 33 (1986) 481–89. **Michaelis, W.** *Die Gleichnisse Jesu: Eine Einführung*. 2nd ed. Hamburg: Furcht, 1956. ———. "Das unbetonte καὶ αὐτός bei Lukas." *ST* 4 (1950) 86–93. **Michalczyk, J. J.** "The Experience of Prayer in Luke/Acts." *RevRel* 34 (1975) 789–801. **Michiels, R.** "La conception lukanienne de la conversion." *ETL* 41 (1965) 42–78. **Miner, P. S.** *To Heal and to Reveal: The Prophetic Vocation according to Luke*. Crossroad Books. New York: Seabury, 1976. ———. "Dear Theo." *Int* 27 (1973) 131–50. ———. "Jesus' Audiences, according to Luke." *NovT* 16 (1974) 81–109. **Moessner, D. P.** "The Christ Must Suffer: New Light on the Jesus—Peter, Stephen, Paul Parallels in Luke-Acts." *NovT* 28 (1986) 220–56. **Moffatt, J.** *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*. International Theological Library. 3rd ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1918. **Monloubou, L.** *La prière selon Saint Luc: Recherche d'une structure*. LD 89. Paris: Cerf, 1976. **Morgenthaler, R.** *Die lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis: Gestalt und Gehalt der Kunst des Lukas*. ATANT 14–15. 2 vols. Zürich: Zwingli, 1949. ———. *Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes*. Zürich/Frankfurt am Main: Gotthelf, 1958. **Morris, L.** *The New Testament and the Jewish Lectionaries*. London: Tyndale, 1964. ———. *The Cross in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965. ———. "Luke and Early Catholicism." *JTSA* 40 (1982) 4–16. **Morton, A. Q., and MacGregor, H. C.** *The Structure of Luke and Acts*. New York/Evanston, IL: Harper & Row, 1965. **Moscato, M.** "Current Theories regarding the Audience of Luke-Acts." *CurTM* 3 (1976) 355–61. **Moule, C. F. D.** "The Intention of the Evangelists." In *New Testament Essays*, FS T. W. Manson, ed. A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: Manchester University, 1959. 165–79. ———. *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: University Press, 1963. **Moulton, J. H., and Milligan, G.** *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-literary Sources*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1930. **Moxnes, H.** "Meals and the New Community in Luke." *SEÅ* 51–52 (1986–87) 158–67. **Muhlack, G.** *Die Parallelen von Lukas-Evangelium und Apostelgeschichte*. Theologie und Wirklichkeit 8. Bern/Frankfurt/Las Vegas: Lang, 1979. **Mulder, H.** "Theophilus de 'godvrezende.'" In *Arcana revelata*, FS F. W. Grosheide, ed. N. J. Hommes et al. Kampen: Kok, 1951. 77–88. **Müller, P.-G.** "Conzelmann und die Folgen: Zwanzig Jahre redaktionsgeschichtliche Forschung am Lukas-Evangelium." *BK* 28 (1974) 138–42. **Navone, J.** *Themes of St. Luke*. Rome: Gregorian University, 1971. ———. "Three Aspects of Lucan Theology of History." *BTB* 3 (1973) 115–32. **Neirynck, F.** "La matière marcienne dans l'évangile de Luc." In *Problèmes*, FS L. Cerfaux, ed. F. Neirynck, 157–201. ———. "Recent Developments in the Study of Q." In *Logia*, FS J. Coppens, ed. J. Delobel, 29–75. ———. *Evangelica. Gospel Studies. Collected Essays*. Ed. F. van Segbroeck. BETL 60. Leuven: University Press, 1982. ———. "The Argument from Order and St. Luke's Transpositions." *ETL* 49 (1973) 784–815. ———, ed. *L'évangile de Luc: Problèmes littéraires et théologiques*. FS L. Cerfaux. BETL 32. Gembloux: Duculot, 1973. ———, ed. *The Minor Agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark: With a Cumulative List*. In collaboration with T. Hanson and F. van Segbroeck. BETL 37. Leuven: University Press, 1974.

- Nestle, E.** *Philologica Sacra: Bemerkungen über die Urgestalt der Evangelien und Apostelgeschichte*. Berlin: von Reuther und Reichard, 1896. **Nevius, R. C.** "Kyrios and Iēsous in St. Luke." *ATR* 48 (1966) 75–77. **Nickelsburg, G. W. E.** "Riches, the Rich, and God's Judgment in I Enoch 92–105 and the Gospel according to Luke." *NTS* 25 (1978–79) 324–44. **Nodet, E.** "Jésus et Jean-Baptiste selon Josèphe." *RB* 92 (1985) 497–524. **Nolland, J. L.** "Luke's Readers: A Study of Luke 4.22–8; Acts 13.46; 18.6; 28.28 and Luke 21.5–36." Ph.D. diss., Cambridge, 1977. ———. "Luke's Use of *χάρις*." *NTS* 32 (1986) 614–20. **Norden, E.** *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formgeschichte religiöser Rede*. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1956 = 1923. **Nuttall, G. F.** *The Moment of Recognition: Luke as Story-Teller*. London: Athlone, 1978. **O'Brien, P. T.** "Prayer in Luke-Acts." *TynB* 24 (1973) 111–27. **Oesterley, W. O. E.** *The Gospel Parables in the Light of Their Jewish Background*. New York: Macmillan, 1936. **O'Neill, J. C.** *The Theology of Acts in Its Historical Setting*. 2nd ed. London: SPCK, 1970. ———. "The Six Amen Sayings in Luke." *JTS*, n.s., 10 (1959) 1–9. **O'Rourke, J. J.** "The Construction with a Verb of Saying as an Indication of Sources in Luke." *NTS* 21 (1975) 421–23. **Osborne, G. R.** "Luke: Theologian of Social Concern." *TJ* 7 (1978) 135–48. **O'Toole, R. F.** *The Unity of Luke's Theology: An Analysis of Luke-Acts*. Wilmington, DE: Glazier, 1984. ———. "Why Did Luke Write Acts (Lk-Acts)?" *BTB* 7 (1977) 66–76. ———. "Parallels between Jesus and His Disciples in Luke-Acts: A Further Study." *BZ* 27 (1983) 195–212. **Ott, W.** *Gebet und Heil: Die Bedeutung der Gebetsparänese in der lukanischen Theologie*. ANT 12. Munich: Kösel, 1965. **Patte, D., ed.** *Semiology and Parables: Exploration of the Possibilities Offered by Structuralism for Exegesis*. PTMS 9. Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1976. **Payne, P. B.** "Metaphor as a Model for Interpretation of the Parables of Jesus with Special Reference to the Parable of the Sower." Ph.D. diss., Cambridge, 1975. **Percy, E.** *Die Botschaft Jesu: Eine traditionskritische und exegetische Untersuchung*. LUÅ 1, 49, 5. Lund: Gleerup, 1953. **Perkins, P.** *Hearing the Parables of Jesus*. New York: Paulist, 1981. **Pernot, H.** *Études sur la langue des évangiles*. Collection de l'Institut Néo-hellénique de l'Université de Paris 6. Paris: Society d'Édition "Les belles lettres," 1927. **Perrin, N.** *Jesus and the Language of the Kingdom*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976. ———. "The Modern Interpretation of the Parables of Jesus and the Problem of Hermeneutics." *Int* 25 (1971) 131–48. ———. "Historical Criticism, Literary Criticism, and Hermeneutics: The Interpretation of the Parables of Jesus and the Gospel of Mark Today." *JR* 52 (1972) 361–75. **Pesch, R.** *Die Apostelgeschichte*. 2 vols. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1986. **Petersen, N.** "On the Notion of Genre in Via's 'Parable and Example Story: A Literary-Structuralist Approach.'" *Semeia* 1 (1974) 134–81. **Pilgrim, W. E.** *Good News to the Poor: Wealth and Poverty in Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1981. **Plooy, G. P. V. du.** "The Use of the Optative in Luke-Acts: Grammatical Classification and Implications for Translation." *Scriptura* 19 (1986) 25–43. **Plümacher, E.** *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller: Studien zur Apostelgeschichte*. SUNT 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972. **Potterie, I. de la.** "Le titre *κύριος* appliqué à Jésus dans l'évangile de Luc." In *Mélanges bibliques*, FS B. Rigaux, ed. A. Descamps and A. de Halleux. Gembloux: Duculot, 1970. 117–46. ———. "Les deux noms de Jérusalem dans l'évangile de Luc." *RSR* 69 (1981) 57–70. **Praeder, M.** "Jesus-Paul, Peter-Paul, and Jesus-Peter Parallelisms in Luke-Acts: A History of Reader Response." *SBLASP* 23 (1984) 23–39. **Prior, M.** "Revisiting Luke." *ScrB* 10 (1979) 2–11. **Radl, W.** *Paulus und Jesus im lukanischen Doppelwerk*. Bern/Frankfurt: Lang, 1975. **Ramsay, W. M.** *The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament*. 2nd ed. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1915. ———. "Luke the Physician" and Other Studies in the History of Religion. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1956 = 1908. **Ravens, D. A. S.** "St. Luke and Atonement." *ExpTim* 97 (1986) 291–94. **Reese, T.** "The Political Theology of Luke-Acts." *BTB* 22 (1972) 62–65. **Rehkopf, F.** *Die lukanische Sonderquelle: Ihr Umfang und Sprachgebrauch*. WUNT 5. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1959. **Reicke, B.** *The Gospel of Luke*. Richmond: John Knox, 1964. **Reiling, J.** "The Use and Translation of *kai egeneto*, 'And It Happened,' in the New Testament." *BT* 16 (1965) 153–63. **Reitzel,**

- F. X.** "St. Luke's Use of the Temple Imagery." *RevRel* 38 (1979) 520-39. **Rese, M.** *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas*. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1969. —. "Das Lukas-Evangelium: Eine Forschungsbericht." *ANRW* II/25.3 (1985) 2259-328. —. "Neurere Lukas-Arbeiten: Bemerkungen zur gegenwärtigen Forschungslage." *TLZ* 106 (1981) 225-37. **Richard, E.** "The Divine Purpose: The Jews and the Gentile Mission." *SBLASP* 17 (1978) 267-82. —. "Luke—Writer, Theologian, Historian: Research and Orientation of the 1970's." *BTB* 13 (1983) 3-15. **Richards, K. H.,** ed. *Society of Biblical Literature. 1982 Seminar Papers*. Chico, CA: Scholars, 1982. **Ricoeur, P.** "Biblical Hermeneutics." *Semeia* 4 (1975) 29-148. **Riddle, D. W.** "The Occasion of Luke-Acts." *JR* 10 (1930) 545-62. **Riesenfeld, H.** *The Gospel Tradition and Its Beginnings*. London: Mowbray, 1957. **Riesner, R.** *Jesus als Lehrer: Eine Untersuchung zum Ursprung der Evangelien-Überlieferung*. WUNT 2/7, 2nd ed. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1984. **Rigaux, B.** *Témoignage de l'évangile de Luc. Pour une histoire de Jésus* 4. Bruges/Paris: Brouwer, 1970. **Ringgren, H.** "Luke's Use of the Old Testament." *HTR* 79 (1986) 227-35. **Robertson, A. T.** *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. 3rd ed. New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1919. **Robinson, D. W. B.** "The Use of Parabolē in the Synoptic Gospels." *EvQ* 21 (1944) 93-108. **Robinson, J. A. T.** *Twelve New Testament Studies*. SBT 34. London: SCM, 1962. —. *Redating the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976. —. "Elijah, John, and Jesus: An Essay in Detection." *NTS* 4 (1957-58) 263-81. **Robinson, J. M.** *The Problem of History in Mark*. SBT 1/21. London: SCM, 1957. —. "Jesus' Parables as God Happening." In *Jesus and the Historian*, FS E. C. Colwell, ed. F. T. Trotter. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968. 134-50. **Robinson, W. C., Jr.** *Der Weg des Herrn: Studien zur Geschichte und Eschatologie im Lukas-Evangelium*. TF 36. Hamburg/Bergstedt: Herbert Reich, 1964. **Rohde, J.** *Rediscovering the Teaching of the Evangelists*. NTL. Tr. D. M. Barton. London: SCM, 1968. **Rolland, P.** "L'arrière-fond sémiotique des évangiles synoptiques." *ETL* 60 (1984) 358-62. —. "L'organisation du Livre des Actes et de l'ensemble de l'oeuvre de Luc." *Bib* 65 (1984) 81-86. **Roloff, J.** *Das Kerygma und der irdische Jesus: Historische Motive in den Jesus-Erzählungen der Evangelien*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970. **Russell, H. G.** "Which Was Written First, Luke or Acts?" *HTR* 48 (1955) 167-74. **Russell, W.** "The Anointing with the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts." *TJ* 7 (1986) 47-63. **Sahlin, H.** *Der Messias und das Gottesvolk: Studien zur protolukanischen Theologie*. ASNU 12. Uppsala: Almqvist and Wiksells, 1945. —. *Studien zum dritten Kapitel des Lukasevangeliums*. UUA 2. Uppsala/Leipzig: Lundeqvistiska/Harrassowitz, 1949. **Sanders, E. P.** *Jesus and Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985. **Sanders, J. A.** "Isaiah in Luke." *Int* 36 (1982) 144-55. **Sanders, J. T.** "The Salvation of the Jews in Luke-Acts." In *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives*, ed. C. H. Talbert, 104-28. —. *The Jews in Luke-Acts*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987. **Saxer, V.** "Le 'Juste Crucifié' de Platon à Théodoret." *RSLR* 19 (1983) 189-215. **Scharburg, J.** "Daniel 7, 12 and the New Testament Passion-Resurrection Predictions." *NTS* 31 (1985) 208-22. **Schelke, K. H.** "Der Zweck der Gleichnisreden." In *Neues Testament und Kirche*, FS R. Schnackenburg, ed. J. Gnllka. Freiburg: Herder, 1974. 71-75. **Schenk, W.** *Evangelium-Evangelien-Evangelologie: Ein "hermeneutisches" Manifest*. Theologische Existenz heute 216. Munich: Kaiser, 1983. **Schenke, L.** *Die Wundererzählungen des Markusevangeliums*. SBB. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, n.d. [1974]. **Schlatter, A. von.** *Die Evangelien nach Markus und Lukas*. Stuttgart: Calwer, 1947. —. *Der Evangelist Matthäus*. 6th ed. Stuttgart: Calwer, 1963 = 1929. **Schlosser, J.** *La règne de Dieu dans les dits de Jésus*. Paris: Gabalda, 1981. **Schmauch, W.** "In der Wüste." In *In Memoriam Ernst Lohmeyer*, ed. W. Schmauch. Stuttgart: Evangelischen Verlagswerk, 1951. 202-23. —. *Orte der Offenbarung und der Offenbarungsort im Neuen Testament*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956. **Schmid, J.** *Das Evangelium nach Markus*. RNT 2. Regensburg: Pustet, 1963. **Schmidt, K. L.** *Die Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu. Literarkritische Untersuchungen zur ältesten Jesusüberlieferung*. Berlin: Trowitsch & Sohn, 1919. **Schmidt, T. E.** *Hostility to Wealth in the Synoptic Gospels*. JSNTSup 15. Sheffield: JSOT, 1987. **Schmithals, W.** "Lukas—Evangelist der

- Armen." *ThViat* 12 (1975-76) 153-67. ———. "Die Berichte des Apostelgeschichte über die Bekehrung des Paulus und die 'Tendenz' des Lukas." *ThViat* 14 (1977-78) 145-65. **Schnackenburg, R.**, et al., ed. *Die Kirche des Anfangs*. FS H. Schürmann. Leipzig: St. Benno, 1977. **Schneider, G.** *Parusiegleichnisse im Lukasevangelium*. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1975. ———. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. HTKNT. 2 vols. Freiburg: Herder, 1980-82. ———. *Lukas, Theologe der Heilsgeschichte: Aufsätze zum lukanischen Doppelwerk*. BBB 59. Bonn: Hanstein, 1985. ———. "Der Zweck des lukanischen Doppelwerks." *BZ* 21 (1977) 45-66. ———. "Schrift und Tradition in der theologischen Neuinterpretation der lukanischen Schriften." *BK* 34 (1979) 112-15. ———. "Jesu überraschende Antworten: Beobachtungen zu den Apophthegmen des dritten Evangeliums." *NTS* 29 (1983) 321-36. **Schneider, F.** *Jesus der Prophet*. OBO 2. Fribourg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973. **Schottroff, L.**, and **Stegemann, W.** *Jesus von Nazareth: Hoffnung der Armen*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1978. **Schramm, T.** *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas: Eine literarkritische und redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. SNTSMS 14. Cambridge: University Press, 1971. **Schulz, S.** *Die Stunde der Botschaft: Einführung in die Theologie der vier Evangelisten*. 2nd ed. Hamburg/Zürich: Furche/Zwingli, 1970. ———. *Q: Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten*. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1972. ———. "Gottes Vorsehung bei Lukas." *ZNW* 54 (1963) 104-16. **Schürer, E.** *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.—A.D. 135)*. Ed. G. Vermes et al. 3 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1973-87. **Schürmann, H.** *Quellenkritische Untersuchung des lukanischen Abendmahlsberichtes Lk 22,7-38*. NTAbh 19/5, 20/4-5. 3 vols. Münster in W.: Aschendorff, 1953-57. ———. *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien*. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1968. ———. *Ursprung und Gestalt: Erörterungen und Besinnungen zum Neuen Testament*. Kommentare und Beiträge zum Alten und Neuen Testament. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1970. ———. *Gottes Reich—Jesus' Geschick: Jesus ureiniger Tod im Licht seiner Basileia-Verkündigung (Teildruck)*. Die Botschaft Gottes 2/34. Leipzig: St. Benno-Verlag, 1985. ———. "Sprachliche Reminiszenzen an abgeänderte oder ausgelassene Bestandteile der Spruchsammlung im Lukas- und Matthäusevangelium." *NTS* 6 (1960) 193-210. ———. "Das Thomasevangelium und das lukanische Sondergut." *BZ* 7 (1963) 236-60. **Schütz, F.** *Der leidende Christus: Die angefochtene Gemeinde und das Christuskerygma der lukanischen Schriften*. BWANT 9. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1969. **Schweizer, E.** *Church Order in the New Testament*. SBT 32. London: SCM, 1961. ———. "Zur lukanischen Christologie." In *Verifikation*, FS G. Ebeling, ed. E. Jungel, J. Wallmann, and W. Werbeck. Tübingen: Mohr, 1982. 43-65. ———. "Zur Frage der Quellenbenutzung durch Lukas." *Neues Testament und Christologie im Werden: Aufsätze*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982. 33-85. ———. "Plädoyer der Verteidigung in Sachen: Moderne Theologie versus Lukas." *TLZ* 105 (1980) 241-52. **Scott, B. B.** *Jesus, Symbol-Maker for the Kingdom*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981. ———. "Parables of Growth Revisited: Notes on the Current State of Parable Research." *BTB* 11 (1981) 3-9. ———. "Essaying the Rock: The Authenticity of the Jesus Parable Tradition." *Forum* 2 (1986) 3-53. **Scott, J. A.** *Luke: Greek Physician and Historian*. Evanston: Northwestern University, 1930. **Seccombe, D. P.** *Possessions and the Poor in Luke-Acts*. SNTU B/6. Linz, 1982. ———. "Luke and Isaiah." *NTS* 27 (1981) 252-59. **Sellin, G.** "Allegorie und 'Gleichnis': Zur Formenlehre der synoptischen Gleichnisse." *ZTK* 75 (1978) 281-335. **Sheridan, M.** "Disciples and Discipleship in Matthew and Luke." *BTB* 3 (1973) 235-55. **Sider, J. W.** "The Meaning of *Parabole* in the Usage of the Synoptic Evangelists." *Bib* 62 (1981) 453-70. ———. "Nurturing Our Nurse: Literary Scholars and Biblical Exegesis." *CLiJ* 32 (1982) 15-21. ———. "Rediscovering the Parables: The Logic of the Jeremiah Tradition." *JBL* 102 (1983) 61-83. ———. "Proportional Analogy in the Gospel Parables." *NTS* 31 (1985) 1-23. **Siebert, F.** "Lukas—ein Historiker, d.h. ein Rhetor? Freundschaftliche Entgegnung auf Erhardt Güttgemanns." *LingBib* 55 (1984) 57-60. **Simson, P.** "The Drama of the City of God: Jerusalem in St. Luke's Gospel." *Scr* 15 (1963) 65-80. **Siotis, M. A.** "Luke the Evangelist as St. Paul's Collabora-

- tor." In *Neues Testament und Geschichte: Historisches Geschehen und Deutung im Neuen Testament*, FS O. Cullmann, ed. H. Baltensweiler and B. Reicke. Zürich/Tübingen: Theologischer Verlag/Mohr (Siebeck), 1972. 105–11. **Sloan, R. B.** *The Favorable Year of the Lord: A Study of Jubilarial Theology in the Gospel of Luke*. Fort Worth, TX: Schola, 1977. **Smalley, S. S.** "Spirit, Kingdom, and Prayer in Luke-Acts." *NovT* 15 (1973) 59–71. **Smith, B. T. B.** *The Parables of the Synoptic Gospels*. Cambridge: SPCK, 1937. **Smith, R. H.** "History and Eschatology in Luke-Acts." *CTM* 29 (1958) 881–901. **Snape, H. C.** "The Composition of the Lukan Writings: A Re-assessment." *HTR* 53 (1960) 27–46. **Snodgrass, K. R.** "Streams of Tradition Emerging from Isaiah 40:1–5 and Their Adaptation in the New Testament." *JSTNT* 8 (1980) 24–45. **Sparks, H. F. D.** "The Semitisms of St. Luke's Gospel." *JTS*, o.s., 44 (1943) 129–38. ———. "St. Luke's Transpositions." *NTS* 3 (1957) 219–23. **Spicq, C.** *Agapè dans le Nouveau Testament: Analyse des textes*. Vol. 1. EBib. Paris: Gabalda, 1958. **Stalder, K.** "Der heilige Geist in der lukanischen Ekklesiologie." *US* 30 (1975) 287–93. **Stein, R. H.** *An Introduction to the Parables of Jesus*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1981. **Stendahl, K.** *The School of St. Matthew, and Its Use of the Old Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968. **Stenning, J. F.**, ed. *The Targum of Isaiah*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1949. **Stewart, R. A.** "The Parable Form in the Old Testament and the Rabbinic Literature." *EvQ* 36 (1964) 133–47. **Stöger, A.** "Die Theologie des Lukasevangeliums." *BLit* 46 (1973) 227–36. **Stonehouse, N. B.** *The Witness of Luke to Christ*. London: Tyndale, 1951. **Strauss, D. F.** *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined*. Ed. P. C. Hodgson. Tr. G. Elliot. SCM Press Lives of Jesus. London: SCM, 1973. **Strobel, A.** "Lukas der Antiochener (Bemerkungen zu Act 11, 28D)." *ZNW* 49 (1958) 131–34. **Stronstad, R.** *The Charismatic Theology of St. Luke*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1984. **Stuhlmacher, P.** *Das paulinische Evangelium*. Vol. 1, *Vorgeschichte*. FRLANT 95. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1968. ———. "Warum musste Jesus sterben?" *TB* 16 (1985) 273–85. ———, ed. *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien: Vorträge vom Tübinger Symposium 1982*. WUNT 28. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1983. **Suggs, M. J.** *Wisdom, Christology, and Law in Matthew's Gospel*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1970. **Sundwall, J.** *Die Zusammensetzung des Markusevangeliums*. Acta Academiae Aboensis. Humaniora 9/2. Abo: Tilgmanns, 1934. **Sutcliffe, E. F.** "A Note on the Date of St. Luke's Gospel." *Scr* 3 (1948) 45–46. **Swaeles, R.** "Jesus nouvel Élie dans S. Luc." *AsSeign* 69 (1964) 41–66. ———. "L'évangile du salut: Saint Luc." *ComLit* 1 (1977) 45–70. **Sylvia, D. D.** "Jerusalem and Hierosoloma in Luke-Acts." *ZNW* 74 (1983) 207–21. **Taeger, J.-W.** *Der Mensch und sein Heil: Studien zum Bild des Menschen und zur Sicht der Bekehrung bei Lukas*. SNT 14. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1982. **Talbert, C. H.** *Luke and the Gnostics: An Examination of the Lukan Purpose*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1966. ———. "The Redaction Critical Quest for Luke the Theologian." In *Jesus and Man's Hope: Proceedings of the Pittsburgh Festival on the Gospels*, ed. D. G. Miller. 2 vols. Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh Theological Seminary, 1970. 1:171–222. ———. *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts*. SBLMS 20. Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1974. ———. *What Is a Gospel? The Genre of the Canonical Gospels*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977. ———. "The Lukan Presentation of Jesus' Ministry in Galilee: Luke 4:31–9:50." *RevExp* 64 (1967) 485–97. ———. "An Anti-Gnostic Tendency in Lukan Christology." *NTS* 14 (1967–68) 259–71. ———. "Shifting Sands: The Recent Study of the Gospel of Luke." *Int* 30 (1976) 381–95. ———, ed. *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*. Perspectives in Religious Studies 5. Danville, VA/Edinburgh: Association of Baptist Professors of Religion/T. & T. Clark, 1978. ———, ed. *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*. New York: Crossroad, 1984. **Tannehill, R. C.** "A Study in the Theology of Luke-Acts." *ATR* 43 (1961) 195–203. ———. *The Sword of His Mouth*. Philadelphia/Missoula, MT: Fortress/Scholars, 1975. ———. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*. Vol. 1, *The Gospel according to Luke*. Foundations and Facets. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986. ———. "Israel in Luke-Acts: A Tragic Story." *JBL* 104 (1985) 69–85. **Taylor, V.** *Behind the Third Gospel*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1926. ———. *The Gospel according to St.*

- Mark*. 2nd ed. London/New York: Macmillan/St. Martin's, 1966. ———. "Rehkopf's List of Words and Phrases Illustrative of Pre-Lukan Speech Usage." *JTS*, n.s., 15 (1964) 59–62. **Tenney, M. C.** "Historical Verities in the Gospel of Luke." *BSac* 135 (1978) 126–38. **TeSelle, S. M.** *Speaking in Parables*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975. ———. "Parable, Metaphor, and Theology." *JAAR* 42 (1974) 630–45. **Theissen, G.** *The First Followers of Jesus: A Sociological Analysis of the Earliest Christianity*. Tr. J. Bowden. London: SCM, 1978. ———. *The Miracle Stories of the Early Christian Tradition*. Tr. F. McDonagh. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1983. **Theobald, M.** "Die Anfänge der Kirche: Zur Struktur von Lk 5.1–6.19." *NTS* 30 (1984) 91–108. **Thériault, J.-Y.** "Les dimensions sociales, économiques et politiques dans l'oeuvre de Luc." *ScEs* 26 (1974) 205–31. **Thiselton, A. C.** "The Parables as Language-Event: Some Comments on Fuchs's Hermeneutics in the Light of Linguistic Philosophy." *SJT* 23 (1970) 437–68. **Tiede, D. L.** *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980. **Tinsley, E. J.** "Parable, Allegory, and Mysticism." In *Vindications: Essays in the Historical Basis of Christianity*, ed. A. Hanson. London: SCM, 1966. 153–92. ———. "Parable and Allegory: Some Literary Criteria for the Interpretation of the Parables of Christ." *CQ* 3 (1970) 32–39. ———. "Parables and the Self-Awareness of Jesus." *CQ* 4 (1971) 18–27. **Tödt, H. E.** *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition*. NTL. Tr. D. M. Barton. London: SCM, 1965. **Tolbert, M.** "Leading Ideas of the Gospel of Luke." *RevExp* 64 (1967) 441–51. **Tolbert, M. A.** *Perspectives on the Parables: An Approach to Multiple Interpretations*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979. **Torrey, C. C.** "The Translations Made from the Original Aramaic Gospels." In *Studies in the History of Religions*, FS C. H. Toy, ed. D. G. Lyon and G. F. Moore. New York: Macmillan, 1912. 269–317. ———. *Our Translated Gospels: Some of the Evidence*. New York: Harper, 1936. **Trocme, É.** *Le "Livre des Actes" et l'histoire*. Études d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses 45. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1957. ———. "The Jews as Seen by Paul and Luke." In *To See Ourselves as Others See Us: Christians, Jews, and "Others" in Late Antiquity*, ed. J. Neusner and E. S. Frerichs. Chico, CA: Scholars, 1985. 145–61. **Tuckett, C. M.** *Synoptic Studies: The Ampleforth Conferences of 1982 and 1983*. JSOTSup 7. Sheffield: JSOT, 1984. ———. "The Argument from Order and the Synoptic Problem." *TZ* 36 (1980) 338–54. **Turner, M. M. B.** "Spirit Endowment in Luke/Acts: Some Linguistic Considerations." *VoxEv* 12 (1981) 45–63. ———. "The Significance of Receiving the Spirit in Luke-Acts: A Survey of Modern Scholarship." *TJ* 2 (1981) 131–58. **Turner, N.** *Grammatical Insights into the New Testament*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1965. ———. "The Minor Verbal Agreements of Mt. and Lk. against Mk." *SE* 1 [= TU 73] (1959) 223–34. **Tyson, J. B.** *The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts*. Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1986. ———. "The Opposition to Jesus in the Gospel of Luke." *PRS* 5 (1978) 144–50. ———. "The Jewish Public in Luke-Acts." *NTS* 30 (1984) 574–83. ———. "The Gentile Mission and the Authority of Scripture in Acts." *NTS* 33 (1987) 619–31. **Unnik, W. C. van.** "Luke's Second Book and the Rules of Hellenistic Historiography." In *Les Actes des Apôtres*, ed. J. Kremer, 37–60. ———. "The 'Book of Acts' the Confirmation of the Gospel." *NovT* 4 (1960–61) 26–59. ———. "Jesus the Christ." *NTS* 8 (1961–62) 101–16. **Vermes, G.** *Scripture and Tradition in Judaism: Haggadic Studies*. SPB 4. Leiden: Brill, 1961. **Via, D. O., Jr.** *The Parables: Their Literary and Existential Dimension*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967. ———. "Parable and Example Story: A Literary-Structuralist Approach." *Semeia* 1 (1974) 105–33. ———. "A Response to Crossan, Funk, and Petersen." *Semeia* 1 (1974) 222–35. **Vincent, J. J.** "The Parables of Jesus as Self-Revelation." *SE* 1 [= TU 73] (1959) 79–99. **Vögtle, A.** "Exegetische Erwägungen über das Wissen und Selbstbewusstsein Jesu." In *Gott in Welt*, FS K. Rahner, ed. J. B. Metz et al. Freiburg/Basel/Vienna: Herder, 1964. 608–67. **Völkel, M.** "Der Anfang Jesu in Galiläa: Bemerkungen zum Gebrauch und zur Funktion Galiläas in den lukanischen Schriften." *ZNW* 64 (1973) 222–32. ———. "Zur Deutung des 'Reiches Gottes' bei Lukas." *ZNW* 65 (1974) 57–70. **Voss, G.** *Die Christologie der lukanischen Schriften in Grundzügen*. StudNeot 2. Paris/Bruges: Brouwer, 1965. **Waal, C. van der.** "The Temple in

- the Gospel according to Luke." *Neot* 7 (1973) 49–59. **Wagner, G.**, ed. *An Exegetical Bibliography of the New Testament*, Vol. 2, *Luke and Acts*. Macon, GA: Mercer University, 1985. **Wainwright, A. W.** "Luke and the Restoration of the Kingdom to Israel." *ExpTim* 89 (1977) 76–79. **Walaskay, P. W.** "The Trial and Death of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke." *JBL* 94 (1975) 81–93. **Wansbrough, H.** "Poverty in the Gospel Tradition." *ProclBA* 6 (1982) 47–57. **Watson, F.** "Why Was Jesus Crucified?" *Theology* 88 (1985) 105–12. **Weder, H.** *Die Gleichnisse Jesu als Metaphern*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978. **Weinert, F. D.** "The Meaning of the Temple in Luke-Acts." *BTB* 11 (1981) 85–89. ———. "Luke, Stephen, and the Temple in Luke-Acts." *BTB* 17 (1987) 88–90. **Wernle, P.** *Die synoptische Frage*. Freiburg i. B./Leipzig: Mohr, 1899. **Wettstein, J. J.** *Novum Testamentum Graecum . . . Opera et Studia*. 2 vols. Amsterdam: Officina Dommeriana, 1751–52. **Wilckens, U.** *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte: Form- und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. WMANT 5. 2nd ed. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1963. **Wilcox, M.** *The Semitisms of Acts*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1965. **Wilder, A.** *Early Christian Rhetoric: The Language of the Gospel*. NTL. London: SCM, 1964; rev. ed., Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1971. ———. *Jesus' Parables and the War of Myths: Essays in Imagination in Scripture*. Ed. J. Breech. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982. ———. "Eschatological Images and Earthly Circumstances." *NTS* 5 (1959) 229–45. **Wilckens, W.** "Die theologische Struktur der Komposition des Lukasevangeliums." *TZ* 34 (1978) 1–13. **Williams, C. S. C.** "The Date of Luke-Acts." *ExpTim* 64 (1952–53) 283–84. **Wilshire, L. E.** "Was Canonical Luke Written in the Second Century?—A Continuing Discussion." *NTS* 20 (1974) 246–53. **Wilson, R. M.** "Farrer and Streeter in the Minor Agreements of Mt. and Lk. against Mk." *SE* 1 [= TU 73] (1959) 254–57. **Wilson, S. G.** *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts*. SNTSMS 23. Cambridge: University Press, 1973. **Wink, W.** *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition*. SNTSMS 7. Cambridge: University Press, 1968. **Wittig, S.** "A Theory of Multiple Meanings." *Semeia* 9 (1977) 75–103. **Wolfe, K. R.** "The Chiastic Structure of Luke-Acts and Some Implications for Worship." *SWJT* 22 (1980) 60–71. **Wren, M.** "Sonship in Luke: The Advantage of a Literary Approach." *SJT* 37 (1984) 301–11. **Yadin, Y.** "A Note on Melchizedek and Qumran." *IEJ* 15 (1965) 152–54. **Yarnold, E.** "The Trinitarian Implications of Luke and Acts." *HeyJ* 7 (1966) 18–32. **Yoder, J. H.** *The Politics of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972. **Zahn, T. von.** *Introduction to the New Testament*. Tr. J. M. Trout et al. 3 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1909. **Zeller, D.** *Kommentar zum Logienquelle*. Stuttgarter kleiner Kommentar, Neues Testament 21. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1984. **Zerwick, M.** *Biblical Greek, Illustrated by Examples*. Ed. and tr. J. Smith. Scripta Pontifici Instituti Biblici 114. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963. **Ziesler, J. A.** "Luke and the Pharisees." *NTS* 25 (1979) 146–57. **Zimmermann, A. F.** *Neutestamentliche Methodenlehre: Darstellung der historisch-kritischen Methode*. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1968. ———. *Der urchristlichen Lehrer: Studien zum Tradentkreis der διδασκαλος im frühen Urchristentum*. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1984. **Zingg, P.** *Das Wachsen der Kirche: Beiträge zur Frage der lukanischen Redaktion und Theologie*. OBO 3. Fribourg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974. ———. "Die Stellung des Lukas zur Heidenmission." *NZM* 29 (1973) 200–209.

Luke 1-9:20

Dedicatory Preface (1:1–4)

Bibliography

- Achtemeier, P. J.** *The Quest for Unity in the New Testament Church*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987. 69–74, 111–12. **Alexander, L.** "Luke's Preface in the Context of Greek Preface-Writing." *NovT* 28 (1986) 48–74. **Bacon, B. W.** "Le témoignage de Luc sur lui-même." *RHPR* 8 (1928) 209–26. **Bauer, J. B.** "ΠΟΛΛΟΙ Luk 1, 1." *NovT* 4 (1960) 263–66. **Blass, F.** *Philology*. 7–20. **Brown, S.** "The Role of the Prologues in Determining the Purpose of Luke-Acts." In *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*, ed. C. H. Talbert, 99–111. **Cadbury, H. J.** "Commentary on the Preface of Luke." In *Beginnings*, ed. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake, 2:489–510. ———. *The Making of Luke-Acts*. 344–48, 358–59. ———. "The Purpose Expressed in Luke's Preface." *Exp* 8/21 (1921) 431–41. ———. "The Knowledge Claimed in Luke's Preface." *Exp* 8/24 (1922) 401–20. ———. "'We' and 'I' in Luke-Acts." *NTS* 3 (1956–57) 128–32. **Callan, T.** "The Preface of Luke-Acts and Historiography." *NTS* 31 (1985) 576–81. **Campanhausen, H. von.** *The Formation of the Christian Bible*. Tr. J. A. Baker. London: A. & C. Black, 1972. 124–28. **Colson, F. H.** "Notes on St. Luke's Preface." *JTS*, o.s., 24 (1923) 300–309. **Delebecque, É.** *Études grecques*. 1–14. **Devoldère, M.** "Le prologue du troisième évangile." *NRT* 56 (1929) 714–19. **Dillon, R. J.** "Previewing Luke's Project from His Prologue (Luke 1:1–4)." *CBQ* 43 (1981) 205–27. **Dömer, M.** *Das Heil Gottes*. 5–14. **Du Plessis, I. I.** "Once More: The Purpose of Luke's Prologue (Lk 1:1–4)." *NovT* 16 (1974) 259–71. **Dubois, J.-D.** "Luc 1, 1–4." *ETR* 52 (1977) 542–47. **Dupont, J.** *The Sources of Acts: The Present Position*. Tr. K. Pond. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964. 101–12. **Feuillet, A.** "'Témoins oculaires et serviteurs de la parole' (Lc 1:2b)." *NovT* 15 (1973) 241–59. **Gibert, P.** "Les évangiles et l'histoire (Luc 1,1–4, Jean 20, 30–31)." *LumVie* 34 (1985) 19–26. **Glöckner, R.** *Die Verkündigung des Heils beim Evangelisten Lukas*. 3–41. **Goodspeed, E. J.** "Some Greek Notes: I. Was Theophilus Luke's Publisher?" *JBL* 73 (1954) 84. **Güttgemanns, E.** "In welchem Sinne ist Lukas 'Historiker'? Die Beziehung von Luk 1, 1–4 und Papias zur antiken Rhetorik." *LingBib* 54 (1983) 9–26. **Haenchen, E.** "Das 'Wir' in der Apostelgeschichte und das Itinerar." *ZTK* 58 (1961) 329–66. ———. "Review of J. Dupont, *Les sources du livre des Actes*." *TLZ* 87 (1962) 42–43. **Hartl, V.** "Zur synoptischen Frage: Schliesst Lukas 1,1–3 die Benutzung des Matthäus aus?" *BZ* 13 (1915) 334–37. **Higgins, A. J. B.** "The Preface to Luke and the Kerygma in Acts." In *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays*, FS F. F. Bruce, ed. W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin. Exeter/Grand Rapids: Paternoster/Eerdmans, 1970. 78–91. **Kahl, B.** *Armenevangelium und Heiden-evangelium: "Sola scriptura" und die ökumenische Traditionsproblematik im Lichte von Väterkonflikt und Väterconsens bei Lukas*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1987. 25–85. **Klein, G.** "Lukas 1,1–4 als theologisches Programm." In *Das Lukas-Evangelium*, ed. G. Braumann, 170–203. **Kürzinger, J.** "Lk 1, 3: . . . ἀκριβῶς καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι." *BZ* 18 (1974) 249–55. **Léon-Dufour, X.** *Études d'évangile*. 210–37. **Lohse, E.** *EvT* 14 (1954) 256–75. **Luck, U.** "Kerygma, Tradition, und Geschichte Jesu bei Lukas." *Das Lukas-Evangelium*, ed. G. Braumann, 95–114. **Mansion, J.** "Sur le sens d'un mot grec: ἀνατάσσω." *Serta Leodiensia* 51 (1930) 261–67 [= *ZTK* 57 (1960) 51–66]. **Marshall, I. H.** "Luke and His 'Gospel' [Lk 1:1–4]." In *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien*, ed. P. Stuhlmacher, 289–308. **Marx, W. G.** "A New Theophilus." *EvQ* 52 (1980) 17–26. **Mulder, H.** "Theophilus, de 'godvrezende.'" In *Arcana revelata*, FS F. W. Grosheide, ed. N. J. Hommes et al., 77–88. **Müller, P.-G.** *Der Traditionsprozess im Neuen Testament*. Freiburg/Basel/Vienna: Herder, 1982. 175–90. **Mussner, F.** "καθεξῆς im Lukasprolog." In *Jesus und Paulus*, FS W. G. Kümmel, ed. E. E. Ellis and E. Grässer. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975. 253–55. ———. "Die Gemeinde des Lukasprologs." In *The New*

Testament Age, FS B. Reicke, ed. W. C. Weinrich. Macon, GA: Mercer University, 1984. 2:373–92. **Piper, O. A.** “The Purpose of Acts.” *USQR* 57 (1945) 15–25. **Pope, A. M.** “The Key Word of the Lukan Narratives.” *Canadian Journal of Religious Thought* 3 (1926) 44–52. **Robbins, V. K.** “Prefaces in Greco-Roman Bibliography and Luke-Acts.” *PRS* 6 (1979) 94–108. **Robertson, A. T.** “The Implications in Luke’s Preface.” *ExpTim* 35 (1923–24) 319–21. **Ropes, J. H.** “St Luke’s Preface; ἀσφάλεια and παρακολουθεῖν.” *JTS*, o.s., 25 (1923–24) 67–71. **Sahlin, H.** *Messias*. 39–47. **Samain, E.** “L’évangile de Luc: un témoignage ecclésial et missionnaire. Lc 1,1–4; 4,14–15.” *AsSeign* 34 (1973) 60–73. **Schneider, G.** *BZ* 21 (1977) 45–66. ———. “Zur Bedeutung von καθεξῆς im lukanischen Doppelwerk.” *ZNW* 68 (1977) 128–31. **Schulz, S.** *Die Stunde der Botschaft*. 243–50. **Schürmann, H.** “Evangelien-schrift und kirchliche Unterweisung: Die repräsentative Funktion der Schrift nach Lk 1,1–4.” *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien*. 251–71. **Sneen, D. J.** “An Exegesis of Luke 1:1–4 with Special Regard to Luke’s Purpose as a Historian.” *ExpTim* 83 (1971) 40–43. **Stein, R. H.** “Luke 1:1–4 and Traditionsgeschichte.” *JETS* 26 (1983) 421–30. **Stonehouse, N. B.** *The Witness of Luke to Christ*. 24–45. **Trocme, E.** *Le “Livre des Actes” et l’histoire*. 38–50, 125–28. **Unnik, W. C. van.** “Remarks on the Purpose of Luke’s Historical Writing.” *Sparsa Collecta*. NovTSup 29. Leiden: Brill, 1973. 6–15. ———. “Once More St. Luke’s Prologue.” *Neot* 7 (1973) 7–26. **Vögtle, A.** “Was hatte die Widmung des lukanischen Doppelwerks an Theophilus zu bedeuten?” *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien: Beiträge zur Evangelienforschung*. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1971. 31–42. **Völkel, M.** “Exegetische Erwägungen zum Verständnis des Begriffs ΚΑΘΕΞΗΣ im lukanischen Prolog.” *NTS* 20 (1973–74) 289–99. **Wijngaards, J.** “Saint Luke’s Prologue in the Light of Modern Research.” *Clergy Monthly* 31 (1967) 172–79, 251–58.

Translation

¹Inasmuch as many have taken it in hand to arrange a narrative concerning the things that have been accomplished in our midst, ²just as those who were, from the beginning, eyewitnesses and who became servants of the message handed it on to us, ³it seemed good to me also, having investigated carefully everything from way back, to write for you, most excellent Theophilus, a well-ordered account, ⁴so that you might know, concerning the reports which you have heard, the truth.

Form/Structure/Setting

Luke begins his gospel distinctly, with a literary preface dedicating the work to Theophilus and setting the background for its creation. The preface consists of a perfectly constructed Greek period (Delebecque, *Études grecques*, 7) which is generally judged to be the best stylized sentence in the whole NT (Norden, *Agnostos Theos*, 316 n. 1). This literary crafting stands in sharp contrast to the rather Jewish-sounding Greek that immediately follows. Indeed, Luke does not devote the same attention again to forming a sentence until Acts 28:30–31 (Schlatter, 14). The preface reaches for its vocabulary beyond current popular language and employs long words, often with prefixes to lend a weightiness to its statement (Delebecque, *Études grecques*, 2–3; Haenchen, *ZTK* 58 [1961] 362).

The preface is clearly in the style of Hellenistic literary prologues. It has especially been compared with historiographical prologues (e.g., Cadbury, “Preface of Luke,” 490), but also with the prefaces to Hellenistic treatises on various subjects (see Moffatt, *Introduction*, 263; Alexander, *NovT* 28 [1986] 48–74), as

well as (though this has less justification) with the prefaces in Greco-Roman biographies and rhetorical works (Robbins, *PRS* 6 [1979] 94–108). Particularly apt for comparison are sections from Josephus' prefaces to *War* (1.17) and *Against Apion* (1.1–18).

Luke is evidently claiming some relationship between his own work and published literary and, especially, historical works of his day (cf. Campenhausen, *Christian Bible*, 124; van Unnik, *Neot* 7 [1973] 12). (For a collection of historical prefaces in English translation see A. J. Toynbee, *Greek Historical Thought from Homer to the Age of Heraclitus* [The Library of Greek Thought; London: Dent-sous, 1924] 1–100.) However, the confident deductions that Luke was writing for the book market (Dibelius, *Acts*, 104, 135, frequently followed) and that Theophilus financed the publication of the work (Goodspeed, *JBL* 73 [1954] 84) go beyond the evidence and are probably incorrect (see A. D. Nock, "Review of M. Dibelius, *Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte*," *Gnomon* 25 [1953] 501–2; H. I. Marron, "La technique de l'édition à l'époque patristique," *VC* 3 [1949] 208–24, and esp. Vögtle, "Die Widmung des lukanischen Doppelwerks," and works cited there). No preface for a published work distributed in the public book market in antiquity would reveal so little of the intention of the work to an uninitiated member of the public. No doubt there would be, with the passage of time, many "Theophiluses" for whom the work would be suitable. But as in the case of Theophilus (v 4), they will have had prior acquaintance with Christianity. It is also likely that, no matter how important some particular Theophilus may have been for the original inspiration that produced the work, Luke, having set himself to the task, would have taken advantage of the possibility of writing his work so as to be of use to a wider public, as no doubt his predecessors had done.

When they had a dedication, ancient works were not anonymous (Dibelius, *Acts*, 104; Campenhausen, *Christian Bible*, 126 n. 92; against Dupont, *Sources*, 138–39; Nock, *Gnomon* 25 [1953] 497–506; Haenchen, *ZTK* 58 [1961] 335–36—exceptions are the *Epistle to Diognetus*, whose origin and history are shrouded in uncertainty, and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, whose authorship was nevertheless well known). Our confidence in the traditional ascription may be strengthened by the likelihood that Luke was named in the original manuscript of his work.

The secular style of the preface has been frequently noted (Dibelius, *Acts*, 123, 135; S. Brown, "The Role of the Prologues," 108). Only the absolute use of ὁ λόγος, "the word," betrays the deeply religious content to come. See further discussion below.

Scholarship is sharply divided over whether the preface relates only to the Gospel (e.g., Haenchen, *ZTK* 58 [1961] 363; Schürmann, 4) or also to Acts (e.g., G. Klein, "Lukas 1,1–4"; Fitzmyer, 290). The decision turns on details of interpretation and will be addressed in the *Comment*.

Comment

Despite Luke's careful composition, the sense of almost every element of the prologue has been disputed. Among the major disputed issues are Luke's attitude to his predecessors (the πολλοί, "many"), the degree to which he may be said to have abandoned a faith certainty in favor of an evidential certainty

in his commendation of the Christian faith, the nature of Luke's claim to "having followed" (*παρηκολουθηκότι*), and the scope of the work anticipated by the preface (Gospel only or Luke-Acts).

1 *ἐπειδήπερ*, "since"/"inasmuch as," is not found elsewhere in the NT or LXX and is rare in the classical period, but it is not uncommon in the literary writings of the Hellenistic age. It is found in Josephus' introduction to *War* (1.17), and here it contributes to the formal and literary flavor of the preface (Cadbury, "Preface of Luke," 492). *ἐπειδήπερ* normally follows the principal clause, but here that would destroy the balance of Luke's sentence as it pivots around *ἔδοξε καί μοι*, "it seemed good to me also."

While for Luke it will not be a merely rhetorical flourish, *πολλοί*, "many," is a rhetorically appropriate beginning (cf. Acts 24:2, 10). See Cadbury, "Preface of Luke," 492-93; Bauer, *NovT* 4 (1960) 263-66; E. Fraenkel, "Eine Anfangsformel attischer Reden," *Glotta* 39 (1960) 1-5, for references from the rhetorical literature. The attention of the "many" underlines the importance of the events while at the same time establishing a precedent for Luke. The verb *ἐπιχειρεῖν* may focus on the achievement ("an attempt") or on the taking in hand of an activity, and it may be pejorative (e.g., Josephus, *Life* 40) or neutral (e.g., Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 1.13—see further references in Cadbury, "Preface of Luke," 494, and Fitzmyer, 291). Reference to the limitations of the works on the basis of theological necessity (the human articulation of the gospel can never be more than an attempt; Grundmann, 43) or of method (the many depend only upon apostolic narration, whereas Luke will reach beyond the barrier between events and their narration and regain the actual events themselves; G. Klein, "Lukas 1,1-4," 173, 188-89) cannot be supported. Any direct criticism must be excluded on the basis of the *καί μοι*, "to me also," of v 3. Even a notion here of "attempts to be improved upon" would require an "although" (*καίπερ*—cf. the opening sentence of Dioscorides, *De Materia Medica*), and either fails to do justice to the forward reference of the confidence-creating words of v 3 or requires that Theophilus had received his instruction from these earlier writings, which in turn makes the implied criticism more radical than the *καί μοι*, "to me also," allows. The parallel between *ἔδοξε καί μοι*, "it seemed good to me also," and *ἐπεχείρησαν*, "they took it in hand," encourages a reading of *ἐπεχείρησαν* in relation to the intentions of the "many," rather than their achievements.

ἀνατάσθαι is a rare word which can mean "to repeat (from memory)" or "to set in order" (G. Delling, *TDNT* 8:32). At issue is whether the *διήγησιν* is primarily that of the witnesses (i.e., an oral narrative) or whether the oral tradition becomes narrative through the literary efforts of the "many." The literary context here strongly favors the latter because of the use of *διήγησις* for the ordered narrative presentation of events in a literary work (cf. Lucian, *How to Write History*, 55). The attention to order indicated by *ἀνατάσθαι* is to be compared with the *καθεξῆς*, "in order," claimed by Luke for his own effort.

The "many" write about (*περί*) what Theophilus has been informed about (*περί*): "the events that have been brought to fruition in our midst" (*τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῶν πραγμάτων*). *πληροφορεῖν* is not used elsewhere by Luke but is almost certainly a more impressive synonym for his usual *πληροῦν*

(see esp. Luke 7:1; Acts 19:21). There is some difficulty involved in doing justice to the notion of completion required by the verb and its tense (perfect). However, G. Klein's separation of the events and their completion is artificial ("Lukas 1,1–4," 174–79). Nevertheless his objection that in the case of the fulfillment of Scripture events may be the fulfillment but may not be themselves fulfilled (175) is telling against those who see here scriptural fulfillment (e.g., Schürmann, 5). Perhaps Luke has in mind the obstacles successfully overcome in the achievement of Jesus (e.g., Luke 4:1–11; 24:19–21). He may have in mind the achievement of heavenly enthronement (1:32–33; 9:31; 24:26; Acts 2:32–36). In any case we are to think in terms of matters brought to a successful completion. The use of *πραγμάτων*, "events," suits well the historian's craft (cf. Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 1.45–49; van Unnik, *Neot* 7 [1973] 12). *ἡμῖν*, "to us" ("in our midst" in the translation above), is also found in v 2. If personal presence were indicated in v 1, then the transmission indicated in v 2 would be superfluous. Blass (*Philology*, 20) understands the "us" geographically: of the Christian community of Judea. This helps a little with v 2, but the writer of Luke-Acts is hardly a member of the Christian community of Judea. Schürmann's eschatological understanding (5) of *ἡμῖν* ("the generation of the end time") in v 1 is attractive but cannot be sustained without a fulfillment understanding of *πεπληροφορημένων*. G. Klein's tradition-historical understanding (the "us" for whom the saving events stand as completed are to be set over against the "eyewitnesses" for whom the events had been in progress; "Lukas 1,1–4," 177–78) makes too much of the perfect tense and creates an unnecessary complexity. The "us" of v 1 is general, and refers to those whose lives are determined by the events that have transpired (cf. Stonehouse, *Witness of Luke*, 38–39): the community formed around these events.

2 *αὐτόπται*, "eyewitnesses," echoes once again the language of the historian (Cadbury, "Preface of Luke," 498–99). It is found only here in the NT. Being present as an eyewitness is the basis for becoming a witness (*μάρτυς*; cf. Acts 26:16). The beginning in mind (*ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*) will be the baptism of John (cf. Luke 3:23, *ἀρχόμενος*, "beginning"; Acts 1:21–22; 10:37). *ὑπηρέται*, "servants," is not used by Luke elsewhere of the Twelve, but a similar thought is expressed by the word *διακονία*, "ministry"/"service," in Acts 1:17, 25 and especially 6:4 where *τοῦ λόγου*, "of the word," follows. While the Twelve are primarily in mind, there is no authority claim here: they are not brought forward as authorized spokesmen (contra S. Brown, "The Role of the Prologues," 108; Riesenfeld, *Gospel Tradition*, 19). Rather, themselves captivated by what has happened, they have devoted themselves to making these things known. (Luke does think of the Twelve as authorized representatives, but in keeping with the secular nature of the preface, that does not surface here.) The attempt by Stendahl, *St. Matthew*, 32–34, and R. Balducci, "Professor Riesenfeld on Synoptic Tradition," *CBQ* 22 (1960) 419, to identify here two separate groups is overturned by the shared definite article and the Acts portrayal of the apostles. The artistry of the phrase with its chiasm is best respected if *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς*, "from the beginning," refers only to *αὐτόπται*, "eyewitnesses," while *γενόμενοι*, "becoming," and *τοῦ λόγου*, "of the word," are restricted to *ὑπηρέται*, "servants": "from the beginning eyewitnesses and servants becoming" (cf. G. Klein, "Lukas 1,1–4," 183–87, against Cadbury, "Preface of Luke," 498–500). This also fits best the two stages

implied by Acts 1:8. The aorist tense of *γενόμενοι*, “having become,” need not imply that apostolic witness is entirely in the past (cf. Acts 4:11). With the absolute use of *ὁ λόγος*, “the word,” Luke slips slightly from the strict secularity of his preface. Here it means no more than “the message,” but the existence of such a message is only satisfactorily accounted for by the Christian narrative to follow (these events imply a message), and Luke’s usage here reflects the technical use of *ὁ λόγος* for the gospel message (cf. Acts 8:4; 10:36; 11:19; 14:25). Feuillet’s understanding of *λόγος* in relation to an almost Johannine Christology of the “Word” (*NovT* 15 [1973] 241–59) is influenced by his linking of *αὐτόπται*, “eyewitnesses,” and *τοῦ λόγου*, “of the word.” Neither the general tenor of the prologue nor Luke’s other uses of *λόγος* can sustain Feuillet’s view.

παρέδοσαν, “handed over,” may indicate any kind of transmission. A literary and classical form of the verb is used that is not elsewhere attested in the NT. While there is a technical use of this verb in the NT for the handing on of tradition in the early church (e.g., 1 Cor 15:3), here we should think rather more broadly of the role of transmission in the preservation of history (van Unnik, *Neot* 7 [1973] 14). The original eyewitnesses made it their business to pass on what they knew. The *ἡμῖν*, “us,” of v 2, like that of v 1, is a more general designation, and we cannot insist on Luke’s being a firsthand recipient. Luke thinks rather of the church as the receptacle for the eyewitness reports (cf. Schürmann, 8). The church knows because the eyewitnesses passed the information on. Luke and the “many” are equally related to the eyewitnesses (cf. Schlatter, 21; against Schürmann, 8). Luke would have written *αὐτοῖς*, “them,” if he wished to indicate his dependence on his predecessors. *παρέδοσαν*, “handed on,” has “the message” as its implied object—not *διήγησιν*, “narrative,” which here refers to a written format, nor *πράγματα*, “events,” which (despite Schürmann, 8 n. 46) may not be handed on. The eyewitnesses were servants of the message (*ὑπηρεταὶ τοῦ λόγου*).

The point of comparison established by *καθώς*, “(just) as”/“since”/“insofar as,” is not immediately evident. *καθώς* is broadly used to indicate various kinds of equivalence and correspondence, even the correspondence of cause and effect (e.g., Rom 1:28; 1 Cor 5:7; see BAGD, 391). In the studies where *καθώς* is attended to, it seems to be consistently related to the accurate preservation of the eyewitness testimony. But this is not without its problems. The curiosity, that Luke should affirm the strict accord with eyewitness testimony of his predecessors’ rather than his own words, has not gone unnoticed. As an adverb *καθώς* may not refer back directly to *διήγησιν*, “narrative.” (There is a usage in which *καθώς* functions like an accusative relative [“just what”: see Matt 21:6; Mark 14:16; Luke 19:32; 22:13], but here the presence of *διήγησιν* as object leaves no place for such a usage.) So, if anything is to be compared at this point, it must be the writing activity of the “many” and the transmitting activity of the eyewitnesses. However, the *καθώς* clause can be located either before or after the clause with which it is compared. And here, a better comparison is obtained by looking forward to v 3. Vv 1 and 2 should, then, be taken as somewhat parallel clauses, each with an independent relationship to v 3. The likeness that binds Luke’s activity to that of the eyewitnesses is the shared motif of the propagation of the knowledge of the matters under discussion.

They “transmitted to us”; Luke will “write for you.” It is likely that Luke views the activity of the “many” also in relation to the same motif.

3 We reach the central pivot of the preface in Luke’s decision to write. What the eyewitnesses provided for the church, Luke will provide for Theophilus. Many have considered the matters worth writing about; Luke will write about them too. *καμαί*, “to me also,” links Luke’s intention with both v 1 and v 2. The impersonal use of *ἔδοξε*, “it seemed good,” is in the NT restricted to Luke-Acts (cf. Acts 15:22, 25, 28). W. C. van Unnik (*Neot* 7 [1973] 16) draws attention to a use of *ἔδοξε μοι*, “it seemed good to me,” by Dionysius of Halicarnassus where he is introducing his own intentions after a discussion of earlier writers on Roman archeology (*Ant. Rom.* 1.6.1).

Cadbury (*Exp* 8/24 [1922] 401–20) has claimed that *παρηκολουθηκότι* (lit., “having followed”) cannot have the meaning “investigated” which is normally attributed to it here. Almost all texts adduced in support are either ambiguous or on careful scrutiny are seen to have another sense. However, Josephus, *Life* 357, is an exception, where the activity involved is clearly separated from that of knowing by being personally present and is set somewhat in parallel with “inquiring” (*πυνθάνεσθαι*). Nicomachus, *Comicus* 1.20, also seems to require the sense “investigated” with reference to *παρακολουθήσας* times of the year when different fish are at their best flavor. If this is sufficient evidence to provide semantic viability, then it is most likely that “investigated” is the sense to be attributed to Luke’s use of the verb. The other options that have been proposed involve a claim by Luke (i) to have been a companion of all the apostles, (ii) to have read carefully the works of the many, (iii) to have been a participant in many of the events (Cadbury), or (iv) to have kept in close touch with what has been going on. (i) is historically problematic. (ii) is somewhat attractive but not if it is understood as limiting Luke’s access to the tradition to its written form. This option does not handle *ἄνωθεν* (“from the time that the narratives began to be produced”) or *πᾶσιν* (“all the writers”) quite as well. (iii) collides with v 2. (iv) is possible, but it requires a vague reference for *πᾶσιν* (“the whole affair”) which seems less satisfactory than something precise from the subject matter attended to in vv 1 and 2. *παρηκολουθηκότι* may be coordinated with *γράφαι*: “that I should investigate and write”; or it may be subordinated: “having investigated, I decided to write.”

πᾶσιν refers most naturally to everything pertaining to the “events” of v 1 and may well involve attention to the accounts of the “many.” *ἄνωθεν* modifies the participial phrase and not the verb strictly. In its temporal use, *ἄνωθεν*, while it can be a synonym for *ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς* (“from the beginning”—v 2), lacks the precision of that expression. It can indicate any starting point a good deal earlier in time than the present. Luke no doubt chooses it here, to stand in parallel with the *ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς* of v 2, because its imprecision (“from way back”) allows for the difference between that beginning and Luke’s own starting point (the infancy narratives—cf. G. Klein, “Lukas 1,1–4,” 190–91; Schürmann, 11). *ἀκριβῶς*, “carefully,” should probably be linked to both *παρηκολουθηκότι*, “investigated,” and *γράφαι*, “write.”

καθεξῆς belongs with *γράφαι*, “to write.” G. Klein’s attempt (“Lukas 1,1–4,” 194–95) to understand the word as Luke’s claim to having included all the connected phases does not persuade. Mussner (“*καθεξῆς* im Lukasprolog”) de-

pendes finally on linking the *πᾶσω*, "all," with *γράψαι*, "to write," for his understanding of *καθεξῆς* as "without a gap." Cadbury's conjecture that *καθεξῆς* may mean "hereinafter" ("Preface of Luke," 505) is not made any more likely by Kürzinger's efforts to find such a sense in other texts (*BZ* 18 [1974] 249-55). Schneider (*ZNW* 68 [1977] 128-31) thinks that it is the *καθεξῆς* that should provide certainty for Theophilus, because it reveals a repeated pattern of fulfillments following prior promise, but the case from Luke's other uses of *καθεξῆς* is unconvincing. Völkel (*NTS* 20 [1973-74] 289-99) has been able to show that the word can denote the use of an ordering principle that sets the parts in logical relation to a coherently understood whole (i.e., an ordering according to the sense of the whole), and this seems to suit best Luke's use here (cf. esp. Acts 11:4 and Völkel, 294).

Ancient prefaces generally speak in terms of a wider readership than the individual to whom the work is dedicated, even when this person is identified as a key reader (e.g., Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 1.1-18). Indeed most historiographical prefaces do not directly address the one to whom the work is dedicated (D. Earl, "Prologue-Form in Ancient Historiography," *ANRW*, vol. 1, part 2, 842-46). It may be reasonable, therefore, to take quite seriously Luke's apparent focused attention on the individual Theophilus, and to be prepared to attribute at least some of the idiosyncratic features of the work to Luke's concern to address Theophilus' particular situation.

The name Theophilus occurs frequently from the third century B.C. on for both Jews and Greeks. It is clear that the etymology of the name was not forgotten when the name was given ("a friend of God"; Cadbury, "Preface of Luke," 507). The many attempts at identifying Theophilus, either under that name, or assuming it is a pseudonym, are pure speculation. A symbolic significance for the name cannot be entirely ruled out. Much about Luke-Acts would well suit Cornelius-like readers.

κράτιστε, "most excellent," is an honorific title. It may be used loosely and imply no more than that Theophilus was socially respected and probably well-to-do, or it may indicate some kind of official status (see Fitzmyer, 300). Luke elsewhere uses *κράτιστος* only in address to Roman procurators (Acts 23:26; 24:3; 26:25), which may encourage us to find an official use here. The title is not repeated in Acts 1:1. Zahn (*Introduction* 2:42, 81-82) notes that this word is not used in early Christian literature of Christians, but our sources are hardly adequate to determine whether such titles would be dropped when addressing a fellow Christian in an official secular capacity, or, as here, whether the word would necessarily be avoided in a stylized dedicatory preface.

4 The construction *περί ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων*, with its absorption of the antecedent (*λόγων*) into the relative clause, could be variously resolved. *λόγων*, "words"/"matters"/"reports," should be retained within the subordinated matter by connecting *περί*, "concerning," with [*τῶν*] *λόγων*, "[the] words," to respect Luke's separation of, and final emphasis on, *τὴν ἀσφάλειαν*, "the truth." It is best not to read the *περί* also with the *ὧν*, "which," since it is simpler to have a word expressing the product of verbal activity (*λόγων*) function as direct object to a verb expressing verbal activity (*κατηχήθης*: cf. Delebecque, *Études grecques*, 8).

κατηχεῖν is later used as a technical term for pre- and post-baptismal instruction of converts, a sense that Schürmann, 15, claims already for the NT period,

and in particular for this text (cf. Acts 18:25–26; Gal 6:6; 1 Cor 14:19). The technical use emerges only later. In the NT period the word can mean “to teach” (Gal 6:6), but it can also mean “to convey information orally”—information that may or may not be accurate (Acts 21:21, 24). The generally secular and historiographical tone of the preface favors the latter neutral and non-instructional sense. Similarly, λόγων here will mean “reports” (see LSJ, 1058) and not “message” or “teaching” as it could in the body of the Gospel (e.g., Luke 6:47). (The Semitic sense “things” should not be admitted for the preface.) Luke writes so that Theophilus will know, about the reports that he has received, the truth. This does not prejudice the issue of how much Theophilus already knows about Christianity, but only acknowledges that he is being addressed as one outside the church, who is still a stranger to the church’s confident possession of the knowledge of what has been accomplished (the ἡμῶν, “us,” of v 2, and also of v 1). What was passed on by the eyewitnesses and given written form by the “many” is now to reach Theophilus.

Luke’s use of ἀσφάλειαν is still the language of the historian. He wants Theophilus to have “the facts” (Cadbury, “Preface of Luke,” 509). But this is part of the studied secularity of the preface. Luke wants Theophilus to embrace Christianity and to become part of the “us.” However, he does not want to say this directly in his preface. The body of the Gospel itself abandons any pretense of secularity and is as much proclamation as any of the others (Schürmann, *passim*; Marshall, *Historian and Theologian*, *passim*). But Luke is aware that the gospel does have a historical face, and to this he draws attention in his preface. Indeed, it is true that Luke is self-conscious about the role of historical evidence in commending Christianity to a degree not reflected by the other evangelists (see Nolland, “Impressed Unbelievers as Witnesses to Christ (Luke 4:22a),” *JBL* 98 [1979] 226–28); but he is no more inclined than they to treat Christian faith as a matter of historical proof. While Luke is certainly interested in the public visibility of the events pertaining to Christianity, he clearly shows that the impact of this public visibility does not necessarily create faith (Luke 4:22; Acts 6:15). It is a mistake to look here for a careful statement about Luke’s convictions on the relationship between history and faith, in a preface in which Christian conviction has been deliberately kept out of sight.

The beginning of Acts, with its summary of τὸν πρῶτον λόγον, “the first book,” suggests that we are dealing with a multivolume work. Also the distribution of motifs between the Gospel and Acts suggests strongly that the two volumes are designed to be read in close relation to each other. Nevertheless, the unity of subject matter linking the works of the “many,” the reports of the eyewitnesses, and Luke’s writing demands that the preface be restricted in the first instance to the Gospel narrative. As will appear below (see especially at 24:44–53), the Gospel has been written to be a work with its own integrity, as well as to be the first volume of a multivolume work.

Explanation

Luke begins his Gospel with a carefully composed literary preface which has a deliberately secular style and invites comparison of his work with that of the historians of his day. The preface is very noncommittal about the subject

matter of the work, beyond saying that Theophilus already knows what it is about. This suggests that we need to take quite seriously the focus of the work on Theophilus.

Luke introduces the fact that quite a number of others have already written about these matters as being an indication of their importance and as establishing a precedent for his own work. Contrary to many claims, Luke suggests not the slightest criticism of their work. They have taken in hand the task of producing an ordered narrative presentation of the events, much as Luke intends to do. They have written about the things that stand as accomplishments of supreme importance.

Alongside these written works, Luke speaks of an oral transmission. Those who were eyewitnesses from the beginning (Luke will have in mind the baptism of John) have made it their business, as devoted servants, to preserve and propagate the knowledge of these matters; the church has its knowledge of these things not vaguely, by hearsay, but confidently from eyewitness report. The activity of the eyewitnesses also establishes a precedent for Luke: the many who wrote, the eyewitnesses who passed on the gospel orally, and Luke himself are bound together by a devotion to making known these great accomplishments. (Luke's use of "the word" for what the eyewitnesses transmitted is the one point at which a Christian notion is presupposed in the preface.)

Luke has investigated carefully everything from way back, even back to the events surrounding the birth of Jesus (he has the historian-cum-biographer's sense that that is where to begin the account of an important figure). Attention to investigation will be matched by attention to composition. Luke will arrange and present his materials not in a disjointed manner, and not merely as a chronicler, but rather as a coherently conceived whole: as a message (cf. the use of "message" in v 2). Further, he will write it in relation to the concrete situation of Theophilus, or at least in relation to the kind of issues and questions that Luke knows will be of concern to a man like Theophilus.

The identity of Theophilus must remain unknown. But in Luke's eyes he was a person of substance and distinction, who had become acquainted with Christianity and, perhaps, had expressed a considerable interest (the Gospel is no tract for the casually interested).

Luke talks in his preface of Theophilus coming to know about the foundational facts of Christianity in the way that he might learn accurately about any other significant historical events. But Luke doesn't really think that knowing about Christianity like that makes a person a Christian. The preface may talk about secular knowledge, but what follows is religious testimony. It is true that Luke is more self-conscious than the other evangelists about the role of historical evidence in commending the Christian faith: the preface reflects this consciousness. But Luke's understanding of the relationship between faith and history must not be read out of a preface in which Christian conviction has been deliberately kept out of sight.

Though we know Luke followed the Gospel with a second volume, and that the completed work is a two-volume unity, the preface as such addresses only the contents of the Gospel, and only in a derived and secondary sense should its statements be applied to the contents of the second volume.

The Infancy Prologue (1:5–2:52)

Luke's story proper is prepared for by an "infancy gospel" which recounts in parallel the origins of John and Jesus, and establishes between them the relationship of transcending parallelism that is to prevail in later life. In an atmosphere of joy, worship, and confession, humble representatives of the best of Jewish temple piety experience "in embryo" the breaking in of the eschatological salvation of God. The OT deeds of God are reiterated and transcended as these two miraculous births set the stage for Luke's account of the climaxing in Jesus of all God's purposes.

John's Birth Announced (1:5–25)

Bibliography

GENERAL FOR 1:5–2:52

(For general studies concentrating only on the infancy of Jesus see at 1:26–38.)

Anderson, J. C. "Mary's Difference: Gender and Patriarchy in the Birth Narratives." *JR* 67 (1987) 183–202. **Audet, J.-P.** "Auteur de la théologie de Luc I–II." *ScEcll* 11 (1959) 409–18. **Aytoun, R. A.** "The Ten Lucan Hymns of the Nativity in Their Original Language." *JTS*, o.s., 18 (1916–17) 274–88. **Baer, H. von.** *Der heilige Geist*. 45–54. **Baudler, G.** "Aspekte für eine christliche Erziehung nach den lukanischen Kindheits Erzählungen." *TPQ* 134 (1986) 28–38. **Benoit, P.** "L'enfance de Jean-Baptiste selon Luc i." *NTS* 3 (1956–57) 169–94. **Bornhäuser, K.** *Die Geburts- und Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu: Versuch einer zeitgenössischen Auslegung von Matthäus 1 und 2 und Lukas 1–3*. BFCT 2/23. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1930. 75–144. **Box, G. H.** "The Gospel Narratives of the Nativity and the Alleged Influence of Heathen Ideas." *ZNW* 6 (1905) 80–101. **Braun, H.** *Qumran und das Neue Testament*. 1:77–86. **Brenner, A.** "Female Social Behaviour: Two Descriptive Patterns within the 'Birth of the Hero' Paradigm." *VT* 36 (1986) 257–73. **Brodie, L. T.** "A New Temple and a New Law: The Unity and Chronicler-based Nature of Luke 1:1–4:22a." *JSNT* 5 (1979) 21–45. **Brown, R. E.** *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in Matthew and Luke*. New York: Doubleday, 1977. 233–499. ———. "Gospel Infancy Research from 1976 to 1986: Part II (Luke)." *CBQ* 48 (1986) 660–80. **Burrows, E.** *The Gospel of the Infancy and Other Biblical Essays*. Bellarmine Series 6. London: Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1940. 1–58. **Carle, P.-L.** "Les deux premiers chapitres de Saint Luc et leur traduction." *Nova et vetera* 46 (1971) 188–201. **Conrad, E. W.** "The Annunciation of Birth and Birth of the Messiah." *CBQ* 47 (1985) 656–63. **Coppens, J.** "L'Évangile lucanien de l'enfance." *ETL* 33 (1957) 729–35. **Daniélou, J.** *The Infancy Narratives*. New York: Herder & Herder, 1968. **Davies, J. H.** "The Lucan Prologue [1–3]: An Attempt at Objective Redaction Criticism." *SE* 6 [TU 112] (1973) 78–85. **Davis, C. T., III.** "The Literary Structure of Luke 1–2." In *Art and Meaning: Rhetoric in Biblical Literature*, ed. D. J. A. Clines et al. JSOTSup 19. Sheffield: JSOT, 1982. 215–29. **Dawsey, J. M.** "The Form and Function of the Nativity Stories in Luke." *MelT* 36 (1985) 41–48. **Derrett, J. D. M.** "Further Light on the Narratives of the Nativity." *NovT* 17 (1975) 81–108. **Dibelius, M.** *Von Johannes dem Täufer*. 67–

77. ———. "Jungfrauensohn und Krippenkind: Untersuchungen zur Geburtsgeschichte Jesu im Lukas-Evangelium." *Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos.-histor.* 22/4. Heidelberg: C. Winters, 1932. **Dignath, W.** *Die lukanische Vorgeschichte.* Gütersloh: Mohn, 1971. **Dillon, R. J.** "St. Luke's Infancy Account: A Study in the Interrelation of Literary Form and Theological Teaching." *DunRev* 1 (1961) 5-37. **Dreyer, A. J. G.** *An Examination of the Possible Relation between Luke's Infancy Narratives and the Qumran Hodayot.* Amsterdam: "A. A. A. Rotex," 1962. **Erdmann, G.** *Die Vorgeschichten des Lukas- und Matthäus-Evangeliums und Vergils vierte Ekloge.* FRLANT 47. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1932. **Farris, S. C.** "On Discerning Semitic Sources in Luke 1-2." In *Gospel Perspectives: Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels*, vol. 2, ed. R. T. France and D. Wenham. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981. 201-37. **Feuillet, A.** *Jésus et sa mère, d'après les récits lucaniens de l'enfance et d'après Saint Jean.* Paris: Gabalda, 1974. ———. "Quelques observations sur les récits de l'enfance chez S. Luc." *Esprit et vie* 82 (1972) 721-24. **Ford, J. M.** "Zealotism and the Lukan Infancy Narratives." *NovT* 18 (1976) 280-92. **Fridrichsen, A.** "Randbemerkungen zur Kindheitsgeschichte bei Lukas." *SO* 6 (1928) 33-38. **Gaston, L.** *No Stone on Another.* 256-76. ———. "The Lukan Birth Narratives in Tradition and Redaction." In *Society of Biblical Literature 1976 Seminar Papers*, ed. G. MacRae. Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1976. 209-17. **George, A.** "Le parallèle entre Jean-Baptiste et Jésus en Lc 1-2." In *Mélanges bibliques*, FS B. Rigaux, ed. A. Descamps and A. de Halleux. Gembloux: Duculot, 1970. 147-71. ———. "L'Évangile de l'enfance selon Luc I et II." *CM* 67 (1969) 99-126. **Glöckner, R.** *Die Verkündigung des Heils beim Evangelisten Lukas.* 68-90, 114-24. **Goodman, F. W.** "Sources of the First Two Chapters in Matthew and Luke." *CQR* 162 (1961) 136-43. **Goulder, M. D., and Sanderson, M. L.** "St. Luke's Genesis." *JTS*, n.s., 8 (1957) 12-30. **Gros Louis, R. R.** "Different Ways of Looking at the Birth of Jesus." *BRev* 1 (1985) 33-40. **Gueuret, A.** *L'engendrement d'un récit: L'Évangile de l'enfance selon Saint Luc.* LD 113. Paris: Cerf, 1983. **Gunkel, H.** "Die Lieder in der Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu bei Lukas." In *Festgabe von Fachgenossen und Freunden A. von Harnack zum siebenzigsten Geburtstag dargebracht.* Tübingen: Mohr, 1921. 43-60. **Hilgenfeld, A.** "Die Geburts- und Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu Luc. 1,5-II,52." *ZWT* 44 (1901) 177-235. **Hillmann, J.** "Die Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu nach Lukas kritisch untersucht." *Jahrbuch für protestantische Theologie* 17 (1891) 192-261. **Hodgson, R.** "The Christmas Story." *BiTod* 22 (1984) 355-60. **Kassel, M.** "Weibliche Aspekte im lukanischen Kindheitsevangelium." *Diak* 15 (1984) 391-97. **Kaufmann, L.** "Geburt des Messias: Text und Kontext einer guten Nachricht." *Orientierung* 44 (1980) 250-53. **Kirchschläger, W.** "Beobachtungen zur Struktur der lukanischen Vorgeschichten Lk 1-2." *BLit* 57 (1984) 244-51. **Klaiber, W.** "Eine lukanische Fassung des sola gratia: Beobachtungen zu Lk 1,5-56." In *Rechtfertigung*, FS E. Käsemann, ed. J. Friedrich et al. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1976. 211-28. **Krafft, E.** "Die Vorgeschichte des Lukas: Eine Frage nach ihrer sachgemässen Interpretation." In *Zeit und Geschichte*, FS R. Bultmann, ed. E. Dinkler. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1964. 217-23. **Laurentin, R.** *Structure et théologie de Luc I-II.* EBib. Paris: Gabalda, 1957. ———. *Les évangiles de l'enfance du Christ. Vérité de Noël au-delà des mythes. Exégèse et sémiotique, historicité et théologie.* Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1982. = *The Truth of Christmas. Beyond the Myths. The Gospel of the Infancy of Christ.* Studies in Scripture. Tr. M. J. Wren et al. Petersham, MA: St. Bede's Publications, 1986. ———. "Traces d'allusions étymologiques en Luc 1-2." *Bib* 37 (1956) 435-56; 38 (1957) 1-23. ———. "Les Évangiles de l'enfance." *LumVie* 23 (1974) 84-105. ———. "Vérité des Évangiles de l'enfance." *NRT* 105 (1983) 691-710. **Lauveriat, M.** "Luc 2: une simple approche." *SémiotBib* 27 (1982) 31-47. **Leaney, A. R. C.** "The Birth Narratives in St. Luke and St. Matthew." *NTS* 8 (1961-62) 158-66. **Machen, J. G.** "The Origin of the First Two Chapters of Luke." *PTR* 10 (1912) 212-77. **MacNeill, H. L.** "The Sitz im Leben of Luke 1:5-2:20." *JBL* 65 (1946) 123-30. **Mann, C. S.** "The Historicity of the Birth Narratives." In *Historicity and Chronology in*

- the New Testament*. Theological Collections 6. Ed. D. E. Nineham et al. London: SPCK, 1965. 46–58. **Martin, R. A.** "Syntactical Evidence of Aramaic Sources in Acts I–XV." *NTS* 11 (1964–65) 38–59, esp. 52–59. **Meagher, G.** "The Prophetic Call Narrative." *ITQ* 39 (1972) 164–77. **Minear, P. S.** "Luke's Use of the Birth Stories." In *Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn, 111–30. ———. "The Interpreter and the Nativity Stories." *TToday* 7 (1950–51) 358–75. **Mullins, T. Y.** "New Testament Commission Forms, Especially in Luke-Acts." *JBL* 95 (1976) 603–14. **Muñoz Iglesias, S.** "El evangelio de la infancia en S. Lucas y las infancias de los héroes bíblicos." *EstBib* 16 (1957) 329–82. ———. "Midrás y evangelios de la infancia." *EE* 47 (1972) 331–59. **Neiryneck, F.** *L'évangile de Noël selon S. Luc*. Les études religieuses B 722. Brussels/Paris: La Pensée Catholique/Office Général du Livre, 1960. ———. "Structuur en theologie van Lc 1–2." *Collationes brugenses et gandavenses* 6 (1960) 222–27. **Nellessen, E.** "Zu den Kindheitsgeschichten bei Matthäus und Lukas: Bericht über neuere deutschsprachige Literatur." *TTZ* 78 (1969) 305–9. **Norden, E.** *Die Geburt des Kindes: Geschichte einer religiösen Idee*. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1924 (cf. the review by R. Bultmann, *TLZ* [1924] 319–23). **Oliver, H. H.** "The Lucan Birth Stories and the Purpose of Luke-Acts." *NTS* 10 (1963–64) 202–26. **Pax, E.** "Palästinensische Volkskunde im Spiegel der Kindheitsgeschichten." *BibLeb* 9 (1968) 287–99. **Pernot, H.** *Les deux premiers chapitres de Matthieu et de Luc*. Paris: Maisonneuve, 1948. **Perrot, C.** *Les récits de l'enfance de Jésus; Matthieu 1–2, Luc 1–2*. Cahiers Evangile 18. Paris: Cerf, 1976. ———. "Les récits d'enfance dans la haggada antérieure au II^e siècle de notre ère." *RSR* 55 (1967) 481–518. **Rersch, A.** *Das Kindheitsevangelium nach Lukas unter Herbeiziehung der aussercanonischen Paralleltex-te quellenkritisch untersucht*. TU 10/5. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1897. **Riedl, J.** *Die Vorgeschichte Jesu: Die Heilsbotschaft von Mt 1–2 und Lk 1–2*. Biblisches Forum 3. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, n.d. [1968]. **Rossmiller, C. J.** "Prophets and Disciples in Luke's Infancy Narrative." *BiTod* 22 (1984) 361–65. **Ruddick, C. T., Jr.** "Birth Narratives in Genesis and Luke." *NovT* 12 (1970) 343–49. **Sahlin, H.** *Messias*. 63–342. **Salazar, A. M.** "Questions about St. Luke's Sources." *NovT* 2 (1957–58) 316–17. ———. "The Nativity in Luke." *Faith and Freedom* 13 (1959) 39–40. **Schierse, F. J.** "Weihnachtliche Christusverkündigung: Zum Verständnis der Kindheitsgeschichten." *BibLeb* 1 (1960) 217–22. **Schürmann, H.** "Aufbau, Eigenart und Geschichtswert der Vorgeschichte, LK 1–2." *BK* 21 (1966) 106–11. **Schweizer, E.** "Zum Aufbau von Lukas 1 und 2." *Neues Testament und Christologie im Werden: Aufsätze*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1982. 11–32. **Solages, B. de.** "Réflexions sur les évangiles de l'enfance." *BLE* 72 (1971) 37–42. **Songer, H. S.** "Luke's Portrayal of the Origins of Jesus." *RevExp* 64 (1967) 453–63. **Spitta, F.** "Die chronologischen Notizen und die Hymnen in Luc 1 u. 2." *ZNW* 7 (1906) 281–371, esp. 313–17. **Stempvoort, P. A. van.** "Maria in Lukas I." *HB* 20 (1961) 166–76. **Talbert, C. H.** "Prophecies of Future Greatness: The Contributions of Greco-Roman Biographies to an Understanding of Luke 1:5–4:15." In *The Divine Helmsman*, ed. J. L. Crenshaw and S. Sandmel. New York: KTAV, 1980. 129–41. **Tatum, W. B.** "The Epoch of Israel: Luke i–ii and the Theological Plan of Luke-Acts." *NTS* 13 (1966–67) 184–95. **Thompson, P. J.** "The Infancy Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke Compared." *SE* 1 [TU 73] (1959) 217–22. **Tsuchiya, H.** "The History and the Fiction in the Birth Stories of Jesus—An Observation on the Thought of Luke the Evangelist." *AJBI* 1 (1975) 73–90. **Turner, N.** "The Relation of Luke i and ii to Hebraic Sources and to the Rest of Luke-Acts." *NTS* 2 (1955–56) 100–109. **Usener, H.** "Geburt und Kindheit Christi." *ZNW* 4 (1903) 1–21. **Vögtle, A.** "Offene Fragen zur lukanischen Geburts- und Kindheitsgeschichte." *BibLeb* 11 (1970) 51–67. **Völter, D.** "Die Apokalypse des Zacharias im Evangelium des Lukas." *Theologisch Tijdschrift* 30 (1896) 224–69. **Voss, G.** "Die Christusverkündigung der Kindheitsgeschichte im Rahmen des Lukasevangeliums." *BK* 21 (1966) 112–15. **Wickings, H. F.** "The Nativity Stories and Docetism." *NTS* 23 (1976–77) 457–60. **Wilson, R. M.** "Some Recent Studies in the Lucan Infancy Narratives." *SE* 1 [TU 73]

(1959) 235-53. **Winter, P.** "Two Notes on Luke I, II with Regard to the Theory of 'Imitation Hebraisms.'" *ST* 7 (1953) 158-65. ———. "Some Observations on the Language in the Birth and Infancy Stories of the Third Gospel." *NTS* 1 (1954-55) 111-21. ———. "The Cultural Background of the Narrative in Luke I and II." *JQR* 45 (1954-55) 159-67, 230-42, 287. ———. "The Proto-source of Luke I." *NovT* 1 (1956) 184-99. ———. "On Luke and Lucan Sources: A Reply to the Reverend N. Turner." *ZNW* 47 (1956) 217-42. ———. "'Nazareth' and 'Jerusalem' in Luke chs. i and ii." *NTS* 3 (1956-57) 136-42. ———. "The Main Literary Problem of the Lucan Infancy Story." *ATR* 40 (1958) 257-64; cf. *Vox Theologica* 28 (1957-58) 117-22. ———. "Lukanische Miscellen." *ZNW* 49 (1958) 65-77. ———. "On the Margin of Luke I, II." *ST* 12 (1958) 103-7.

FOR 1:5-25

Badham, F. P. "The Integrity of Luke i. 5-ii." *ExpTim* 8 (1896-97) 116-19. **Benoit, P.** "L'Enfance de Jean-Baptiste selon Luc i." *NTS* 3 (1956-57) 169-94. **Böcher, O.** "Lukas und Johannes der Täufer." *SNTU* 4 (1979) 27-44. **Dubois, J.-D.** "La figure d'Elie dans la perspective lucanienne." *RHPR* 53 (1973) 155-76. **King, P. J.** "Elizabeth, Zachary, and the Messiah." *BiTod* 1 (1964) 992-97. **König, E.** "Elisabeth." *ExpTim* 20 (1908-9) 185-86. **Scott, R. B. Y.** "The Expectation of Elijah." *CJRT* 3 (1926) 1-13. **Wink, W.** *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition*. Cambridge: University Press, 1968. 58-82. **Winter, P.** "Hoti 'recitativum' in Lc 1, 25.61; 2,23." *ZNW* 46 (1955) 261-63; cf. *HTR* 48 (1955) 213-16.

Translation

⁵It happened that in the days of Herod, the king of Judea, there was a certain priest by the name of Zechariah of the priestly division of Abijah; and his wife was of the daughters of Aaron, and her name was Elizabeth. ⁶They were both righteous before God, walking blameless in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord. ⁷But they did not have a child, because Elizabeth was barren, and both of them were advanced in years.

⁸It happened, when he was serving as priest in the turn of his priestly division to be before God, ⁹that according to the custom of the priesthood the lot fell to him to go into the temple of the Lord and offer incense, ¹⁰and the whole multitude of the people was there, praying outside at the hour of incense. ¹¹An angel of the Lord appeared to him, standing at the right side of the altar of incense. ¹²Zechariah was troubled when he saw him and fear fell upon him. ¹³The angel said to him,

"Do not fear, Zechariah,
because your prayer has been heard,
and your wife Elizabeth will bear you a son,
and you will call his name John.

¹⁴For you there will be joy and gladness,
and many will rejoice at his having been born.^a

¹⁵For he will be great before the Lord,
and he will not drink wine or beer,
and he will be filled with the Holy Spirit

*from the time when still in his mother's womb,
¹⁶and he will restore many of the sons of Israel
 to the Lord their God.*

*¹⁷He will go ahead^b before him
 in Elijah's spirit and power,
 to turn the hearts of fathers toward their children
 and the disobedient to the wisdom of the righteous,
 in order to establish for the Lord a people who are prepared."*

¹⁸But Zechariah said to the angel, "How will I know this? For I am old and my wife is advanced in years." ¹⁹The angel answered him, "I am Gabriel who stands in the presence of God, and I was sent to speak to you, and to announce to you the good news of these things. ²⁰Now,^c you will be reduced to silence and unable to speak until the day in which these things happen, because you did not believe my words, which will be fulfilled in their time."

²¹Meanwhile,^d the people were waiting for Zechariah and were marveling at his delay in the temple. ²²When he came out he was unable to speak to them, so they realized that he had seen a vision in the temple (he kept gesturing to them and remaining mute). ²³When^e the days of his priestly service were completed, he went off to his home.

²⁴After these days, Elizabeth his wife became pregnant and hid herself for five months, saying, ²⁵"This is how the Lord^f has dealt with me in the days when he looked to take away my disgrace among people."

Notes

^a γενήσεται, the normal word for birth, is read here by a few texts (Γ Ψ 053 f¹.¹³ etc.).

^b The προσελύσεται of B* C L etc. would make for an approach to God, in place of a going ahead of God. It may be influenced by a priestly understanding of Elijah (cf. Jeremias, *TDNT* 2:930, 932–33).

^c Lit., "and, behold."

^d Lit., "and."

^e An "and it happened that" (καὶ ἐγένετο) has been omitted in translation here for clarity of flow.

^f Κύριος, "Lord," is omitted here by A B Θ Ψ etc.

Form/Structure/Setting

1:5–2:52

Despite dissenting views (see recently Wilkens, *TZ* 34 [1978] 1–2; Talbert, "Prophecies of Future Greatness," 129–30) the vast majority of scholars rightly recognize 1:5–2:52 as the first major section of Luke's account. It is separated from the dedicatory preface (1:1–4) by a shift both from literary Greek to heavily Semitic Greek and from studied secularity to a tone of intense Jewish piety. Within the section, the materials concerning the infancies of John the Baptist and Jesus are bound together by close parallelism (1:5–20 cf. 1:26–38; 1:57–66 cf. 2:1–21; etc.) and by the entwining of materials dealing with the respective figures (esp. 1:39–56 and the placing of 1:26–38 earlier than the account of the birth of John [1:57–66]). 1:5–2:52 is distinguished from

the beginning of chap. 3 by the fresh setting in world history provided at that point, by the move from the infancy to the adult careers of John and Jesus, by the disappearance from the scene of the characteristic participants in the story thus far (the leaping of the prenatal John [1:41], and the temple visit of the twelve-year-old Jesus [2:41–52] provide the only bridge; Mary reappears briefly in 8:19–21), and by the total failure to play any role in the continuing story line from 3:1 onward of the insight achieved by participants in chaps. 1 and 2.

The impulse to preface a Gospel account with an “infancy gospel” is not evidenced for Mark, the earliest of our Gospels, nor for John, and does not seem to have been part of the shape of the earliest preached gospel as reflected in any part of the New Testament (but see Gal 4:6); but it led to a whole genre of infancy gospels in later Christian tradition (see E. Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha*, ed. W. Schneemelcher, vol. 1, sec. 8). The Lukan annunciation accounts in particular show a heavy dependence on OT prototypes (esp. Judg 13:2–7; 1 Sam 1–3), and OT allusion is pervasive in Luke 1 and 2. However, Erdmann (*Vorgeschichten*, 8) rightly stresses as parallel the provision of infancy and early youth narratives in Greco-Roman biography (esp. by Plutarch), and this has been spelled out in detail by Talbert (“Prophecies of Future Greatness”). At the same time, the way in which theological perspectives that are foundational for the Gospel as a whole are established in the infancy narratives justifies Audet’s comparison (*ScEccl* 11 [1959] 412–13) with the *προοίμια*, “prefaces,” of classical and Hellenistic literature. These *προοίμια* set the perspective for the reader to understand correctly the main body of the work to follow (cf. Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 3.14). In Luke 1 and 2 the strong element of angelic and prophetic statement provides place for a directness of statement which gives way, at least in part, to more subtle communication along the story line of the Gospel narrative. Yet even this is a little misleading. Despite the directness of the statement, what is striking is not the instruction and explanation provided for the reader, but rather the pervasive religious experience of joy, worship, and confession: we have stumbled into the worship service rather than the catechetical class. There is much to be said for Schürmann’s judgment (24) that, despite obvious links with contemporary genres, just as the first apostolic preaching created the literary form “gospel,” and apostolic pastoral care created the form “apostolic epistle,” so the believers’ confession of the coming of Christ has created the distinctive narrative form in which the infancy events are reported.

To the already mentioned Jewish use of OT prototypes (i.e., typology) and the Hellenistic likeness to Greco-Roman biography and *προοίμια* must be added two further Jewish elements. The first is the similarity of Luke 1 and 2 to Jewish haggadic synagogue preaching with its expansion of OT narratives for the purpose of illuminating the deeper sense of these events and moving the hearer to response. The literary deposit of this preaching activity is to be found in the Jewish midrashim.

The approach to haggadah reflected here is that of R. Bloch (“Midrash,” *Approaches to Ancient Judaism: Theory and Practice*, ed. W. S. Green [Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1978] 1:29–50 [= French of 1955?]) and G. Vermes (*Scripture and Tradition in Judaism:*

Haggadic Studies [SPB 4; Leiden: Brill, 1961]). Cf. also A. G. Wright, "The Literary Genre Midrash," *CBQ* 28 (1966) 105–38, 417–57. The study of the haggadic component of the midrashim is in its infancy (cf. the critical remarks of G. G. Porton, "Defining Midrash," *The Study of Ancient Judaism, I. Mishnah, Midrash, Siddur*, ed. J. Neusner [New York: KTAV, 1981] 55–92, esp. 77–79), and it would be a mistake to use this likeness between Luke 1 and 2 and haggadah as a basis for far-reaching decisions about the infancy narratives (e.g., with respect to historical basis). It must be stressed that the Lukan infancy accounts exhibit an incredible reserve in comparison with typical haggadic developments of OT infancy narratives (cf. Perrot, *RSR* 55 [1967] 481–518 for examples). An extensive bibliography on midrash, assembled by L. Haas, may be found in *Study of Ancient Judaism* 1:93–103.)

The second additional Jewish element is especially to be discerned in the visits of the angel Gabriel (1:11–20, 26–38 and cf. 2:9–14). Here we encounter a narrative mode that is familiar to us from Jewish apocalyptic texts. While angelic visitation has a wider provenance, the naming of angelic figures derives from apocalyptic circles (beginning from Dan 8–12), and in the apocalyptic manner the angel Gabriel announces end-time events (again the point of departure is Dan 8–12).

The importance of the infancy narratives for Luke's theological presentation has not always been recognized. Indeed, the infancy accounts are almost totally ignored in Conzelmann's classic study. And, even more widely, Lukan scholarship has failed to come to terms with the fact that it is precisely with these infancy narratives, with their intense Jewish piety, that Luke considers that he will be able to establish a point of first contact with his intended readership.

R. E. Brown (*Birth*, 242–43) has helpfully compared the role of Acts 1 and 2 in the Book of Acts to that of Luke 1 and 2 in the Gospel account. Both are important in foundational ways for what follows. But, more than that, there is the important shared atmosphere of fulfillment and worship between the openings of the respective books (cf. Minear, "Luke's Use"). It will not do (with Oliver, *NTS* 10 [1963–64] 202–26) to relegate the infancy narratives to the period of Israel, nor (with Conzelmann, *Luke*, and many after him) to deny to the pentecostal church a sense of participation in eschatological fulfillment.

Various attempts have been made to structure the infancy narratives in relation to an extensive correlation to a block of OT material (Burrows [*Infancy*] speaks of an "imitative historiography" based on 1 Sam 1–3; Goulder [*Midrash*, 452–59, 472] finds a calendrical correlation with Gen 17–37; Ruddick [*NovT* 12 (1970) 343–48] claims that the order of Gen 27–43 has been followed; Brodie [*JSNT* 5 (1979) 21–37] is persuaded that Luke 1–2 is a rewriting of 1 and 2 Chronicles). While many acute observations of Lukan allusion are to be found in these studies, the initial attractiveness of at least Burrows's and Ruddick's schemes is overturned by the ease with which an alternative can be found.

Beyond the obvious parallel between the treatment of John and Jesus, decisions concerning the internal structuring of the section have remained somewhat problematical. The major units are for the most part clear: annunciation, 1:5(8)–(23)25; second annunciation, 1:26–38; visitation, 1:39–(55)56; birth, circumcision, naming, 1:57–66 (or birth, 1:57–58, circumcision and naming, 1:59–66;

or continue unit to v 79[80]); Benedictus, 1:67–79[80]; birth, circumcision, naming, 2:1–21 (or birth, 2:1–7; annunciation, 2:8–20; circumcision and naming, 2:21 [this could be separate with 2:1–20 considered a single unit; also it can be absorbed into the following unit]); temple presentation, 2:[21]22–[38][39]40; Jesus with the temple teachers, 2:41–[50][51]52. The minor uncertainties about start and finish of units has mostly to do with whether introductory, transitional, or concluding elements should be accorded a separate status. More difficult than establishing the units is the discernment of the logic of such a sequence. R. E. Brown (*Birth*, 251–52) seeks to cut through all the difficulties by looking for clear structure only in a first phase of composition prior to the insertion of the canticles (1:46–55, 67–79; 2:28–33) and the appending of 2:41–52. But despite this expedient, Brown's structure is no more convincing than other proposals. No real improvement has been made on the structure proposed by Dibelius, *Von Johannes dem Täufer*, 67:

Annunciation of the birth of the Baptist by the angel Gabriel (1:5–25)

Annunciation of the birth of Jesus by the angel Gabriel (1:26–38)

Mutual greeting of the mothers of the two unborn children (1:39–56)

Birth, circumcision, and naming of the Baptist with accompanying wonders (1:57–66)

Birth, circumcision, and naming of Jesus with accompanying wonders (2:1–21)

Greeting (perhaps recognition would be better) of the little John by the inspired Zechariah; growth of the child (1:67–80)

Greeting (recognition) of the little Jesus by the inspired Simeon and Anna; growth of the child (2:22–40)

Proof of the surpassing significance of the child Jesus, by means of his behavior in the temple (2:41–52).

(The correspondence between 1:39–56 and 2:41–52 would, perhaps, be better exhibited if we spoke respectively of John's and Jesus' future role anticipated, and noted that only in these sections of the infancy narrative do John [yet unborn] and Jesus, respectively, actually play an active role.)

Because the Baptist account in 1:57–66 is focused on the circumcision and naming, while the parallel Jesus account (2:1–21) is focused on the birth, one should perhaps divide these sections chiastically:

Statement of birth (1:57–58)

Scene of birth (2:1–20)

Scene of circumcision and naming (1:59–66)

Statement of circumcision and naming (2:21).

But this may be only to make an artistic virtue out of the state of Luke's sources. Indeed, the difficulties with the structure point more than anything to a significant Lukan use of sources: only the two annunciations are closely parallel in form; the bare notice in 2:21 allows what is essentially a birth account

(2:1–20) to stand parallel to a circumcision and naming tradition (1:57–66), while the Benedictus (1:67–79), which is really part of the circumcision and naming account, is pressed into service as a parallel for 2:22–40 by the simple expedient of separating it from its natural position (1:64), so that it can stand as a distinct item, and appending to it the growth statement of 1:80 (which has its natural home after 1:66), to which a parallel is provided in 2:40.

The least satisfactory aspect of the present structural analysis is the existence of three growth statements, only two of which play a structural role, and similarly three statements about the taking to heart of what was heard/experienced (1:66; 2:19, 51). This may reflect two stages of composition. Of the three growth statements, 2:40 is the most clearly Lukan in language and, as we have seen, corresponds to the structural needs of the final form. If we treat the canticles as added later by Luke (along with the temple presentation setting for the Simeon canticle), then the pre-canticle structure may well have been:

A	Annunciation (1:5–25)	A ¹	Annunciation (1:26–38)
B	John's future role anticipated (1:39–45)	C ¹	Birth, circumcision, and naming (2:1–24?, 39)
C	Birth, circumcision, and naming (1:57–64)	B ¹	Jesus' future anticipated (2:41–51)
D	Conclusion: taking to heart, growth, location (1:65–66, 80)	D ¹	Conclusion: location, taking to heart, growth (2:51–52).

(Note the better parallel between B and B¹ without the Magnificat [1:46–55].) At the final stage of editing, the conclusion for the Johannine infancy is broken up to generate the unit 1:67–80 as a parallel to 2:22–40. The taking-to-heart statement now becomes part of 1:57–66, and Luke, inspired by 2:51, adds a similar statement in v 19 to the parallel section 2:1–21.

Among scholars there has been a protracted debate over whether the obvious Semitisms of Luke 1 and 2 have source implications. Little recent support has been found for the Aramaic sources suspected by some earlier scholars (e.g., Godet, 85; Plummer, xxvi, 7, 46). The field remains fairly equally divided between those who stress Luke's ability to write Jewish (Septuagintal) Greek (e.g., Benoit, *NTS* 3 [1956–57] 169–94; N. Turner, *NTS* 2 [1955–56] 100–109; Turner allows for ultimate Semitic sources; Benoit does so only for 1:68–75, 78–79) and those who insist on a Hebrew substratum (notably Winter's various essays).

Frequently the interest in a Semitic substratum goes hand in hand with an appeal to a Baptist sect document polemically altered by a Christian editor (Dibelius, "Jungfrauensohn," 3–8; Erdmann, *Vorgeschichten*, 50–53; P. Vielhauer, "Das Benedictus des Zacharias," *ZTK* 49 [1952] 255–72; Winter, *NovT* 1 [1956] 184–99). The positive interest in John the Baptist, appealed to by this view, is undeniable, but the isolation of a Baptist sect document is a product of an inappropriate literalism; and Wink is surely closer to the mark when he identifies the Baptist materials as the earliest Christian hagiography, stemming from Christians who had responded in turn to the ministries of John and Jesus (*John the Baptist*, 42–82).

However, separated from the Baptist sect document theory, the arguments of Winter for Hebrew sources remain (despite Benoit and Turner) essentially unanswered. Winter is able to identify (i) a significant number of texts in which an independent relationship to the MT better accounts for the present Lukan text than would a basis in the LXX; (ii) Semitisms that are not Septuagintal; and (iii) a situation in which the logic of the narrative is only evident through retranslation. See also Laurentin's careful and sober work (*Bib* 37 [1956] 435-56; 38 [1957] 1-23) on the difficult-to-assess matter of etymological allusions. (It is notable that Goulder and Sanderson, who argue so forcefully for free Lukan composition, nevertheless concede to Luke a smattering of Hebrew, or at least an OT closer to the MT than our LXX.) At the same time Benoit and Turner are certainly right to insist that Luke can and does write Septuagintal Greek. We cannot, therefore, generalize from Winter's work to claim all the Semitisms in the infancy narratives as due to translation. Winter's texts are well scattered through Luke 1 and 2, but the density, and the nature of the arguments involved, are not such as to make it possible to insist on a Hebrew source for every episode or canticle (the recent statistical argument of Farris ["Sources"] is altogether too optimistic about the separation of translation Greek from Septuagintal imitation, especially in view of his own criticisms of the criteria adopted). See individual sections for further discussion. Special attention has been directed to the source question in 1:5-25 and 1:26-38, and in these texts at least a strong case can be made for extensive Hebrew documentary sources.

The fact that the internal connections between units of the Jesus infancy material are far looser than between the two main units of the Baptist infancy material (1:5-25; 1:57-66, 80) probably has source implications. 2:1-20 does not presuppose the annunciation (1:26-38), and only in the broadest sense is either presupposed by 2:22-38. 2:41-51 in its turn has no particular connection with any of the previous units. In its present form 1:26-38 is dependent on the Baptist annunciation. But through all these materials we have to reckon with significant Lukan rewriting; also, the recognition of a common dependence in both annunciations upon stereotyped biblical patterns of announcement (R. E. Brown, *Birth*, 156; and cf. Meagher, *ITQ* 39 [1972] 164-77; Mullins, *JBL* 95 [1976] 603-14; Hubbard, *Semeia* 8 [1977] 103-26) renders the dependence less striking and makes it entirely possible that the core of 1:26-38 could have been quite independently transmitted. The canticles, while appropriate, are not firmly anchored in their present contexts and could easily have been transmitted separately. Only the meeting of the two mothers (1:39-45) presupposes something of the larger present context, and even here a core (esp. v 44) could have been transmitted without reference to the present literary context. It is as we might expect that there should be a range of independently transmitted traditions about the infancy of Jesus, but only a more limited basis in the case of John.

It is striking that the infancy narratives in Matthew and Luke do not have a common episode. Given the difficulties of harmonization, it does not seem possible that either account could have been written with an awareness of the other (despite the imaginative midrash views of M. D. Goulder, *Midrash*, and R. Gundry, *Matthew*, and cf. P. J. Thompson, *SE* 1 [= TU 73] [1959]

217–22). For that reason special weight can be given to the basic agreement which, nevertheless, exists between the two accounts. At least the following twelve items are attested to by both infancy narratives (Fitzmyer, 307):

- (i) Jesus' birth is related to the reign of Herod (Luke 1:5; Matt 2:1);
- (ii) Mary is a virgin engaged to Joseph, but they have not yet begun to live together (Luke 1:27, 34; 2:5; Matt 1:18);
- (iii) Joseph is of Davidic descent (Luke 1:27; 2:4; Matt 1:16, 20);
- (iv) The coming birth is angelically announced (Luke 1:28–30; Matt 1:20–21);
- (v) Jesus is understood to be a son of David (Luke 1:32; Matt 1:1);
- (vi) His conception is through the Holy Spirit (Luke 1:35; Matt 1:18, 20);
- (vii) Joseph plays no part in the conception (Luke 1:35; Matt 1:18–25);
- (viii) The name "Jesus" is divinely provided (Luke 1:31; Matt 1:21);
- (ix) An angel speaks of Jesus as "Savior" (Luke 2:11; Matt 1:21);
- (x) Jesus is born after Mary and Joseph have come to live together (Luke 2:4–7; Matt 1:24–25);
- (xi) Jesus is born in Bethlehem (Luke 2:4–7; Matt 2:1);
- (xii) Jesus' family settle in Nazareth in Galilee (Luke 2:39, 51; Matt 2:22–23).

The orientation of Luke's account to Mary may, at least in part, be due to his desire to balance the orientation to Zechariah of the tradition concerning John's origins.

1:5–25

The account of the infancy of John the Baptist is presented in three major sections: the annunciation, 1:5–25; birth, circumcision, and naming, 1:57–66; and Zechariah's rejoicing and prophetic greeting of his infant son, 1:67–80. To these can be added the exultant movement of the unborn John at the approach of the pregnant Mary in 1:44 and the account of the adult ministry in 3:1–20. Further discussion of John is to be found at 5:33; 7:18–35; 9:7, 9; 11:1; 16:16; 20:4, 6.

Luke establishes the beginning point for his account in the heartland of Jewish piety attached to the temple. John's parents are exemplary law-keeping Jews of the first order and Zechariah is a priest (1:5–6). Not only that, but the decisive impetus for all that is to follow takes place when Zechariah has his once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to offer incense before the Lord at the altar of incense (1:9): no lesser figure than the angel of the Lord, Gabriel himself, confronts Zechariah in the temple (1:11). The infancy narratives begin and end in the temple (cf. 2:41–51), the whole Gospel account begins and ends in the temple (cf. 24:53), and Jesus is taken off to trial and execution from a daily temple teaching ministry (21:37–38). In Acts as well the temple is a focus of Christian loyalty from chap. 2 to chap. 26.

By means of OT allusion the events of John's beginnings are shown to reiterate the shape of God's acts in the past on behalf of his people. And while these are taken up onto a higher level (1:14–15; cf. 7:26) and given an eschatological setting (1:17), there is nothing here that goes beyond the reach of existing Jewish piety.

Taken alone, the Baptist infancy material would celebrate the greatness of

John and his connections with the eschatological purposes of God. But Luke does not allow us even for a moment to take them alone. He interrupts the Baptist account immediately after its first episode to set alongside it the annunciation of the birth of Jesus, follows this up with the meeting of the two mothers, and has the prophecy of Zechariah to be more a celebration of the Davidic savior than of his prophetic precursor, John. The significance of the account of John's origins is controlled by being clamped closely together with that of Jesus' origins (the two promised sons represent the one purpose of God). By this means, at every stage, as the accounts are allowed to unfold in parallel, it is shown that this one than whom none greater has been born of woman (7:28) is, nevertheless, to be totally overshadowed by the coming of the one who is mightier than he (3:16).

There are strong internal connections between 1:5-25 and 1:57-66 to the extent that neither could have existed without the other, though it must be admitted that 1:57-66 adds little that could not have been spun out of 1:5-25 and a reasonable knowledge of Jewish custom, and may, therefore, be an expansion of a more summary conclusion (but the poor balance between 1:56-66 and 2:21 argues against Luke's being responsible for any such expansion). The case for a Hebrew original is strong in 1:5-25 where a Hebrew text would make transparent the connection in thought (1:13) between "your prayer has been heard" and "you shall call his name John [יֵהוָה, *Yôhānān* = Yahweh is gracious]" and where 1:17 shows a relationship to the Hebrew text of Mal 4:5 (cf. Sir 48:10) which is clearly independent from the LXX. (See *Comment* below where an attempt has been made to map in some detail the relationship of the text to Lukan style, Septuagintal usage, and other Hebraisms.) The general verisimilitude of the account has been well demonstrated by Winter (*JQR* 45 [1954-55] 159-67, 230-42).

The account 1:5-25 subdivides naturally into an introduction (1:5-7) of the main participants (Zechariah and Elizabeth), the annunciation itself (1:8-23), and a preliminary statement of fulfillment (1:24-25). The central annunciation has been connected with a "commissioning" (the word is used broadly) form used frequently in Luke-Acts in full or in part (B. J. Hubbard, *The Matthean Redaction of a Primitive Apostolic Commissioning* [Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1974] 33-65; Hubbard, *Semeia* 8 [1977] 103-26; Mullins, *JBL* 95 [1976] 603-14). The seven elements of this "commissioning" form are said to be (i) circumstantial introduction (vv 8-10); (ii) confrontation between commissioner and commissioned (v 11); (iii) reaction to the holy presence (v 12); (iv) commission proper (vv 13-17); (v) protest to commission (v 18); (vi) reassurance (vv 19-20); and (vii) conclusion (vv 21-23). There is merit to this form analysis, but two qualifications need to be stressed: (i) that it is not really a commissioning that makes up the common denominator for Luke's utilization of this form, and (ii) that the degree of compliance with the form is quite variable. This "commissioning" form is clearly to be related to OT antecedents, and in particular to the call narratives Judg 6:11-24; Exod 3; Jer 1:4-10, but also (and especially here) to the birth oracles Gen 16:7-14; 17-18; Judg 13:2-23. As will be seen at 1:26-38, a comparison of the two annunciation accounts reveals that the first accommodates more closely to the birth oracle form, and the second comes much closer to the call narrative form. In terms of the "commissioning" form

that has been identified, the judgmental sign in vv 19–20 is distinctive (but cf. Isa 7:11–25, esp. v 19). However, the place of a sign is familiar from Judg 6:37–40 and 2 Kgs 20:8–11.

Comment

There is a jarring transition from the studied secularity of 1:1–4 to the deeply religious atmosphere of the infancy narratives. Luke will at once make his thesis clear, and this thesis is confessionally religious in nature. The elements of the faith mirrored in the infancy narratives are at one and the same time those of a traditional temple-centered Jewish faith and those of a fully Christian confession of Jesus as the eschatologically anticipated Christ of God and as the transcendent Son of God.

Schürmann (106) rightly identifies 2:1–20 as the heart and center of Luke 1 and 2: where John *will* be something (1:15–17, 66) Jesus already *is* of intrinsic significance (2:11) and is the content proper of God's eschatological act (2:29–30). Within the limits of 1:5–25, that for which John will prepare (1:16–17) lacks concrete description (he will "make ready for the Lord a people prepared"). But it is clear that despite John's unsurpassed greatness (1:15) he is to be a preparer, and not the true object of hope.

5 From the beginning a pervasive typological connection is established between the infancy narratives and the past saving acts of God (in their biblically reported dress) by means of an "anthological style." (This term, adopted by Feuillet [*Jésus et sa mère*, 154] from A. Robert, seems best to describe the deliberate evocation in Luke 1 and 2 of OT narrative by the use of terms and themes from the OT as well as more developed typological correspondence in the recounting of the infancy events.)

ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἡρώδου βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας, "it happened in the days of Herod king of Judea," at once evokes the biblical period of the kings of Judah and thus the deeds of God in that setting (cf. esp. Jer 1:2, 3 [LXX: ἐγένετο ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις Ἰωακείμ . . . βασιλέως Ἰούδα]; Amos 1:1). Only Luke's definite article before Ἰουδαίας "Judea," is not Semitic (though it is regularly found in the LXX). The Herod here is Herod the Great, who ruled from 37 to 4 B.C. (Derrett's attempt [*NovT* 17 (1975) 82–85] to identify the Herod here with Archelaus only creates fresh problems at 3:1–2, 23.) Herod's territory also included Galilee, Samaria, and much of Perea and Coele-Syria, but attention is here, for the sake of OT correspondence, restricted to Judea. (Luke can also use Judea in a broader Hellenistic sense as a term for the whole of Palestine [e.g., 4:44; 6:17; 7:17, etc.], but such is not the case here. The narrower sense is sustained through the infancy narratives [1:65; 2:4] and is also found at 3:1, 5:17; 21:21, etc.)

The introduction of the man and his wife that follows also evokes OT patterns. Cf. esp. 1 Sam 1:1–2 and Judg 13:2, where in each case the couple are unable to have children (cf. Luke 1:7), and Gen 18:11, where the added element of the advanced age of the couple is present (cf. Luke 1:7). The use of *τις*, "a certain," after the noun is rare outside Luke in the NT but is used quite frequently by him (10:25, 30, 31, 33; 14:2, 16; 15:11, etc.). It is not characteristic of the LXX (it is found in Job 1:1; 35:15; Bel 2 [closest with ἀνθρωπὸς τις ἦν ἱερεὺς]; and then 2, 3, and 4 Maccabees). We should perhaps regard it here

as a non-Septuagintal Semitism (cf. for example the $\tau\pi\alpha \psi\alpha$, 'š 'ehād ["a certain man"], of Judg 13:2 and 1 Sam 1:1). $\delta\nu\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\iota$, "by name," is also Lukan and non-Septuagintal (more than twenty-five times in Luke-Acts [R. E. Brown, *Birth*, 258]). Its use here may, however, obscure an original $\kappa\alpha\iota \tau\omicron \delta\nu\omicron\mu\alpha$, $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\eta\varsigma$ ("and his name"), to avoid a repetition of the $\kappa\alpha\iota \tau\omicron \delta\nu\omicron\mu\alpha$ ($\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\eta\varsigma$) later in the verse (cf. Machen, *PTR* 10 [1912] 213). The name Zechariah is used seven times for a priest or Levite in 1 and 2 Chronicles (R. E. Brown, *Birth*, 258), but there is no reason to treat the name as based upon a confusion between a priestly Zechariah and the minor prophet that precedes Malachi (as Goulder and Sanderson [*JTS* 8 (1957) 15], who press to a radical extreme the evident anthological style).

The priests were divided into twenty-four courses, each of which provided in turn priestly service in the temple for one week, twice in the year. The earlier preexilic divisions (1 Chr 24:7-18) were apparently reconstituted out of the four divisions that returned from exile (Ezra 2:36-39; 10:18-22). The word Luke uses for these courses ($\acute{\epsilon}\phi\eta\mu\epsilon\rho\iota\alpha$) is found in the LXX of 1 Chr 23:6 and is also found in a first-century-B.C. inscription (BAGD, 330). The division of Abijah is the eighth of the courses (special dignities were attached to the first of the courses [Zahn, 63 n. 52], but there is no reason to think beyond that of a ranking of the courses). Goulder and Sanderson (*JTS* 8 [1957] 17) note that the following course in 1 Chr 24:10 is that of Jeshua (=Jesus).

$\kappa\alpha\iota \gamma\upsilon\eta \acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega$, "and his wife," = $\kappa\alpha\iota \psi\omega\gamma\eta$, $\acute{\omega}\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\omicron$, of Judg 13:2. The LXX has $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omicron\upsilon$. $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa \tau\omicron\omega\upsilon \theta\upsilon\gamma\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\upsilon \text{'A}\alpha\rho\omega\upsilon$, "of the daughters of Aaron," indicates that Elizabeth was descended from pure priestly stock. A priest could marry any pure Israelite, but a marriage within the priestly stock was to be preferred. The use of "daughter" is Semitic (e.g., Gen 24:3, מִבְּנוֹת , $mib\acute{e}n\acute{o}t$ ["one of the daughters of"]), but the precise expression has not been reported. The corresponding מִבְּנֵי אַהֲרֹן , $mib\acute{e}n\acute{e} \text{'a}h\acute{a}r\acute{o}n$ ("of the sons of Aaron"), is well attested (e.g., Lev 7:33). $\kappa\alpha\iota \tau\omicron \delta\nu\omicron\mu\alpha \acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\eta\varsigma$ ("and her name"; cf. $\kappa\alpha\iota \tau\omicron \delta\nu\omicron\mu\alpha$, $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\eta\varsigma$), in 1 Sam 1:1; the LXX uses the dative and not Luke's genitive) is non-Lukan (cf. at 1:27, $\kappa\alpha\iota \tau\omicron \delta\nu\omicron\mu\alpha \tau\eta\varsigma$. . .). The LXX uses $\kappa\alpha\iota \tau\omicron \delta\nu\omicron\mu\alpha$ ($\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\eta\varsigma$) some eighteen times (George, "Jean-Baptiste et Jésus," 166). Elizabeth (Elisheba) was the name of Aaron's wife (Exod 6:23) and thus a desirable name in priestly circles. Goulder and Sanderson (*JTS* 8 [1957] 17) trace the use of the name to the need for Elizabeth and Mary to be related (1:36): Elizabeth is wife and Mary (Miriam) is sister of Aaron (Exod 15:20). But on this basis the name could equally be Jochebed (Aaron's mother, Exod 6:20) or that of a wife of Moses.

A priestly origin plays no role in the presentation of the significance of John in any of our sources, and thus is not to be connected with any Qumran (or other) priestly messianic expectation.

6 For the same use of $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$, "righteous," in Luke see 1:17; 2:25; 23:47; Acts 10:22; and cf. Luke 14:14; 15:7; Acts 24:15. An exemplary Jewish piety is in view (cf. Gen 6:9; Sus 3 [LXX and Theod.]; Sir 44:17), which has an apologetic value for Luke. In the NT only Luke uses $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\upsilon\tau\iota\omicron\upsilon$, "before." It is used often in the LXX (in connection with $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\varsigma$ at, e.g., Gen 7:1; Job 32:2). For the juxtaposition of $\delta\iota\kappa\alpha\iota\omicron\iota$ and $\pi\omicron\rho\epsilon\iota\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$, "to go," cf. Hos 14:10. Benoit

(NTS 3 [1956–57] 172) is correct that *πορευόμενοι ἐν ταῖς ἐντολαῖς [καὶ δικαιώμασιν]*, “going in the commandments [and ordinances],” is not strictly speaking a Septuagintal idiom for obedience to God. It does, however, correspond to the Hebrew of 2 Chr 17:4 (בְּמִצְוֹתַי הָלַךְ, *bēmizōtāyw hālak* [“to go in the commandments”]) and 1 Kgs 8:61 (לֵלֶךְ בְּחֻקָּי, *hālak bēhuqqāyw* [“to go in the ordinances”]). “Commandments” and “ordinances” are a frequent OT pair, but in neither Hebrew nor Septuagintal idiom do they share a common definite article (and genitive qualifier). Sahlin (*Messias*, 71) helpfully conjectures that Luke added ἀμεμπτοι, “blameless,” to clarify the force of the Semitic idiom (though the word ἀμεμπτος is a good OT word, e.g., Gen 17:1).

In the infancy narratives [ὁ] Κύριος, “[the] Lord,” is used almost exclusively for God (twenty-six times; of Jesus in 1:43 and 2:11, assuming that we have there an uncorrupt text). Elsewhere Luke uses Κύριος without the article for God and with the article for Jesus (Winter, ZNW 49 [1958] 70). The infancy narratives, therefore, may well reflect a source usage.

7 For the comparison with Abraham and Sarah, and the mothers of Samson and Samuel, see at 1:5. To the list of famous cases of barrenness in Israel we must add that of Rebekah (Gen 25:21) and that of Rachel (Gen 29:31). The initial καὶ (“and”) is to be read adversatively (“but”): barrenness was not normally the fate of the righteous (cf. Lev 20:20–21). οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς τέκνον, “they did not have a child,” does not correspond closely to either MT or LXX. καθότι, “because,” is used only by Luke in the NT and is quite frequent in the LXX. στεῖρα is used for barrenness in Gen 25:21; 29:31; Judg 13:2. Since advanced age is not a cause of childlessness, the final clause should be treated separately from the καθότι. Its role is to heighten the sense of miracle in what follows. προβεβηκότες ἐν ταῖς ἡμεραῖς, “advanced in years,” reflects OT idiom (Gen 18:11; 24:1; Josh 13:1; 23:1; 1 Kgs 1:1). Luke’s inclusion of ἐν (contrast LXX) probably reflects the כ (b) of a Hebrew source (so Winter, NTS 1 [1954–55] 114); but as Benoit notes (NTS 3 [1956–57] 173), Luke always elsewhere employs ἐν with the dative plural ἡμεραῖς, “days,” so the difference could merely be Lukan.

8 Having finished with introductions, the text now reports the episode in relation to which the aged couple are of interest. Vv 8–10 provide the immediate setting. ἐγένετο (“it happened”) + ἐν τῷ (“when”) + infinitive is frequent in Luke-Acts and also in the LXX. ἐγένετο with a finite verb is found eight times in the infancy narratives, six times in the rest of Luke, not at all in Acts, and frequently in the LXX. The two come together in both the infancy narratives and the body of the Gospel.

9 κατὰ τὸ ἔθος, “according to the custom,” is not Septuagintal (only Bel 15 [Theod.]). The MT of 1 Sam 2:13 is closest: מִשְׁפַּח הַכֹּהֲנִים, *mišpat hakkōhānim* (“the custom of the priests”). κατὰ τὸ ἔθος is also found at 2:42 and 22:39. Luke’s frequent use of ἔθος (ten of twelve NT occurrences) suggests that the phrase may be Lukan. The particular temple duties were allocated by lot (*m. Tamid* 5:2–6:3). Given the large number of priests available, the privilege of offering incense before the Lord would normally be expected only once or twice in a lifetime (Jeremias [*Jerusalem*, 200] estimates the number of priests in Palestine at about eight thousand). Incense was offered morning and evening (Exod 30:7–8) in connection with the daily sacrifice (Str-B, 2:71–75). It was offered at the table of incense, which stood in the holy place before the curtain

separating the holy place from the most holy place (Exod 30:1-6; cf. 1 Macc 1:21-22), and was as near as an ordinary priest would ever get to the most holy place. ναός, "temple," used here covers only these two places. The broader word ἱερός, normally used by Luke, covers the whole temple complex.

10 [πᾶν τὸ] πλῆθος ἦν τοῦ λαοῦ, "[all the] multitude of the people," does not occur in the LXX, though πλῆθος, "multitude," is common. The idiom is found in the MT of Jer 26:17 (כָּל־הָעָם לְפָנַי, *kol-qēhal hā'ām*). However, both the ἦν ("was") which intrudes before the genitive (unique in the infancy narratives [Schlatter, 157]) and the three other cases in Luke-Acts where τοῦ λαοῦ ("of the people") modifies πλῆθος suggest that τοῦ λαοῦ could also be Lukan (Sahlin, *Messias*, 72-73). πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος is Septuagintal (approx. seventeen times). Periphrastic tenses (as here) are used frequently by Luke (Luke, forty-eight; Acts, thirty-nine).

The presence of the praying crowd suggests that the evening offering time is in view. Presumably the smoke of the incense was the signal for prayer (cf. Ps 141:1-2; Rev 8:3-4). Acts 3:1 locates this "hour of prayer" (cf. Dan 9:20-21) at around three in the afternoon. Luke uses λαός for this historic people of God (cf. at 3:15). Here faithful Israel is pictured at worship, at the commencement of the fateful chain of events that will constitute Luke's story.

11 Although Zechariah would have been in the company of other priests for most of the ceremony, *m. Tamid* 6:3 seems to allow at the end for a brief moment of private prostration before God for the chief officiant. This will be the moment of encounter. (In the normal course of events, those charged with the final details would have walked in on the encounter [*m. Tamid* 6:1-3; *b. Yoma* 47a; cf. Winter, *JQR* 45 (1954-55) 233], but this is beyond the scope of the narrative concern.) We have the setting; the decisive event now unfolds.

The LXX uses ὤφθη, "he appeared," of the divine appearances to Abraham (Gen 12:7; 17:1; 18:1) and others. Exod 3:2 has the full Lukan phrase ὤφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος Κυρίου, "the angel of the Lord appeared to him," and cf. also Judg 6:12. The lack of an article with ἄγγελος, "angel," is possibly Semitic; but if the dependence is here on the LXX, then the addition of the article in second occurrences in Gen 16:7, cf. v 8; and Judg 2:1, cf. v 4 (but not in Gen 22:11, cf. v 15) suggests that the LXX translators may have taken the phrase indefinitely (in Gen 31:11 and Exod 14:19 they make the phrase definite with the article). This second option may find support in the giving of a name to the angel (vv 19, 26), since the OT angel of the Lord is not an angelic being, but rather a way of describing God's own visible presence among men. (Postexilic, and especially apocalyptic, Judaism has a variety of named angels.) The phrase in Acts seems to be indefinite (5:19; 8:26; 12:7, 23).

Luke uses ὤφθη for various other kinds of appearances as well (Luke 24:34; Acts 2:3; 7:2, 26, 30, 35; 9:17; 13:31; 16:9; 26:16). ἰστάναι ἐκ δεξιῶν, "to stand at the right," is used again in Acts 7:55: the right side being the favored side, the angel's visit to Zechariah is thereby shown not to be ominous (Fitzmyer, 324-25). The south side of the altar is intended (the altar is described in Exod 30:1-10; 37:25-29). Earlier revelations in the temple are reported in 1 Sam 3:4-14; Isa 6:1-13 (and cf. Str-B, 2:77-79). John Hyrcanus is said to have experienced a revelation during the time of incense offering (Josephus,

Ant. 13.282–83). Against making the whole thing a matter of inner experience, Schürmann (32) rightly protests that to do so does not make clear enough the transcendent nature of this experience of revelation.

A whole series of clues suggest that Zechariah's experience is to be compared to that of Daniel to whom Gabriel announces the eschatological events. Already here the appearance is at the time of the evening sacrifice (Dan 9:20–21); in Luke 1:13 it is connected with prayer (Dan 9:20); the fear of Luke 1:12 matches that of Dan 8:17; 10:7; *ὄπτασία*, "vision," in Luke 1:22 is found six times in Dan 9–10 (Theod.); both in Luke 1:20, 22 and Dan 10:15 the visionary is rendered mute. It may even be that a symbolic interest in the seventy weeks of Dan 9:24 lurks behind the explicit and implicit chronological indicators of the infancy account (six months=180 days between the two annunciations; nine months=270 days for Mary's pregnancy; and 40 days from there to the presentation [cf. Lev 12]: total 490 days=seventy weeks). This view is proposed by Burrows (*Infancy*, 41–42) and defended carefully by Laurentin (*Structure*, 48–50), but falls short of certainty. Further connections with Daniel may be discerned in the account of Mary.

12 Luke uses *ταράσσειν*, "to be troubled," similarly in Luke 24:38, but differently in Acts. The verb is used in connection with a vision in Dan 7:15 (LXX and Theod.), but closest is Tob 12:16 where with the coming of the angel Raphael *ἐταράχθησαν . . . καὶ ἔπεσον ἐπὶ πρόσωπον, ὅτι ἐφοβήθησαν*, "they were troubled . . . and fell on their faces because they were afraid." The cognate verb *διαταράσσειν* is used in Mary's parallel experience (Luke 1:29). Such fear is the standard reaction to the presence of the divine (Exod 15:16; Jdt 15:2; Matt 28:4; Luke 2:9). *φόβος ἐπιπίπτει ἐπὶ*, "fear to fall upon," is good LXX idiom.

13 *εἶπεν πρὸς*, "he said to," is Lukan (seventy-two times in the Gospel: Machen, *PTR* 10 [1912] 219) but also frequent in the LXX. As regular as the fear evoked by a divine visitation is the reassuring *μὴ φοβοῦ* ("do not fear"; cf., for example, Gen 15:1; Judg 6:23; Dan 10:12, 19; Tob 12:17). In Gen 28:13 the LXX adds this motif to the MT. For childlessness as occasion for prayer see Gen 25:21; 30:22; 1 Sam 1:10–13, 17. The declaration that prayer has been heard is also not uncommon (cf. 2 Kgs 20:5; Dan 10:12; Sir 51:11; Sus 44 [Theod.]). Closest is Dan 10:12, which in Gabriel's (?) words combines the "do not be afraid" and a statement that Daniel has been heard. Divine birth annunciations are to be found in Gen 17:19 (cf. v 16); 18:10; Judg 13:3; 1 Kgs 13:2; Isa 7:14; and cf. Gen 16:11. A name is divinely provided in Gen 16:11; 17:19; Isa 7:14; and cf. 1 Kgs 13:2. Closest is Gen 17:19, *Σάρρα ἡ γυνὴ σου τέξεται σοι υἱόν, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰσαάκ* ("Sarah your wife will bear you a son, and you will call his name Isaac"), but Luke does not use the LXX word for "to bear," nor follow the word order of LXX (or MT). Judg 13:3 has little common wording but provides immediately thereafter the motif of abstinence from wine or strong drink (cf. Lk 1:15). "To call the name of a person something" is a Semitism, found in the LXX, and also in the infancy narratives at 1:31; 2:21, but not elsewhere in Luke's writings.

Heaven-given names always have etymological significance. The name John (Ἰωάννης, *Yōhānān*) means "God has been gracious," while the cognate ΠῑπΠ, *tēhinnā* ("prayer for favor"), is rendered by the LXX as *δέησις*, the word in

Luke 1:13 for prayer. Thus the logical basis for the specified name is in the original Hebrew provided by the statement that the prayer for favor has been heard (Winter, *NTS* 1 [1954-55] 120; Laurentin, *Bib* 37 [1956] 441-42).

While attempts to structure the angelic message are not entirely persuasive (best is R. E. Brown [*Birth*, 261], who sections vv 13-14; vv 15-16; v 17), the message is full of the kinds of parallelism that mark Hebrew poetic form.

14 *καὶ ἔσται χαρά* ("and there will be joy," cf. 15:7; 21:23) is Semitic (Largange, 16: in Hebrew the gender-related verb form would remove the ambiguity as to the subject), although *χαρά*, "joy," is an important word for Luke, expressing the joy of eschatological fulfillment (esp. Luke 2:10; 10:17; 24:41, 52). *ἀγαλλίασις*, "rejoicing," has a similar force (cf. 1:44; Acts 2:46). Because of Luke 1:16, the *πολλοί*, "many," is probably not the Semitic inclusive use: not all will respond to John (7:29-30, 33). *γένεσις* here is not "birth" as such, but rather John's having been born and thus having come on the scene (Schürmann, 33 n. 48).

15 For the sake of translation back into Hebrew a connection with 1 Sam 2:21 (cf. Exod 2:11; *Jub.* 17.13) is attractive: "He will grow up." But this does not produce a satisfactory flow in our present text (v 15b would need to precede v 15a), and is discouraged by the *ἔσται*, "he will be." The qualifying *ἐνώπιον Κυρίου*, "before the Lord," separates John's greatness off from that contemplated in Acts 8:9 (but not that of 5:36). But, even if there were no qualifiers, we should not press Laurentin's sharp distinction (*Structure*, 36) between greatness standing alone as only an attribute of God, and greatness qualified as appropriate to man (cf. *T. Levi* 17.2). The following clauses locate John's greatness in a special consecration to God and in John's significance for salvation history.

οἶνον καὶ σίκερα, "wine and beer," is a stereotyped OT expression (Lev 10:9; Num 6:3; Deut 14:26; Judg 13:14; etc.). *σίκερα* is normally used for alcoholic drinks not made from grapes, and especially for beer. Here John's abstinence echoes Judg 13:7 (and cf. 1 Sam 1:15; note that the LXX wording of Judg 13:7 does not seem to be in view, nor the wording of the LXX addition at 1 Sam 1:11, which speaks of Samuel in similar terms [this reading now has the support of 4QSam^a]) and expresses his consecration to God without necessarily implying a specific Nazirite vow (cf. Luke 7:33).

The idiom *πιμπλάναι πνεύματος ἁγίου* (with or without the article and without regard for word order) is found three times in the infancy narratives, five times in Acts, and not in the rest of the NT or the LXX (Machen, *PTR* 10 [1912] 224). Further, OT references to the Holy Spirit are always used with a possessive (in Wis 1:5 the qualifier is "of instruction"; in *Pss. Sol.* 17.42 there is an anarthrous use without qualifier). While the role of God's Spirit with the OT prophets is clear enough (1 Sam 10:10; 2 Sam 23:2; 2 Kgs 2:9-16; Isa 61:1; Ezek 11:5; Joel 3:1 [ET 2:28]), what we have here, if only in an anticipative way, is the filling with the Spirit that is eschatological (cf. Acts 2:18). The dominantly anarthrous reference to the Holy Spirit in the infancy narratives (five out of six occurrences: the adjective is consistently after the noun) is Semitic and in light of Luke's varying usage in Acts may imply a source usage. That Luke evidently sees v 17 as parallel to v 35 (*πνεῦμα, δύναμις* ["spirit, power"]) makes it unlikely that he is responsible for the reference to the Spirit here. *Τὸ ἐκ κοιλίας μητρὸς αὐτοῦ*, "from the womb of his mother,"

compare Ps 22:10 [21:11 LXX] (and Judg 16:17) מִבֶּטֶן אִמִּי, *mibbeten 'immi* ("from the womb of my mother"). The expression could mean "from birth" or even "prenatally." The ἐτι ("even"; cf. Isa 48:8) as well as Luke 1:41, 44 indicates the latter. Such total invasion by the Spirit of God is unprecedented, but it is quickly to be surpassed in the case of the one whose very existence is due to creative movement of the Spirit (1:35) and whose task it will be to dispense the eschatological Spirit (3:16).

16 Many (πολλούς), but not all, will respond to John's call (cf. v 14). "The sons of Israel" is standard OT idiom for the people of Israel (Exod 40:36; Lev 1:2; Hos 3:4–5; etc.) and is used by Luke (Acts 5:21; 7:23, 37; 9:15; 10:36). The striking idiom "to restore someone to God (the Lord, etc.)" is rare in both MT and LXX. MT has as the servant's role in Isa 49:5, לְשׁוּבָב אֵלָיו יַעֲקֹב, *lēšōbēb ya'āqōb 'ēlāyw* ("to restore Jacob to him"; "Israel" is used in the following parallel clause), and 2 Chr 19:4 reports how Jehoshaphat went out among the people וַיְשִׁיבֵם אֶל־יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵי אֲבוֹתֵיהֶם, *wayēšībēm 'el-Yhwh 'ēlōhē 'ābōtēhem* ("and restored them to the LORD, the God of their fathers"). The second of these is reproduced by the LXX using ἐπιστρέφειν, "to restore," and while the text seems to be disturbed, 2 Chr 15:4 has the same idiom with God (?) as subject. (Cf. more remotely Lam 5:21; Ezek 34:16; Mal 2:6; Sir 48:10; Jas 5:19–20.) Apart from vv 16–17 here Luke does not use ἐπιστρέφειν transitively. Lukan composition is not likely.

17 The unstressed καὶ αὐτός, "and he," is Semitic, but also frequent elsewhere in Luke's Gospel (though not in Acts). προελεύσεται ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, "he will go before him," echoes the thought but not the language of Mal 3:1. The phrase is neither Lukan nor Septuagintal. John will go before God in the sense of Mal 3:23–24 [ET 4:5–6]: he precedes the great and terrible day of the Lord which means both salvation and judgment (cf. Fitzmyer, 327). The juxtaposition of πνεῦμα, "spirit," and δύναμις, "power," is Lukan (cf. 1:35; 4:14; Acts 10:38; and cf. Luke 24:48–49; Acts 1:8; 6:8, 10), and the present phrase does not reflect Hebrew idiom (Sahlin, *Messias*, 81). It is likely that καὶ δυνάμει, "and power," is a Lukan addition, perhaps specifically inspired by 1:35. Luke will not have in view, for John, the miracles of 1 Kgs 17–18: the language is simply controlled by the parallel with Jesus. For Elijah's spirit cf. 2 Kgs 2:9, 15. Elsewhere in Luke the declined form is used for Elijah's name.

ἐπιστρέψαι καρδίας πατέρων ἐπὶ τέκνα, "to turn the hearts of fathers toward [their] children," is derived from the MT of Mal 3:24 [ET 4:6] along a track independent of both LXX and Sir 48:10, since it adopts a different solution than those texts do to the problem posed by rendering appropriately the singulars and plurals of the MT (cf. Winter, *ZNW* 49 [1958] 65–66). Sahlin (*Messias*, 83) is perhaps correct that the common omission by Luke, LXX, and Sir 48:10 of the following complementary statement in the MT—"and the heart of the children to the fathers"—stems from a shared theological motif of pessimism about the adequacy of the response of the "fathers" to God (in Luke cf. 6:23, 26; Acts 7:52; 28:25), but there may be no more than accidental agreement in economizing so as to make room for an added generalizing statement. In the larger Lukan picture this renewal of family harmony must be balanced by the division of 12:53.

The juxtaposition of "wisdom" and "the righteous" is unusual. It may reflect

the eschatological situation of Dan 12:3 where "the wise . . . turn many to righteousness." *ἐτοιμάσαι*, "to prepare," is best subordinated to *ἐπιστρέψαι*, "to turn": it does not denote a separate activity. In the OT, only 2 Sam 7:24 uses the idiom "to establish [for the Lord] a people" (but cf. Sir 49:12 and more remotely Exod 19:17). The juxtaposition of *ἐτοιμάσαι* and *κατεσκευασμένον*, "prepared," makes the normal sense, "to prepare," unlikely for *ἐτοιμάσαι* and suggests the more Semitic sense "to establish" which *ἐτοιμάσαι* gains under the influence of Hebrew *יָבַן*, *kān* (this is better than thinking of an awkward combination of the LXX of Mal 3:1 and the related Isa 40:3, as R. E. Brown does [*Birth*, 278]). Luke does not use the verb in this way. The use of *κατεσκευασμένον* may reflect Mal 3:1 LXX (cf. Luke 7:27, Luke's only other use of the verb), but need not (cf. Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 2.188, *πλῆθος κατεσκευασμένον πρὸς τὴν εὐσέβειαν* ["a multitude prepared for worship"]).

In the angel's message no trace has been allowed to appear of the relationship of John to another coming one, but neither has there been anything that does not entirely fit the broader NT picture of John.

18 *εἶπεν* . . . *πρὸς*, "he said to," is Lukan (see at v 13). *κατὰ τί γινώσσομαι*, "how shall I know," is clearly meant to reflect the question of Abraham in Gen 15:8 and has been conformed to the LXX wording (Benoit, *NTS* 3 [1956-57] 174-75). The allusion to Abraham is further strengthened by the following statement about age (Gen 18:11-12; the language differs significantly from the LXX). A similar desire for certainty about a divine revelation can be seen in Judg 6:36-37 and 2 Kgs 20:8, but only here is the uncertainty grounded in a perceived obstacle to the fulfillment of the promise. Perhaps this is sufficiently distinctive to justify the motif of unbelief in vv 19-20.

19 The self-disclosure here already implies the impropriety of Zechariah's question. *ἀποκρυβείς* . . . *εἶπεν*, "having answered . . . he said," is Lukan (but Jeremias [*Sprache*, 39-41] argues that Luke does not use the idiom after *καί*) and also Septuagintal. Gabriel's OT role is as revealer of the eschatological mysteries (Dan 8-12). In later Jewish angelology he is one of the four (*1 Enoch* 9.1; 40.2) or seven (*1 Enoch* 20; *T. Levi* 8; Tob 12:15; Rev 8:2, 6) angels who stand in the presence of God. *παριστάναι ἐνώπιον*, "to stand before," is Septuagintal, and is used by Luke again in Acts 4:10 (but Luke prefers the participle form *παρεστώς* to the *παρεστηκώς* of the present verse [Benoit, *NTS* 3 (1956-57) 175]). In a Hebrew text "I was sent" (*ἀπεστάλην*) would be cognate with "angel" (*מַלְאָךְ*, *mal'āk*). Some echo of Dan 10:11 may be intended. If so, more is made of that connection in the parallel Luke 1:26-30. *εὐαγγελισσασθαι τινί τι*, "to announce the good news of something to someone," is Lukan (4:43; Acts 8:35; cf. Luke 3:18; Acts 15:35; 17:18) and as in Luke 3:18 (see there) should be given the full Christian sense: "to announce the good news of salvation." Luke does not deny this to John (cf. 1:77).

20 *καὶ ἰδοὺ*, "and behold," is Semitic but also thoroughly Lukan (twenty-seven times in Luke; nine times in Acts). The repetition in the clause following is Semitic (cf. Judg 13:3; Isa 54:1; Ep Jer 40 [Sahlin, *Messias*, 89]). *ἄχρι ἧς ἡμέρας*, "until the day in which," is thoroughly Lukan (Luke 17:27; Acts 1:2) and not Septuagintal. *ἀνθ' ὧν*, "because," is Lukan and Septuagintal.

R. E. Brown (*Birth*, 263) suggests "reduced to silence" for *σιωπῶν*, which would suit well 1:62. The silence may have a triple role. It is certainly punitive

("because you did not believe"); it probably is meant to be a sign creating certainty (cf. Gen 15:9–21; Judg 6:36–40; 2 Kgs 20:8–11; and cf. 1 Sam 10:2–16; Luke 1:36; 2:12); and there may be an apocalyptic secrecy motif according to which Zechariah's silence is designed to keep God's plans from human beings until the appropriate time (cf. Dan 8:26; 12:4, 9; Rev 10:4). Zechariah's unbelief is later contrasted with Mary's belief (1:45). The same verb for "fulfilled" is used by Luke at 4:21 and 24:44 in connection with the Scriptures.

21 προσδοκᾶν, "to wait for/expect," is Lukan, and not frequent in the Septuagint. So also is the periphrastic construction of which it is part (cf. at v 10). The people were "waiting" because, as the main officiating priest, it was Zechariah's place to take the lead in the blessing of the people pronounced corporately by the priests at the conclusion of the incense offering (*m. Tamid* 7:2). Popular nervousness about a priest staying too long in the temple is reflected in the directive in *m. Yoma* 5:1. After the lengthy interchange of vv 13–20 the temple setting comes again clearly into focus.

22 ὄρασις, "vision," could be from Daniel (9:23; 10:1, 7, 8, 16 [Theod.]). It also occurs in Luke 24:23; Acts 26:19. For unstressed καὶ αὐτός, "and he," see at v 17. The periphrastic tense ἦν διανεύων, "he was nodding/beckoning," may be from Luke, as the use of ἐπιγινώσκειν ὅτι ("to realize that"; cf. 7:37; 23:7; Acts 3:10; 4:13; 19:34; 22:29; 24:11; 28:1; the idiom is not found in the other Gospels).

Silence descends on Zechariah at once, and he is not able to pronounce the blessing. Is the blessing here withheld delivered by Jesus in Luke 24:50–51 (R. E. Brown, *Birth*, 280)? The inference of the people is only sensible in relation to a tradition of divine apparitions in the temple (see at v 11). Zechariah could only communicate by body movements. κωφός can mean both "mute" and "deaf," more often the latter. Probably both are implied here (cf. v 62).

23 ἐγένετο ὡς ("it happened that, when") occurs three times in Luke 1 and 2, and only in Luke 19:29 of the remainder of the NT. It is not infrequent in the LXX, but Luke prefers ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ. πῖμπλασθαι, "to fulfill," is used five times in the infancy narratives of the fulfillment of a time, but never in this sense by Luke (Benoit, *NTS* 3 [1956–57] 175).

With the going home from the temple Burrows (*Infancy*, 8) compares 1 Sam 1:19, which is also followed by a conception. A note of departure comes near, or at, the end of six of the infancy episodes (1:38, 56; 2:20, 39, 51 [1:24–25; 2:40; and 2:52, which follow statements of departure, are in each case somewhat independent from the episodes to which they are attached]). The verb of this verse is repeated in the parallel verse 1:38. Here the verse provides a connective to vv 24–25, which will record the beginning of the positive fulfillment of Gabriel's words.

24 μετὰ δὲ ταύτας τὰς ἡμέρας, "after these days," recurs but with different word order in Acts 21:15. It is not Septuagintal idiom (there are two occurrences of the Acts 21:15 word order: Jdt 16:21 and Dan 1:18, LXX). περικρύπτειν, "to hide," occurs only here in the NT and not at all in the LXX.

After the days of separation necessitated by Zechariah's priestly duty, Elizabeth conceives, and, with a sense of privacy about the precious and intimate way that God has dealt with her in her old age, withdraws into seclusion with her secret, until the stage where her pregnancy will be physically obvious (cf.

Schlatter, 154). (We should think in terms of the nine-month pregnancy of 2 Macc 7:27; 4 Ezra 4.40, rather than the ten lunar months of Wis 7:2–3.) Elizabeth's withdrawal continues the secrecy imposed on Zechariah (cf. at v 22) and also explains Mary's later (v 36) ignorance of the pregnancy of her relative. As Schürmann (38 n. 82) notes, the implicit time notice of v 41 is the crucial one which the others anticipate or follow on from.

25 Benoit (NTS 3 [1956–57] 172) recognizes *οὕτως μοι πεποίηκεν Κύριος*, "thus the Lord has done to me," as a Semitism not otherwise evidenced in Lukan style. He derives it from Gen 21:1 LXX. But then we would expect *ἐπεσκέψατο*, "he visited," rather than the *ἐπείδεν*, "he looked [upon]," of Luke's text (Luke's only other use of this verb has a different sense [Acts 4:29], whereas he is quite fond of *ἐπισκέπτεσθαι*). With the lack of the article before *δνειδος*, Luke's phrase *ἀφελείν δνειδός μου*, "my disgrace," is more Semitic than the LXX of Gen 30:23 to which it is close (Luke's text has also stayed closer to the MT word order).

Elizabeth expresses her wonderment at God's graciousness to her in terms reminiscent of the experience of Sarah (Gen 21:1) and Rachel (Gen 30:23). (On the disgrace of childlessness see Gen 16:4, 11; 29:32; 30:1; 1 Sam 1:5–6, 11; 2:5, 7–8.)

Explanation

The studied secularity and polished style of the preface gives way abruptly to the heavily Semitic Greek and the deep reverence of Jewish temple piety which characterize the infancy narratives (1:5–2:52). The "infancy gospel" is a new departure in comparison with Mark. It has strong links with OT infancy accounts (esp. Judg 13:2–7; 1 Sam 1–3), but also with infancy and early youth narratives in Greco-Roman biography. Luke uses the infancy narratives to establish foundational theological perspectives for the correct understanding of the main body of the work to follow (much as the "prefaces" of classical and Hellenistic literature do). Here he establishes a point of first contact with his intended readers. And he does so by describing the joy, worship, and confession with which faithful Judaism responds to this fresh movement of God "in embryo." The infancy narratives are reported with almost constant echoing of OT items: what happens here is to be understood in terms of what happened there.

The infancy narratives are set out with an evident parallel between John and Jesus, but with Jesus surpassing John in every respect. Schematically the major units and their structural relationship may be represented:

A (1:5–25)	A ¹ (1:26–38)
B (1:39–56)	
C (1:57–66)	C ¹ (2:1–21)
D (1:67–80)	D ¹ (2:22–40)
B ¹ (2:41–52).	

It seems likely that Luke had Hebrew sources, probably already translated into Greek before him, for much of the infancy accounts.

The first unit (1:5–25) begins by evoking the biblical period of the kings of Judah (Jer 1:2, 3; Amos 1:1). Herod the Great (37–4 B.C.), whose territory was much broader, was in fact king of Judea (Judah). Zechariah and Elizabeth also at once call to mind OT counterparts: Elkanah and Hannah (1 Sam 1:1–2); Manoah and his wife (Judg 13:2); and Abraham and Sarah (Gen 18:11). Despite their exemplary piety they are childless, and now old.

Twice in the year Zechariah's section of the priesthood, as one of the twenty-four divisions, provided priestly service in the temple for one week, and the principal duties were allocated by lot. To make the incense offering fell to a priest only once or twice in a lifetime and was thus a high point of privilege and honor, the closest that an ordinary priest would ever get to the presence of God in the most holy place on the other side of the dividing curtain. The afternoon incense offering at around 3:00 P.M. was a special time of prayer, and crowds gathered in the temple courtyards (cf. Acts 3:1; Ps 141:1–2; Rev 8:3–4). Faithful Israel is, thus, at worship when Zechariah has his fateful experience in the temple. This is not the first revelation to occur in the temple (1 Sam 3:4–14; Isa 6:1–13).

It is the angel Gabriel (cf. v 19), who in the OT appears only in the Book of Daniel, who encounters Zechariah. And a whole series of clues suggest that we should think in terms of Gabriel's announcements of end-time events to Daniel (Dan 9:20–21 cf. Luke 1:10; Dan 9:20 cf. Luke 1:13; Dan 8:17; 10:7 cf. Luke 1:12; "vision" in Dan 9–10 cf. Luke 1:22; Dan 10:15 cf. Luke 1:20, 22). Even the passage of time from the annunciation to Zechariah to the presentation of Jesus in the temple can be computed as the seventy weeks of Dan 9:24.

The elements of the encounter all have clear antecedents in the OT. At the same time the recounting of the annunciation here also contains a set of formal elements which will recur frequently in Luke-Acts in full or in part. This has been loosely called a commissioning form, but the commissioning element is slight here—although it will be prominent in the annunciation to Mary which follows.

As regular as the fear provoked by a divine visitation is the reassuring "do not fear" (Gen 15:1; Judg 6:23; Dan 10:12, etc.). Childlessness is an occasion for prayer in Gen 25:21; 30:22; 1 Sam 1:10–13, 17. For declarations that prayer has been heard cf. 2 Kgs 20:5; Dan 10:12. Of the various OT divine birth announcements the closest is Gen 17:19, but Judg 13:3 is followed immediately by the motif of abstinence found in Luke 1:15. The name John ("God has been gracious") is based on the experience of answered prayer, just as the names divinely given in the OT reflect the experience there of God's action (cf. esp. Gen 17:19).

As the explanatory clauses to follow make clear, the joy anticipated in v 14 is more than that of happy parenthood: it is the joy of the eschatological fulfillment (cf. 2:10; 10:17; 24:41, 52). John's greatness is to be located in a special consecration to God and in his significance for salvation history. As a symbol of consecration he will fulfill the Nazirite abstinence from alcohol (Lev 10:9; Judg 13:14 cf. v 7), and surpassing all the prophets, he will in an anticipative way experience the eschatological gift of the Spirit, being filled with the Spirit even before birth. Like the servant of Isa 49:5 his task will be to restore

Israel to God, coming ahead before the great day of the Lord (cf. Acts 2:20). Like Elisha, John will operate with Elijah's spirit and power (2 Kgs 2:9, 15), and as the anticipated Elijah figure of Mal 3:1; 4:5, 6, he will unite the generations in God, and yet further, following the pattern of Dan 12:3, he will turn many from ways of disobedience to wisdom and righteousness, in expectation of the near approach of the end of the days.

For Zechariah, the angel's word is not enough. He reaches out for certainty (cf. Abraham in Gen 15:5), because he sees an insuperable barrier in the advanced ages of both himself and his wife. But that is to disbelieve the word of Gabriel, the revealer of eschatological mysteries (Dan 8-12) who stands in the presence of God himself. For his disbelief, but also to overcome it (cf. Gen 15:9-21; Judg 6:36-40; 2 Kgs 20:8-11), and perhaps also to keep this revelation from wider dissemination until the proper time (v 20 cf. Dan 8:26; 12:4, 9), Zechariah is reduced to silence (probably rendered both deaf and mute).

As all this has gone on the people have become anxious. Zechariah should have appeared to pronounce the final blessing. When he finally appears, they soon deduce from OT precedent, Jewish tradition, and the silent gestures of Zechariah that a divine manifestation has occurred.

At the end of his temple week Zechariah returns home and his wife is soon pregnant. With a sense of privacy about the precious and intimate way that God has dealt with her in her old age, she withdraws into seclusion with her secret until the stage where her pregnancy will be physically obvious. Her words of wonderment echo the experience of Sarah (Gen 21:1) and Rachel (Gen 30:23).

Jesus' Birth Announced (1:26-38)

Bibliography

- Allard, M.** "L'Annonce à Marie et les annonces de naissance miraculeuses de l'Ancien Testament." *NRT* 78 (1956) 730-33. **Allgeier, A.** "Ἐποικιάζω Lk 1,35." *BZ* 14 (1917) 338-43. **Audet, J.-P.** "L'Annonce à Marie." *RB* 63 (1956) 346-74. **Auer, J.** "Maria und das christliche Jungfräulichkeitsideal: Eine biblischdogmatische Studie." *GuL* 23 (1950) 411-25. **Avi-Yonah, M.** "L'Inscription 'Nazareth' à Césarée." *BTS* 61 (1964) 2-5. **Baarda, T.** "Dionysios bar Šalibi and the Text of Luke i, 35." *VC* (1963) 225-29. **Bardenhewer, O.** *Mariä Verkündigung: Ein Kommentar zu Lukas I, 26-38*. BibS(F) 10/5. Freiburg: Herder, 1905. 129-37. **Barrett, C. K.** *Holy Spirit*. 5-24. **Barth, K.** *Church Dogmatics*, vol. 1, part 2. Tr. G. T. Thompson and H. Knight. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1956. 172-202. **Bauer, J. B.** "Die Antwort der Jungfrau (Luke 1, 34)." *Österreichisches Klerusblatt* 90 (1957) 244-45. ———. "Monstra te esse matrem, Virgo Singularis." *MTZ* 9 (1958) 124-35. ———. "Philologische Bemerkungen zu Lk 1, 34." *Bib* 45 (1964) 535-40. **Bearsley, P. J.** "Mary the Perfect Disciple: A Paradigm for Mariology." *TS* 41 (1980) 461-504. **Benko, D.** "The Perpetual Virginity of the Mother of Jesus." *LQ* 16 (1964) 147-63. **Benoit, P.** "L'Annonciation." *AsSeign* 6 (1955) 40-57. **Bosloooper, T.** *The Virgin Birth*. London: SCM, 1962. ———. "Jesus' Virgin Birth and Non-Christian

- 'Parallels.' " *Religion in Life* 26 (1956-57) 87-97. **Bornhäuser, K.** *Die Geburts- und Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu: Versuch einer zeitgenössischen Auslegung von Matthäus 1 und 2 und Lukas 1-3.* BFCT 2/23. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1930. 75-144. **Bourassa, B.** "Κεχαριτωμένη, Lc 1:28." *ScEcll* 9 (1957) 313-16. **Brinkmann, B.** "Die Jungfrauengeburt und das Lukas-evangelium." *Bib* 34 (1953) 327-32. **Brodmann, B.** "Mariens Jungfräulichkeit nach Lk 1, 34 in der Auseinandersetzung von heute." *BK* (1955) 98-110; *Anton* 30 (1955) 27-44. **Brown, R. E.** "Luke's Method in the Annunciation Narrative of Chapter One." In *No Famine in the Land*, FS J. L. McKenzie, ed. J. D. Flannagan and A. W. Robinson. Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1975. 179-94. ———. "The Problem of the Virginal Conception of Jesus." *TS* 33 (1972) 3-34. ———. "Luke's Description of the Virginal Conception." *TS* 35 (1974) 360-62. ———. "Virgin Birth." *IDBSup* (1976) 940-41. **Brown, R. E.**, et al., eds. *Mary in the New Testament.* Philadelphia/New York: Fortress/Paulist, 1978. 105-34. **Brunner-Traut, E.** "Die Geburtsgeschichte der Evangelien im Lichte ägyptologischer Forschungen." *ZRGG* 12 (1960) 97-111. **Cabanis, A.** "Christmas Echoes at Paschaltide." *NTS* 9 (1962) 67-69. **Cambe, M.** "La χάρις chez Saint Luc: Remarques sur quelques textes, notamment le κεχαριτωμένη." *RB* 70 (1963) 193-207. **Campenhause, H. von.** *The Virgin Birth in the Theology of the Ancient Church.* SHT 2. Naperville, IL: Allenson, 1964. **Carmignac, J.** "The Meaning of *parthenos* in Luke 1.27—A Reply to C. H. Dodd." *BT* 28 (1977) 327-30. **Cazelles, H.** "Fille de Sion et théologie mariale dans la Bible." *Bulletin de la Société Française d'Études Mariales* 21 (1964) 51-71. **Ceroke, C. P.** "Luke 1, 34 and Mary's Virginity." *CBQ* 19 (1957) 329-42. **Cole, E. R.** "What Did St. Luke Mean by *kecharitōmenē*?" *AER* 139 (1958) 228-39. **Collins, J. J.** "Our Lady's Vow of Virginity (Lk. 1:34)." *CBQ* 5 (1943) 369-80. **Craghan, J. F.** "The Gospel Witness to Mary's 'Ante Partum' Virginity." *Marian Studies* 21 (1970) 28-68. ———. "Mary's 'Ante Partum' Virginity: The Biblical View." *AER* 162 (1970) 361-72. **Daube, D.** "Evangelisten und Rabbinen." *ZNW* 48 (1957) 119-26, esp. 119-20. **Delebecque, É.** "Sur le salutation de Gabriel à Marie (Lc 1,28)." *Bib* 65 (1984) 352-55. **Delling, G.** "παρθένος." *TDNT* 5 (1967) 826-37. **Dodd, C. H.** "New Testament Translation Problems I." *BT* 27 (1976) 301-11. **Edwards, D.** *The Virgin Birth in History and Faith.* London: Faber & Faber, 1943. **Enslin, M. S.** "The Christian Stories of the Nativity." *JBL* 59 (1940) 317-38. **Fahy, T.** "The Marriage of Our Lady and St. Joseph." *ITQ* 24 (1957) 261-67. **Fenasse, J.-M.** "Le Christ 'Saint de Dieu.'" *MScRel* 22 (1965) 26-32. **Fitzmyer, J. A.** "The Virginal Conception of Jesus in the New Testament." *TS* 34 (1973) 541-75. ———. "The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament." *NTS* 20 (1973-74) 382-407, esp. 391-94. **Flanagan, N. M.** "Our Lady's Vow of Virginity." *Marian Studies* 7 (1956) 103-21. **Ford, J. M.** "The Meaning of 'Virgin.'" *NTS* 12 (1966) 293-99. **Freire, C. E.** "Alcance cristológico de Lc. 1,35 y 2,49." *Communio* 8 (1975) 5-77. **Fuller, R. H.** "The Virgin Birth: Historical Fact or Kerygmatic Truth?" *BR* 1 (1956) 1-8. **Gaechter, P.** *Maria im Erdenleben: Neutestamentliche Marienstudien.* ———. "The Chronology from Mary's Betrothal to the Birth of Christ." *TS* 2 (1941) 145-70, 347-68. ———. "Der Verkündigungsbericht Lk 1, 26-38." *ZKT* 91 (1969) 322-63, 567-86. **Galot, J.** "Vierge entre les vierges." *NRT* 79 (1957) 463-77. **Gese, H.** "Natus ex Virgine." *Vom Sinai zum Zion.* BET 64. Munich: Kaiser, 1974. 130-46. **Gewiess, J.** "Die Marienfrage, Lk 1,34." *BZ* 5 (1961) 221-54. **Gordon, C. H.** "The Double Paternity of Jesus." *BAR* 4 (1978) 26-27. **Gothard, D.** "The Annunciation." *Scr* 10 (1958) 116-21. **Graber, O.** *Die Frage Marias an den Verkündigungengel: Eine exegetische-dogmatische Studie zu Luk. 1,34.* Graz: Akademisch, 1956. ———. "Wollte Maria eine normale Ehe eingehen?" *Marianum* 20 (1958) 1-9. ———. "Marias Jungfräulichkeitswille vor der Engelsbotschaft." *Marianum* 22 (1960) 290-304. **Grant, F. C.** "Where Form Criticism and Textual Criticism Overlap." *JBL* 59 (1940) 11-21. **Graystone, G.** *Virgin of All Virgins: The Interpretation of Lk 1:34.* Rome: Tipografia S. Pio X, 1968. **Grelot, P.** "La naissance d'Isaac et celle de Jésus: Sur une interprétation 'mythologique' de la conception virginale." *NRT* 94

- (1972) 462-87, 561-85. **Guy, H.** "The Virgin Birth in St. Luke." *ExpTim* 68 (1957) 157-58. **Harnack, A. von.** "Zu Lk 1,34-35." *ZNW* 2 (1901) 53-57. **Harrington, W.** "The Annunciation." *DL* 13 (1963) 306-15. **Haugg, D.** *Das erste biblische Marienwort: Eine exegetische Studie zu Lukas 1.34.* Bibelwissenschaftliche Reihe 1. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1938. **Herbert, A. G.** "The Virgin Mary as the Daughter of Zion." *Th* 53 (1950) 403-10. **Hehn, J.** "Ἐπισκιάζων Lk 1,35." *BZ*, o.s., 14 (1917) 147-52. **Humaney, R. L.** "The Place of Mary in Luke: A Look at Modern Biblical Criticism." *AER* 168 (1974) 291-303. **Humbert, P.** "Der biblische Verkündigungsstil und seine vermutliche Herkunft." *AfO* 10 (1935-36) 77-80. **Isaacs, M. E.** "Mary in the Lukan Infancy Narrative." *Way, Suppl.* 25 (1975) 80-95. **Jellouschek, C. J.** "Mariä Verkündigung in neuer Sicht." *MTZ* 10 (1959) 102-13. **Jones, A.** "Background of the Annunciation." *Scr* 11 (1959) 65-81. **Kattenbusch, F.** "Die Geburtsgeschichte Jesu als Haggada der urchristlichen Theologie." *TSK* 102 (1930) 454-74. **Knight, G. A. F.** "The Virgin and the Old Testament." *RTR* 12 (1953) 1-13. **Koster, H. M.** "Die Jungfrauengeburt als theologisches Problem seit David Friedrich Strauss." *Jungfrauengeburt gestern und heute.* Mariologische Studien 4, ed. H. J. Brosch and J. Hasenfuss. Essen: H. Driewer, 1969. 35-87. **Kugelman, R.** "The Object of Mary's Consent in the Annunciation." *Marian Studies* 11 (1960) 60-84. **Lagrange, M.-J.** "Le récit de l'enfance de Jésus dans S. Luc." *RB*, o.s., 4 (1895) 160-85. ———. "La conception surnaturelle du Christ d'après Saint Luc." *RB* 11 (1914) 60-71, 188-208. **Landersdorfer, S.** "Bemerkungen zu Lk 1:26-38." *BZ*, o.s., 7 (1909) 30-48. **Latke, G.** "Lukas 1 und die Jungfrauengeburt." *Zum Thema Jungfrauengeburt.* Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1970. 61-89. **LaVerdiere, E.** "Be It Done to Me." *Emman* 90 (1984) 184-90, 196. ———. "The Virgin's Name Was Mary." *Emman* 92 (1986) 185-89. **Legrand, L.** "Fécondité virginele selon l'Esprit dans le Nouveau Testament." *NRT* 84 (1962) 785-805. ———. "L'arrière-plan néo-testamentaire de Lc. 1.35." *RB* 70 (1963) 161-92. **Leisegang, H.** *Pneuma Hagion: Der Ursprung des Geistbegriffs der synoptischen Evangelien aus der griechischen Mystik.* Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche, 1922. 14-72. **Levin, S.** *The Father of Joshua/Jesus.* Binghamton, NY: State University of New York, 1978. **Lyonnet, S.** "Χαίρε, κεχαρισμένη." *Bib* 20 (1939) 131-41. ———. "Le récit de l'annonciation et la maternité divine de la sainte Vierge." *Ami du clergé* 66 (1956) 33-46. Tr. in part as "St. Luke's Infancy Narrative." In *Word and Mystery: Biblical Essays on the Person and Mission of Christ*, ed. L. J. O'Donovan. Glen Rock, NJ: Newman, 1968. 143-54. **Machen, J. G.** *The Virgin Birth of Christ.* London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1930. **Maillot, A.** "Quelques remarques sur la Naissance Virginele du Christ." *Foi et Vie* 77 (1978) 30-44. **McHugh, J.** *The Mother of Jesus in the New Testament.* Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1975. **Michel, O., and Betz, O.** "Von Gott gezeugt." In *Judentum-Urchristentum-Kirche.* FS J. Jeremias, ed. W. Eltester. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1960. 3-23. **Miyoshi, M.** "Zur Entstehung des Glaubens an die jungfräuliche Geburt Jesu in Mt 1 und Lk 1." *AJBI* 10 (1984) 33-62. **Mussner, F.** "Der Glaube Mariens in Lichte des Römerbriefs." *Catholica* 18 (1964) 258-68. **Neiryneck, F.** "Visitatio B. M. V.: Bijdrage tot de Quellenkritik van Lc. 1-2." *Collationes brugenses et gandavenses* 6 (1960) 387-404. **Paramo, S. del.** "La anunciación de la Virgen: Reparos exegeticos y doctrinales a una reciente interpretación." *EstBib* 16 (1957) 161-85. **Piper, O. A.** "The Virgin Birth: The Meaning of the Gospel Accounts." *Int* 18 (1964) 131-48. **Potterrie, I. de la.** "Κεχαρισμένη en Luc. 1,28: Étude philologique." *Bib* 68 (1987) 357-82. ———. "Κεχαρισμένη en Luc 1,28: Étude exégétique et théologique." *Bib* 68 (1987) 480-508. **Quecke, H.** "Lk 1,34 in den alten Übersetzungen und im Protevangelium des Jakobus." *Bib* 44 (1963) 499-520. ———. "Lk 1,34 im Diatessaron." *Bib* 45 (1964) 85-88. ———. "Lukas 1,31 in den alten Übersetzungen." *Bib* 46 (1965) 333-48. ———. "Zur Auslegungsgeschichte von Lk 1,34." *Bib* 47 (1966) 113-14. **Räsänen, H.** *Die Mutter Jesu im Neuen Testament.* Annales academiae scientiarum fennicae B/158. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia, 1969. **Schelkle, K. H.** "Die Kindheitsgeschichte

Jesu." *Wort und Schrift: Beiträge zur Auslegung und Auslegungsgeschichte des Neuen Testaments*. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1966. 59–75. **Schierse, F. J.** "Weihnachtliche Christusverkündigung: Zum Verständnis der Kindheitsgeschichten." *BibLeb* 1 (1960) 217–22. **Schneider, G.** "Jesu geistgewirkte Empfängnis (Lk 1,34 ff): Zur Interpretation einer christologischen Aussage." *TPQ* 119 (1971) 105–16. ———. "Lk 1,34.35 als redaktionelle Einheit." *BZ* 15 (1971) 255–59. **Schürmann, H.** "Die geistgewirkte Lebensentstehung Jesu: Eine kritische Besinnung auf den Beitrag der Exegese zur Frage." In *Einheit in Vielfalt*, FS H. Aufderbeck, ed. W. Ernst and K. Feiereis. Erfurter theologische Studien 32. Leipzig: St.-Benno, 1974. 156–69. **Schwank, B.** "Lk 1,34 im Lichte von I Kor 7,36–38." *Oberrheinisches Pastoral Blatt* 57 (1956) 317–23. **Smith, D. M.** "Luke 1:26–38." *Int* 29 (1975) 411–17. **Soares Prabhu, G. M.** "'Rejoice, Favoured One!' Mary in the Annunciation-Story of Luke." *Biblehashyam* 3 (1977) 259–77. **Sobosan, J. G.** "Completion of Prophecy: Jesus in Lk 1:32–33." *BTB* 4 (1974) 317–23. **Stanley, D. M.** "Balaam's Ass, or a Problem in New Testament Hermeneutics." *CBQ* 20 (1958) 50–56. **Stock, K.** "Die Berufung Marias (Lk 1,26–38)." *Bib* 61 (1980) 457–91. **Strobel, A.** "Der Gruss an Maria (Lc 1,28): Eine philologische Betrachtung zu seinem Sinngehalt." *ZNW* 53 (1962) 86–110. **Taylor, V.** *The Historical Evidence for the Virgin Birth*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1920. **Turner, H. E. W.** "The Virgin Birth." *ExpTim* 68 (1956–57) 12–17. **Unnik, W. C. van.** "Dominus Vobiscum: The Background of a Liturgical Formula." In *New Testament Essays*, FS T. W. Manson, ed. A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: University Press, 1959. 270–305. **Verweyen, H.** "Mariologie als Befreiung: Lk 1,26–45.56 im Kontext." *ZKT* 105 (1983) 168–83. **Vicent, A.** "La presunta sustantivación τὸ γεννώμενον en Lc 11,35b [sic! read 1,35b]." *EstBib* 33 (1974) 265–73. **Vogels, H.** "Zur Textgeschichte von Lc 1,34 ff." *ZNW* 43 (1950–51) 256–60. **Vögtle, A.** "Offene Fragen zur lukanischen Geburts- und Kindheitsgeschichte." *BibLeb* 11 (1970) 51–67. **Voss, G.** *Christologie*. 65–81. ———. "Geboren aus Maria, der Jungfrau: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der lukanischen Kindheitsgeschichte." *Lebendiges Zeugnis* 4 (1964) 41–56. **Winter, P.** "'Nazareth' and 'Jerusalem' in Luke chs. i and ii." *NTS* 3 (1956–57) 136–42. **Zerwick, M.** "' . . . quoniam virum non cognosco' (Lc 1,34) (Conspectus criticus de opinionibus recentioribus)." *VD* 37 (1959) 212–24, 276–88. (See also at 1:5–25.)

Translation

²⁶In the sixth month the angel Gabriel was sent from^a God to a city of Galilee, the name of which was Nazareth, ²⁷to a virgin betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David, and the name of the virgin was Mary. ²⁸He went in to her and said, "Rejoice, privileged one, the Lord is with you."^b ²⁹She was thoroughly troubled by what he said, and wondered what kind of greeting this could be. ³⁰The angel said to her,

"Do not be afraid, Mary, for you have found favor with God.

³¹Look,^c you will conceive in your womb and give birth to a son, and you will call his name Jesus.

³²He will be great, and will be called Son of the Most High. The Lord God will give him the throne of his father David;

³³he will rule over the house of Jacob forever; and there will be no end of his kingdom."

³⁴Mary said to the angel, "How will this be, since I have no sexual relationship with a man?" ³⁵The angel answered her,

"The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you:

therefore the child to be born^d will be called holy—Son of God.

³⁶Look,^c your relative Elizabeth, in her old age, has also conceived a son; indeed, this is the sixth month for her who was called barren. ³⁷For nothing is too hard for God.”^e ³⁸Mary said, “I am the servant of the Lord. Let it happen to me according to your word.” Then the angel departed from her.

Notes

^a A C D etc. miss the spatial imagery and correct to *ὑπό*, “by.”

^b Under the influence of v 42, A C D etc. add *εὐλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυναῖξιν*, “blessed are you among women.”

^c Lit., “and behold.”

^d C* Θ¹ 33 etc. add *ἐκ σοῦ*, “out of you.”

^e N² A C etc. replace a Semitic genitive here with the more usual dative.

Form/Structure/Setting

Through being followed at once by this second birth annunciation, the annunciation to Zechariah is kept from having an independent role (cf. at 1:5–25): the whole significance of John is to be located in that which follows him. After this second annunciation and an encounter scene between the two mothers which marks the intertwining of the destinies of the two heroes, Luke is content to complete his infancy account for John before proceeding with that of Jesus (2:1–52).

While in the case of John the dramatic movement is out from the temple (i.e., this impulse arises *out* of the heart of Jewish temple piety), in the case of the Jesus infancy account the dramatic movement is toward the Jerusalem temple (i.e., fulfillment comes *to* the heart of Jewish religion; cf. the dramatic movement of Jesus’ ministry from Galilee [Nazareth] to Jerusalem [the temple], and see esp. at 19:45–48).

The parallels between the two annunciation accounts are striking, and include at least the following elements:

- (i) introduction of the key figures (Zechariah and Elizabeth; Mary);
- (ii) mention of special condition precluding normal conception (old age; virginity);
- (iii) encounter with angel Gabriel;
- (iv) troubled response (Zechariah to the angelic visitation; Mary to the greeting);
- (v) call not to fear, with address by name;
- (vi) birth announcement including the giving of the child’s name, predication of future greatness, the role of the Spirit in what is to happen (with Mary this motif is delayed to v 35), the future role of the child;
- (vii) a question in response that finds a problem with the angelic announcement;
- (viii) angelic answer that includes a sign;
- (ix) departure statement.

This impressive list of parallels must, however, be qualified in two ways. First, the parallelism is a step-parallelism (as is pervasively the case between John and Jesus). So a further list can be provided of ways in which the second annunciation surpasses the first:

- (i) the first is in response to prayer; the second is entirely by the initiative of God;

- (ii) conception by the barren and aged is a wonder of God, but has OT precedents; conception by a virgin is an unheard-of wonder;
- (iii) Zechariah is greeted by name; but Mary is greeted with the awesome "Rejoice, favored one, the Lord is with you";
- (iv) John will be great before the Lord; but Jesus' greatness knows no qualification;
- (v) John is consecrated to Nazirite abstinence; Jesus' holiness extends to the very basis of his existence;
- (vi) John will be preparer; but Jesus will be Son and King forever;
- (vii) John will be filled with the Holy Spirit while still in the womb; but Jesus' human existence is due entirely to the activity of the Spirit;
- (viii) Zechariah could not believe the angelic announcement; Mary declared herself ready for God's declared purpose.

The second qualification has to do with form. In both cases we have the annunciation of a birth, and there is an evident relationship with OT birth annunciations (Gen 16:7–14; Gen 17–18; Judg 13:2–23). But in the second case the birth oracle form has been heavily modified in the direction of a call narrative form (Judg 6:11–24; Exod 3; Jer 1:4–10; cf. Soares Prabhu, *Biblehashyam* 3 [1977] 259–65; and esp. Stock, *Bib* 61 [1980] 457–91), and the account overall is best seen as a call, to which Mary responds as an obedient servant of God (Luke 1:38).

The texture of OT allusions that characterized 1:5–25 continues here to the same effect, but here there is a heightening that takes us beyond the normal limits of first-century Judaism, even in its eschatological thought (there is no evidence for a Jewish reading of Isa 7:14 in connection with a virginal conception of the messiah, nor for a Jewish understanding of the messiah as Son of God in any sense that transcends OT adoption categories [Ps 2:7; 2 Sam 7:14; 4QFlor 10–13; 4Q243 1.7–2.4]).

The language of 1:26–38 continues to be quite Semitic, but a much stronger case can be made for significant Lukan intervention. The larger component of Lukan style makes more difficult the full resolution of source questions here.

Perhaps the most pressing source question is that concerning whether 1:34–35 represents an addition (scribal, Lukan creation, or insertion from a separate source) to an earlier annunciation account. The scribal addition view, earlier made popular by von Harnack (*ZNW* 2 [1901] 53–57), lacks textual support and completely overlooks the nature of the parallelism between the two annunciations. The view survives in the modern discussion only in the form of more restricted claims. It is suggested that v 34c (ἐπεὶ ἄνδρα οὐ γινώσκω, "since I do not know a man") has been interpolated (Grant, *JBL* 59 [1940] 19–21), but here too there is no textual support, and as Räisänen observes (*Mutter Jesu*, 95–96), such an interpolation would in any case only make explicit what is already the actual concern of the text and in the present text is required to complete the parallel with v 18 (Machen, *Virgin Birth*, 158). Vogels (*ZNW* 43 [1950–51] 256–60) has argued on the basis of the reading of the Old Latin text b (which substitutes Mary's words from v 38 for the normal text of v 34) that the whole of Mary's words in v 34 represents a later interpolation, but Brinkmann (*Bib* 34 [1953] 327–32) has shown clearly the tendential nature of Vogel's argument.

The presence of significant elements of Lukan style in vv 34-35 cannot be denied (Taylor, *Virgin Birth*, 55-69) but traces of a pre-Lukan hand may also be discerned, especially in v 35bc (πνεῦμα ἁγίον . . . ἐπισκιάσει σοι, "The Holy Spirit . . . will overshadow you"; cf. Räisänen, *Mutter Jesu*, 99-100). The argument that the change from υἱὸς ὑψίστου, "Son of the Most High," in v 32 to υἱὸς θεοῦ, "Son of God," in v 35 betrays a difference of origin has been completely overturned by the discovery at Qumran of a text that (in Aramaic) juxtaposes precisely these titles (4Q243 1.7-2.4; cf. Fitzmyer, *NTS* 20 [1973-74] 392-94). Also, the juxtaposition in Rom 1:3-4 (pre-Pauline tradition) of Davidic origin and the role of the Spirit in relation to Jesus' identity and status suggests strongly that this same juxtaposition in Luke 1:32 and 35 is no secondary formation (R. E. Brown, *Birth*, 312-13; Fitzmyer, 340; Legrand, *RB* 70 [1963] 179-88). Note also the symmetry between v 32, where God on first occurrence is ὑψίστος and then θεός, and v 35, where the order is reversed.

We can reject, then, any suggestion that Luke 1:34-35 is an addition to the annunciation account, whether this addition is seen in terms of scribal interpolation, Lukan creation, or insertion from a separate source. (A stronger case can be made for the separate origin of vv 36-37, but this is of much less importance for the whole pericope. Also to be questioned is whether the mention in v 27 of the betrothed state of Mary belonged to the earlier tradition. Other items may also be questioned. See *Comment* below.)

The question of the nature of Luke's source(s) is altogether a much more difficult one. As the arguments for decomposing the text have lost ground in favor of a recognition of the intrinsic unity of the account, so the question that has come to the fore is that of whether Luke is the creator of this unitary composition (using perhaps a certain amount of oral tradition) or whether we still have before us what is essentially the unity of a pre-Lukan annunciation account (even if Lukan editing is also to be recognized). The judgment that v 34 is a Lukan literary device (see *Comment*) has become the growth point for an increasing tendency to attribute to Luke the creation of the annunciation account as we now have it. Such a judgment concerning v 34 becomes especially influential in this direction when linked with the discovery of a related pairing of theological motifs in Luke 1:32, 35 and Rom 1:3-4 (see above): v 35 requires the prior question of v 34. The evident parallelism between the two annunciation accounts has also had its influence here. R. E. Brown's study (*Birth*, 286-329) is the most careful statement of the view that Luke is essentially responsible for the creation of the annunciation account.

The deliberate parallelism between the two annunciations is, indeed, probably to be attributed to Luke. But the anticipation of important births must in the nature of things have a measure of intrinsic similarity. Also, it is likely that both annunciation accounts were already, prior to Luke, conformed to OT precedents (see at 1:5-2:52 above), and we have already seen that, in any case, only a limited parallelism is established between the two accounts. The annunciation to Zechariah does not account for the annunciation to Mary!

The importance of the connection between Luke 1:32, 35 and Rom 1:3-4 has already been acknowledged above, but there is more uncertainty about whether Luke 1:34 is to be viewed as no more than a literary device. A different view will be defended in the *Comment* section below.

The presence of residual non-Lukanisms and non-Septuagintal Semitisms must once again play an important role in the case for a written source, but can on this occasion be less decisive because of the indubitably greater intervention of Luke in this pericope. Nevertheless, it seems best on the basis of the evidence that exists to claim a literary source for Luke and not merely an indeterminant quantity of oral tradition.

Closely related to the source question is that concerning the world of thought in relation to which this tradition should be understood. Under the influence of the history-of-religions-school ethos many, especially earlier, studies have related the conception proposed in v 35 to a variety of traditions in antiquity that spoke of the impregnation of a woman by a deity (an extensive survey of the materials may be conveniently consulted in Boslooper, *The Virgin Birth*, 135–86). Most of those traditions plainly involve sexual deities engaged in some species of sexual commerce with a woman. The few apparent exceptions (impregnation by (i) the spirit of a god [Plutarch, *Life of Numa* 4]; (ii) a mystic breath [Aeschylus, *Suppliants* 17–19]; (iii) the power of a god [Plutarch, *Moralia* 9.114–19] are actually, as may be seen from the contexts, attempts to speak of modes of intercourse possible and appropriate to the divine nature of the male partner (cf. R. E. Brown, *TS* 33 [1972] 30 n. 78). Now it would not be impossible to read the words of Luke 1:35 in just this manner. But sexual overtones are completely absent from Luke's account, and such a reading would be impossible in the present strongly Jewish context. As well, the difficulties involved from the point of view of Jewish ethics would be insurmountable (cf. the suspicions of Manoah in Josephus' account [*Ant.* 5.276–85]).

Dibelius, sensitive to just such a problem, looked for a bridge from Hellenistic Egyptian ideas to that of conception through the divine Spirit as we have it in Luke 1:35. From Paul's statement in Gal 4:29 about Isaac's being begotten according to the Spirit (*γεννηθεῖς . . . κατὰ πνεῦμα*) Dibelius concluded that though the idea must have originated in Egyptian thought, the notion of conception by means of the Spirit of God, apart from any sexual union between a man and a woman, must have gained currency in Hellenistic Judaism. This conclusion is shored up with reference to the works of the Alexandrian Jew Philo, who also knew of conception of the patriarchs through "divine seed" (*De Cherub.* 44–47) and moreover was of the opinion that it was only with a virgin that God would consort (*De Cherub.* 49–52). Dibelius contended that in the Hellenistic Jewish view involved here, God through the Spirit is understood to act as Creator and not as lover, but that, nevertheless, the intelligibility of the view is ultimately dependent on a recognition of its kinship with the Egyptian mythological ideas in which it is ultimately rooted ("Jungfrauensohn," 27–44).

But in Gal 4:29 Paul's language is determined by his typological application and has nothing to do with any legend of divine paternity for Isaac, and in the Philonic texts what is being talked about in Philo's typical allegorical manner is the coming to birth of virtues in the human soul (despite Dibelius, Philo's imagery is in fact quite sexual [cf. *De Som.* 1.200 where, though there is no mention of God, the same ideas are expressed in an extended sexual metaphor; and *Quaes. Exod.* 2.3 where God is the sexual partner]), and there is not the slightest evidence that he considered the patriarchs to have been conceived

in anything other than the usual way (cf. Grelot, *NRT* 94 [1972] 472–77, 561–85).

The “missing link” sought by Dibelius is still missing, and in its absence one cannot responsibly postulate a link between Luke 1:35 and any of the suggested history-of-religions backgrounds. There is at this point general agreement in critical scholarship that no satisfactory background for Luke 1:35 can be provided from the mythologies of antiquity.

At the same time, one can hardly say that a virginal conception by means of the Holy Spirit has a natural home in Judaism. Nevertheless, given the unsatisfactory outcome of the history-of-religions inquiry, and the strongly Jewish setting of Luke 1:35, it seems best to seek to elucidate the text in relation to such relevant Jewish traditions as exist.

But here at once we run up against a problem. The absence of a human father, the action of God in the conception, and the kind of logic that would deduce from this the identity of the child as son of God, form together a matrix that seems anything but Jewish and would be thoroughly at home in the history-of-religions material we have just discarded. How are we to deal with this?

Quite a common approach is to assume a setting in Hellenistic Judaism. This solution is carefully articulated and defended by Barrett (*Holy Spirit*, 5–24). On a rather slender basis it is first affirmed that Hellenistic Judaism has (due to the stimulus of wider Hellenism) an interest in a creative role for the Spirit not shared to any degree by Palestinian Judaism (see *Comment* on 1:35). This, then, becomes the basis for maintaining that for an adequate background for Luke 1:35 we must look to Hellenistic Judaism in which another Hellenistic concept, that of a divine begetting, will have been able to be accommodated. But this is really to ask for the assumption of Dibelius’ conclusions after the attempt to establish them empirically has collapsed. It is finally the very existence of Luke 1:35 that is being asked to bear the burden of the proof that a certain set of Hellenistic ideas were current in Hellenistic Judaism. Certainly this is not an impossible way to go. With Gabriel and not God in the leading role, the late Jewish text *Beth ha-Midr.* 2:65 would seem to offer the absence of a human father (Gabriel takes the form of the husband), the supernatural (but quite sexual) conception, and a quasi-supernatural identity for the child (the child resembles Gabriel). For this text, simply on the basis of content, I have no compunction about speaking of Hellenistic influence—despite the heavily Jewish context. But for Luke 1:35, are there other ways to go?

If we are to escape our dilemma, it seems that we must break up in some way the threefold matrix spoken of above. The easiest way to achieve this is that proposed by Räisänen (*Mutter Jesu*, 99–101) who, on the basis of metrical considerations proposed by Aytoun (*JTS* 18 [1916–17] 279–80) and a consideration of Lukan vocabulary and style, pronounced v 35d (διὸ καὶ . . . υἱὸς θεοῦ, “therefore . . . Son of God”) to be a Lukan commentary. This would, however, require us to ignore the strong case for integrity that has been built squarely upon the presence of the final clause of v 35. The same objection is to be raised to the occasional suggestion (following von Baer [*Der heilige Geist*, 126–27]) that υἱὸς θεοῦ, “Son of God,” is an addition.

If therefore we are to retain all three items in the matrix, then perhaps it is possible to approach them without needing to understand the individual

elements as the links between them in a manner which is controlled by the pattern created by seeing them together against a Hellenistic background. Indeed it may be that the text provides us with indications that one or more of these items should be taken in a way that does not allow the elements to coalesce into a Hellenistic understanding. Proposals along these lines have certainly been made in relation to all three items.

What of the role of the virginity of Mary? In the Hellenistic pattern where the absence of the human father takes this form, virginity is the condition of purity for the approach of the god, or, where there is fertility cult influence (cf. R. E. Brown, *TS* 33 [1972] 30 n. 1), virginity functions as a symbol of untapped fertility. But in the present setting Mary's virginity appears as an obstacle to the provision of the child (vv 27 and 34 in parallel with vv 7 and 18) which must be miraculously overcome (v 37).

When we turn to the action of God in Jesus' origin, once again we are not presented with quite what is to be expected from Hellenistic thought. A conception through the spirit of a god or the power of a god is not impossible in Hellenism (Plutarch, *Life of Numa* 4; *Moralia* 9.114–19), but it constitutes the exception rather than the rule. The nonsexual activity of the Spirit here (see *Comment*) is more surprising still. The Spirit's coming upon Mary here (πνεῦμα . . . ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ) is, rather, the eschatological coming of the Spirit by means of which the wilderness becomes a fruitful field (Isa 32:15: ἕως ἂν [ἐπ'] ἐλθῇ ἐφ' . . . πνεῦμα). The activity of the Spirit here is viewed in line with that creative role attributed in Judaism to the Spirit from the original creation (Gen 1:2; Ps 33:6; 2 *Apoc. Bar.* 21.4; Jdt 16:14), through the ongoing creation and sustaining of life (Job 27:3; 33:4; Ps 104:30; Wis 15:11; Philo, *De Opif. Mundi* 29–30), to the eschatological renewal of God's people (Isa 32:15; 44:3–4; Ezek 37:1–14; *Exod. Rab.* 48 [102d]).

The important question here for Luke 1:35 is whether the envisaged creative work of the Spirit is the provision of the male principle, albeit nonsexually, in the conception of Jesus: is God father of Jesus as Mary is mother? Attention to Jewish traditions concerning the creative role of the Spirit in the origin of human life (Job 33:4; Ps 104:30 [and cf. the targum reading]; Eccl 11:5) would suggest a negative answer, as would the step-parallelism between the situations of Elizabeth and Mary (note also Paul's description in Gal 4:29 of God's role in the overcoming of Sarah's barrenness: γεννηθεῖς . . . κατὰ πνεῦμα, "born . . . according to the Spirit"). In this heightened miracle, the creative presence of the eschatological Spirit overcomes that total barrier to the provision of a child posed by the absence of the male principle—a true parthenogenesis, miraculously made possible. Only the following clause, "therefore . . . Son of God" (διὸ καὶ . . . υἱὸς θεοῦ), causes hesitation. So to this we now turn.

What kind of logic is involved in the "therefore" (διὸ καὶ) clause with which Luke 1:35 concludes? The history-of-religions answer lies immediately to hand: the child will be called son of God because he will have "divine blood" running through his veins; while Mary may be his mother, his superlative qualities will be due to the fact that God is his father. But would this answer satisfy Luke or the tradition before him?

In Jewish thought to be a son of God is never a matter of physical origin. The notion "son of God" is generally focused on adoption or election to a special relationship with God (Exod 4:22; 2 Sam 7:14; Pss 2:7; 89:26–27; Jer

31:20; Hos 11:1; Sir 36:11; 4 Ezra 6:58; Ps.-Philo, *Bib. Ant.* 32:10; cf. *TDNT* 8:347-53). When the nation Israel is in view, sometimes the additional element of God's formation of the nation is also present (Isa 43:6-7; cf. 63:16; 64:8), and something analogous in the way of endowment is possibly present also in the case of the king (Ps 2:7). Even when used of supernatural beings the language of sonship expresses no more than that these beings belong to the heavenly order and not to the earthly (Gen 6:2, 4; Job 1:6; 2:1; 38:7; Pss 29:1[?]; 82:6[?]; 89:6). Occasionally the element of moral likeness to God appears, though not generally alone (Ps 73:15 [?]; Sir 4:10; *Jub.* 1.24-25 [?]; *T. Jud.* 24.3; *y. Qidd.* 1:8; cf. Matt 5:45; Luke 6:35).

Luke's own use of sonship language in connection with Jesus stands squarely in continuity with that of the Jewish tradition (see at 3:22). And here, where the text still reflects the Semitisms of an earlier tradition (see *Comment*), we are encouraged in the same direction. Further, while it is difficult to be certain where to locate syntactically the ἅγιον, "holy," of Luke 1:35, the general agreement of scholarship in relating it to κληθήσεται, "he shall be called," and thus having it stand alongside υἱὸς θεοῦ, "Son of God," at least places a question mark over the attempt to read the text here in a simple father/son generational manner (see further in *Comment* below):

Though the matter is complex, it seems right, therefore, to conclude that the birth announcement with its call to Mary should be understood in relation to the thought world of Judaism and that a history-of-religions reading of the text is a product of a too superficial attention to the detail of the text.

The final issue which must be briefly addressed here is that of the historicity of Mary's virginal conception of Jesus. The initial impetus for the standard critical questioning of its historicity has come from antisupernaturalistic sympathies, but quite apart from any doctrinaire rejection of supernatural interventions, serious questions have been raised about the basis upon which the historicity of the virginal conception is maintained. For example, where the very form of much of the Gospel materials reflects a considerable history of usage in the church prior to embodiment in a Gospel text—and thus the time lapse is narrowed between occurrence in the life of Jesus and report in the early church—in the case of the nativity we appear to be dealing with an event of a generation earlier which does not become visible in the life of the church until considerably later (Mark has no nativity account, and Paul reflects no awareness of the virginal conception of Jesus). Why so late? Legends do accumulate around the births of great figures, and most of them, though seriously reported in antiquity, have no real claim to historicity. Is the case any different with Jesus? Even recent Roman Catholic discussion has begun to return a verdict of "not proven" in relation to the historicity of the virginal conception (R. E. Brown, *Birth*, 517-33; Schürmann, "Lebensentstehung Jesu").

Though no justice can be done here to the issues involved, the following points may be made in favor of the traditional view (the most responsible and extensive defense of the historicity of the virginal conception remains that of Machen [*Virgin Birth*; and cf. McHugh, *Mother of Jesus*, 269-342]).

(i) The impression of late attestation is at least partly illusory. Initially, at least, the Gospel materials circulated primarily in other than the Pauline

churches. Their use was associated with a type of Christian proclamation whose focus was rather different from that of Pauline theology. To say that Paul reflects no awareness of the virginal conception is, therefore, not really any different from saying that he also reflects no awareness of much else that is to be found in the Gospels. Though the form is rather different, it is probably more significant that Paul is aware of a tradition that brackets together Davidic origin and designation as Son of God in connection with the activity of the Spirit (Rom 1:3–4). John's Gospel certainly does not report a virginal conception, but it would hardly suit his whole approach to do so, and it does seem likely that the typically Johannine irony of 7:41 echoes an awareness of the tradition of the virginal conception (cf. R. E. Brown, *John* 1:357; Barrett, *John*, 348). The virginal conception of Luke 1:26–38 is frequently set over against the traditions of Luke 2 which treat Joseph and Mary as parents (esp. vv 27, 41, 48). But the difficulty here largely disappears when it is realized that 1:26–38 is not a tradition about how God fathered Jesus. In the light of these considerations, it may be suggested that altogether too much has been extrapolated out of the Markan lack of an infancy gospel. It is true that the event is of a generation earlier, but this extra generation is adequately spanned by Mary's involvement in the early church, which there is no good reason to doubt.

(ii) The motif of virginal conception has been borrowed neither from paganism nor from pre-Christian Judaism. The first of these possibilities has been adequately dealt with in the discussion above on the world of thought to which Luke 1:26–38 is to be related. The only place where a Jewish tradition of virgin birth could be claimed is in relation to Isa 7:14. The MT with its use of נַעֲמָה, 'almâ ("young woman"), is not sufficient to establish a virginal conception tradition. נַעֲמָה is quite consonant with virginity and may even normally create a presumption of virginity, but the focus of the word is not there. The OT uses are Gen 24:43; Exod 2:8; Pss 46:1; 68:26; Prov 30:19; Isa 7:14; Cant 1:3; 6:8; 1 Chr 15:20. For a summary of the extensive discussion see R. G. Bratcher, "A Study of Isaiah 7:14," *BT* 9 (1958) 97–126. An נַעֲמָה would normally be thought of as conceiving in the normal sexual manner (cf. Prov 30:19). After the event of Jesus' conception, a special significance for Isa 7:14 in light of the event is quite understandable, but the text is quite inadequate to "create" the event. It is true that the LXX uses παρθένος, which is normally translated "virgin." But the move to Greek already takes us outside the language context in which, we have argued, the tradition of Luke 1:26–38 first flourished, and in any case παρθένος can definitely be shown to have itself at times a broader sense than "virgin" (see Dodd, *BT* 27 [1976] 301–5; Ford, *NTS* 12 [1966] 293–99; Dodd's contention that this wider sense of παρθένος is in view in Luke 1:27 has been adequately answered by Carmignac, *BT* 28 [1977] 327–30). No other Jewish sources reflect any virginal conception motif.

(iii) The cogency of the case for treating the virginal conception tradition as a Christian theologoumenon (i.e., a deduction reached by theological reasoning from other accepted religious truths) depends finally on a history-of-religions reading of Luke 1:26–38. This is so because the logic of the formation of the alleged theologoumenon requires that in the tradition the absence of a human father, and the fulfillment of that role by God, should be key to Jesus' identity as Son of God (i.e., God is Jesus' father, as Mary is Jesus' mother).

But we have seen above that Luke's text does not finally allow itself to be read in this manner. (It is at least of interest that the only father mentioned for Jesus in Luke 1:26–38 is in fact David [v 32].) A generally more plausible theologoumenon explanation of Luke 1:35 is offered by Schneider (*TPQ* 119 [1971] 113–14) in terms of a combination of Ps 2:7 and the tradition of Jesus' baptismal experience, but as he rightly recognized, this requires the prior existence of a virginal conception tradition which can act as catalyst and to which the theologoumenon may be attached.

While difficulties no doubt remain, there seems to be no adequate basis for abandoning the essential historicity of the tradition of a virginal conception of Jesus.

The annunciation to Mary is more simply organized than the parallel annunciation to Zechariah. The whole account corresponds to the central section of that account (1:8–23). The introduction of the participants has been absorbed into the beginning of the action sequence (vv 26–27), and there is nothing in the episode to correspond to the preliminary statement of fulfillment in vv 24–25. The action of the episode is more strongly dialogical (see above the comparison with OT call narratives, esp. Judg 6:11–24) than in the earlier annunciation, and with both Gabriel (vv 28, 30–33, 35) and Mary (vv 29, 34, 38) there is a three-step progression to a climax.

Comment

The significance of the preceding episode is finally determined by the content of this second annunciation, which must be studied, therefore, with constant reference back to that to which it offers a transcending parallel. The texture of OT allusion remains strong, but the more broadly eschatological ethos of 1:5–25 becomes here more focusedly messianic.

Scholarly interest has been dominated by the puzzling conclusion to Mary's question in v 34, *ἐπεὶ ἄνδρα οὐ γινώσκω*, "since I know not a man," and by a concern with the Christological content of v 35, especially with its *διὸ καὶ . . . υἱὸς θεοῦ*, "therefore . . . Son of God."

26 ὁ ἄγγελος Γαβριήλ, "the angel Gabriel," does not correspond to normal Hebrew usage (nearest is the *Ῥαφαήλ τὸν ἄγγελον*, "Raphael the angel," of Tob 5:4 [8], which serves to elucidate a contrast) and is, therefore, probably formed in relation to vv 11 and 19, from which the *ἀπεστάλην*, "I was sent," may also come. The rest of the verse reflects natural Hebrew construction except for the *τῆς* ("the") before *Γαλιλαίας* ("Galilee"), which the LXX also adds, and the *ἣ ὄνομα* construction (lit., "to which a name"), which is not infrequent in the LXX (six times in Genesis alone) but which could as well be Lukan (introduced into a Markan context at 8:41 and occurring outside the infancy narratives also at 24:13 [and cf. Acts 13:6]). Sahlin (*Messias*, 98, 140–43) finds a problem, unnecessarily, with *πόλιν (τῆς) Γαλιλαίας*, "city of Galilee." For the idiom cf. Num 22:36, and further the LXX of Gen 33:18; Judg 17:8, 4 Kgdms 23:8 (A).

"In the sixth month" establishes an immediate time sequence between this episode and vv 25–26 and may be Lukan (cf. further vv 36, 41; in v 36 the form is different [traditional?]). Time is regularly "filled" in the infancy narra-

tives (cf. 1:56–57; 80; 2:21, 22, 39–40, 41–42, 52; 2:1 is a partial exception but see v 6). ἀπεστάλη, “was sent,” is the first of a series of echoes of Dan 10:11–12 in Luke 1:26–30 (note as well the address by epithets, “greatly beloved”/ “highly favored” (v 28); the disturbed state of both Daniel and Mary; the directive “fear not” [v 30]; and the address by name [v 30]). For ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, “from God,” cf. at v 19. The infancy account exhibits in the case of Jesus the same movement from Galilee to Jerusalem that marks his later ministry (cf. at 2:46). Nothing is to be made (against Schürmann, 42) of the noncultic setting. The dramatic movement is to the temple (2:22–38, 41–49). The form Ναζαρέθ for Nazareth (as at 2:4, 39, 51; Acts 10:38) is a transliteration of the Hebrew form of the name (cf. the third- or fourth-century-A.D. Hebrew inscription reported by Avi-Yonah [BTS 61 (1964) 2–5]; a σ might have been expected for the ζ). In Luke 4:16 we have Ναζαρά, which may be an Aramaized form of the name. Matthew seems to have been unaware of an original domicile in Nazareth for Mary and Joseph (2:23).

27 The construction here seems overloaded (cf. Sahlin, *Messias*, 98 n. 2) with the sequence ἡ ὄνομα . . . ὃ ὄνομα . . . καὶ τὸ ὄνομα, “whose name . . . whose name . . . and the name.” Since Joseph plays no further role in the episode, it may be that ἐμνηστευμένην ἀνδρὶ ὃ ὄνομα Ἰωσήφ, “betrothed to a man named Joseph,” has been transferred from an introductory position before 2:4–5, in order to bind together the two episodes (cf. Dibelius, “Jungfrauensohn,” 11–14; Gaechter, *Maria*, 30–31; Leaney, *NTS* 8 [1961–62] 163). Some influence from the parallel 1:6–7 may also be at work. The resultant tracing of the ancestry through the mother is not usual, but Hillel is said to have traced for himself Davidic ancestry through his mother (Bornhäuser, *Kindheitsgeschichte*, 83). It is the specific mention of Joseph and the betrothal at this point that has produced difficulties with v 34 (see there). To introduce a name with καὶ τὸ ὄνομα (+ gen.) is non-Lukan, Semitic, and rare in the LXX.

The virginity of Mary functions, in parallel with Elizabeth’s barrenness, as an obstacle to the production of the promised child. It is exalted neither as of value in itself (as commonly assumed in Catholic study) nor as a mark of spiritual humility (as Legrand, *NRT* 84 [1962] 792–93). Her virginity is repeatedly stressed (twice here and in v 34) to underline the magnitude of the miracle (and cf. the similar function of vv 36, 37). In the present text the betrothal to Joseph serves to provide (legal) Davidic ancestry for the child. In Jewish tradition a girl was normally betrothed in the thirteenth year and for legal but not domestic purposes was from that point on considered to be married. Around a year later the girl was taken to the bridegroom’s home for normal married life to begin. Sexual relations prior to this “taking home” would be considered a violation of marriage customs (cf. Str-B, 1:45–47; 2:393–98; Gaechter, *Maria*, 79–92).

28 εἰσελθὼν πρὸς, “going into,” is Lukan idiom (Acts 11:3; 16:40; 17:2; 28:8; and cf. esp. 10:3) and is balanced by the ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ’ αὐτῆς, “he departed from her,” of v 38. χαῖρε, “rejoice,” can be a conventional Greek greeting (Matt 26:49; 27:29; 28:9; Mark 15:18; John 19:3; not found in the LXX)—through which, nevertheless, an actual call to joy could sound in appropriate contexts (Strobel, *ZNW* 53 [1962] 87–105), as would be the case in this text. Here, however, the threefold structure: call to rejoicing + a vocative of address

+ a reference to the attitude or action of God which is the ground for joy (Stock, *Bib* 61 [1980] 469) takes us to a frequent OT pattern which in the LXX is introduced by χαίρει in Joel 2:21; Zeph 3:14; Zech 9:9 (χαίρει is only found elsewhere in Lam 4:21 in a parody of this pattern; cf. Ps 32:11; Isa 12:6; 44:23; 49:13; 52:9; 54:1; Joel 2:23; etc.). Compare also the role of joy in the angelic statements of Luke 1:14 and 2:10. Mary is here greeted with a mini-oracle of salvation. χαίρει is chosen here over joy words for the sake of alliteration with the following κεχαριτωμένη, “favored one,” and need not be Septuagintal. The extended parallelism between Zeph 3:14–17 and Luke 1:28, 30, 31 claimed by Laurentin (*Structure*, 151–59) and others, and made a basis for an identification of Mary as “daughter of Zion,” has little to commend it.

χαριτοῦσθαι is a quite rare Hellenistic verb (only elsewhere in the NT at Eph 1:6 in the active). Etymologically it should mean “to be furnished with grace,” and it is used both in relation to intrinsic qualities for which a person is to be commended (like the English “well-favored”; cf. Cole, *AER* 139 [1958] 232–39) and also in relation to the receipt of special graces or privilege by a benefactor (“privileged”; cf. Audet, *RB* 63 [1956] 358–60; Cambe, *RB* 70 [1963] 202–5). The latter is undoubtedly to be preferred here and points already to the privileged role for which Mary has been marked out by God. As with the words to Gideon, “You mighty man of valor” (Judg 6:12, cf. v 14 and contrast v 15), the address already states enigmatically Mary’s task in the purpose of God (the “greatly beloved” of Dan 9:23; 10:11, 19 may have the same function and identify Daniel as marked out to be the recipient of special revelations). Lyonnet (*Bib* 20 [1939] 134) suggests an underlying use of the Hebrew root חָנַן, *hānan*, the same root that underlies the name John (cf. at v 13). An allusion to the name Hannah is also possible (1 Sam 1 and 2; cf. at Luke 1:46). κεχαριτωμένη is interpreted in the text by the declaration “You have found grace with God” in v 30 (see there).

In a greeting, ὁ Κύριος μετὰ σοῦ or a similar form (“the Lord [is] with you”) occurs in the OT only at Judg 6:12 and Ruth 2:4 (van Unnik, “Dominus Vobiscum,” 281) and thus, on the basis of the sustained links with Judg 6:11–24, is to be treated as an allusion to the Judges text (the form is as LXX except for the initial article, which is also not Luke’s usage [cf. at 1:6]). This is no conventional or pious greeting but announces the dynamic power of God’s own presence, the effects of which will be spelled out particularly in v 35. The promise or statement of the presence of God runs like a thread through OT history (see van Unnik [“Dominus Vobiscum,” 276–79] for a partial list) and here reaches a certain culmination.

29 The use of the optative εἴη (“may be”) suggests Lukan intervention in this verse (Machen, *PTR* 10 [1912] 229–31), since the use of the optative other than to express a wish is in the NT almost exclusively Lukan. The use of διαλογίζεσθαι, “to wonder,” is also likely to be Lukan (added at 20:14 and probably 3:15). Thus, we may need to attribute the whole of the second clause to Luke.

The exalted but cryptic oracular greeting is naturally disturbing to Mary (cf. Zechariah’s comparable reaction in v 12; an intensified verb form [διαταράσσειν vs. παράσσειν] is used in the case of Mary because what is happening here is yet more significant than in the case of Zechariah [a Lukan touch?]). At

the literary level, Mary's response is reported as a "wordless question" (Schürmann, 45) which can be answered by the ensuing words of the angel.

30 The reassuring *μή φοβοῦ*, "do not fear," is found in Judg 6:24, in Dan 10:12, in the Zechariah parallel (Luke 1:13), and often in divine visitations (cf. at 1:13). "To find grace" is a frequent OT idiom (Gen 6:8; 18:3; 30:27; Judg 6:17; etc.). The usage here echoes Judg 6:17 (and cf. also Gen 18:4 where additional parallels between v 10 and Luke 1:31, v 12 and Luke 1:34 culminate in the allusion to v 14 in Luke 1:37 [Allard, *NRT* 78 (1956) 730]), but since we have here in Luke a heavenly affirmation of the divine favor, there is probably also a connection with the one place where this happens in the OT, viz. in the case of Moses (Exod 32:12, 17; in narrative it is also said that Noah found grace with God [Gen 6:8]). The allusion is not, in any case, to the language of the Septuagint. In biblical idiom *יָבַח חֵן*, *māšā' hēn*, ("find favor/grace"), is the passive form for *יָבַח חֵן*, *nātan hēn*, ("to extend favor/grace to"), and is the result of a magnanimous act of a superior (cf. Cambe, *RB* 70 [1963] 196 n. 7) as an expression of favor to an inferior, sometimes, as here, in connection with the bestowal of a distinguished role.

31 *συλλαμβάνειν ἐν γαστρὶ*, "to conceive in the womb," is not Septuagintal idiom. Audet (*ScEcll* 11 [1959] 414) notes its occurrence in the *Corpus Hippocraticum* in at least three places, so it is native Greek idiom and there is no real basis for Laurentin's desire to make something special of the "abnormal" *ἐν γαστρὶ* (= the "Yahweh in your midst [i.e., womb]" of Zeph 3:17; *Structure*, 68) as part of his case for the daughter-of-Zion typology. The arguments for and against an allusion here to Isa 7:14 are finely balanced. The trio of conception, birth, and naming come together frequently in the OT (Gen 16:11; 19:36–38; 21:2–3; 1 Sam 1:20; Isa 8:3; Hos 1:3–4; etc.). The name is divinely given on no less than six such occasions. If the influence was from the LXX, the presence of *παρθένος* in Luke 1:27 and Isa 7:14 would be significant, but it is less impressive in a comparison of Hebrew texts (see further in *Form/Structure/Setting* above). Only in Gen 16:11 does the trio occur in an angelic message as in Luke 1:31, and in a Hebrew text it is Gen 16:11 that comes closest of all to the wording of Luke 1:31. On balance it seems mostly likely that Isa 7:14 is not in view. The Hebrew *הִנָּה חָרָה*, *hinnāk hārā*, underlying *ἰδοὺ συλλαλήμην ἐν γαστρὶ* is used in the OT in relation to both existing and future pregnancy (cf. the ambiguity of the English expression "You are going to have a baby"). Sahlin (*Messias*, 105–6) argues from the LXX for the same ambiguity in the Greek, but this is not as certain.

As in the annunciation to Zechariah (v 13; see there) a name for the child is provided. "To call the name of a person something" is Semitic and non-Lukan. Heaven-given names always have etymological significance (cf. Matt 1:21), but in the underlying Hebrew text there was no need to make it explicit.

32 "He will grow up" for the *ἔσται μέγας*, "he will be great," is more attractive here than at v 15 (see there), but would require a mistranslation of a Hebrew original and does not do justice to the parallel with v 15. On the other hand, no transcendent significance for the *μέγας*, "great," is warranted (cf. Sir 48:22; Luke 9:48; *T. Levi* 17.2; and esp. 4Q243 1.7). The absolute use of *ὕψιστος*, "most high," for God is not, after all, Hellenistic here (with Fitzmyer, 347–48, and against, e.g., Schürmann, 48 n. 57) in light of the juxtaposition in

4Q243 2.1 of (in Aramaic) just the two titles, “son of the Most High” and “son of God” that are found here in Luke 1:32, 35 (the *κληθήσεται*, “shall be called,” is also paralleled, which had been already recognized as Semitic [Gunkel, “Die Lieder,” 58 n. 2]). In Semitic idiom *κληθήσεται* means “will be recognized to be” rather than referring specifically to a verbal act (Luke does not use the verb in this way). “Son” here is a designation of the messiah and is ultimately dependent on such texts as 2 Sam 7:12–16; 1 Chr 22:9–10; Ps 2:7; Ps 89:26–29, which play an important role in the development of the messianic hope. Sonship is an exalted status and relationship with God experienced by the messiah, and it is on the basis of this sonship that he is enabled to carry out his messianic functions (see further at 3:22).

δώσει αὐτῷ . . . τὸν θρόνον, “he will grant to him . . . the throne,” is an ellipsis to which is to be supplied *καθῆσθαι ἐπὶ*, “to sit upon,” or a similar form (see the full form in connection with Solomon’s accession in 1 Kgs 1:48, a text which may be echoed here; and cf. further 1 Kgs 2:24, which has also “the throne of David my father” and may contribute to Luke 1:31; none of the better-known messianic texts are at all close [Isa 9:7 does have “throne of David”]).

It may be no accident that while in v 32 God is first called *ὕψιστος* and then *θεός*, in v 35 the order is reversed.

33 The ideas of the verse are clearly those of OT messianism, but the language is not closely that of any of the major messianic texts (for rule by the messiah forever see Gen 49:10; Ps 110:4; Isa 9:7 [?]; Ezek 37:25; and cf. Ps 72:5–7; for an everlasting kingdom see 2 Sam 7:16; 1 Kgs 8:25; Mic 4:7; 1 Macc 2:57). Closest to *βασιλεύσει ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰακώβ*, “he will rule over the house of Jacob,” is 2 Sam 2:4 where David is anointed “to rule over the house of Judah” (LXX reading, which reflects a different vocalization of the Hebrew text). “House of Jacob” is quite common in the OT, especially in Isaiah (2:5; 8:17; 10:20; etc.). “House of Jacob” is particularly appropriate for an emphasis on rule over the whole twelve tribes. *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*, “forever,” is found in the LXX, but not in messianic texts. The Hebrew *לְעֹלָם*, *lēʿôlām* (“forever”), of Ps 110:4 is closest. “His kingdom” corresponds to 2 Sam 7:16 (LXX and not MT) but is frequent in both MT and LXX. *οὐκ ἔσται τέλος*, “there will not be an end,” comes from Isa 9:6 [ET v 7] and reflects an independent translation of the MT (LXX has *οὐκ ἔστιν ὄριον*, “there is no boundary”). Overall the evidence of the verse favors an independent relationship to the MT.

In vv 32–33 there is a strong affirmation of Davidic messianism, an affirmation which Luke sustains consistently (cf. Acts 1:6) despite the fact that he understands the fulfillment in terms that transcend traditional Jewish messianism (cf. Luke 19:14, 27, 38; 23:2, 3, 37–38; Acts 2:30–36; 13:34–37). A relationship between Jesus’ rule and kingdom-of-God language is established at Luke 19:11 (see there).

34 For *εἶπεν πρὸς*, “said to,” which may well be Lukan, see at 1:13. There may have been some conforming of the wording here to v 18. Luke does not elsewhere use a future tense with *πῶς*, “how,” in a question (only Luke 11:18, which is shared by Matthew). At this point in the call pattern Judg 6:15 has a question beginning *בַּמָּה*, *bammâ* (“how”/“in what way”), which may stand behind the *πῶς* here (LXX has the more literal *ἐν τίνι*, “in what”). *ἐπεὶ*, “since,”

is not used elsewhere by Luke. The use of *γινώσκειν*, “to know,” to indicate sexual intimacy is Semitic (Gen 19:8; Judg 11:39; 21:11; Num 31:17–18) but also occurs in popular-level Hellenistic Greek. Following the MT, which never uses the imperfect tense for this idiom, the present tense of *γινώσκειν* is not used in this way in the LXX (Judg 21:11 [A] has the present participle but there the following *κοίτην ἀρσενοῦς* makes the sexual statement explicit). For that reason a slightly different sense is to be expected here (Carmignac, *BT* 28 [1977] 327–30).

Suggestions as to the precise sense of v 34 have been legion. The difficulty that has produced them all is the apparent unnaturalness of the question, given the explicit attention drawn to Mary’s betrothed state in v 27: so far as the contents of the angel’s words in vv 30–33 are concerned one might expect Mary to assume that the child will be the fruit of the coming union with Joseph. So why the question, and especially its second clause? Suggestions range from the traditional Catholic claim of a preexistent vow of (or strong inclination to) perpetual virginity (with or without an existing virginal marriage to Joseph), through appeal to a knowledge by Mary of a messianic understanding of Isa 7:14 which included a virginal conception, or some kind of confusion about the time-frame for the conception, to the now common assumption that the question is only a literary device preparing for the material of v 35 and that therefore, strictly speaking, the question does not have an exact meaning, but only a literary role. Only the final two suggestions do not labor under the burden of needing to bring too much to the text (not to say the burden of historical improbability in a first-century Jewish context).

If v 34 were purely Lukan, then the literary device suggestion would have much to commend it. Acts 21:25 clearly has such a literary role. The question in Luke 13:23 is probably a literary device designed to facilitate the flow of the narrative. For other possible examples see Gewiess (*BZ* 5 [1961] 244–52). However, the language of v 34 favors on the whole a pre-Lukan existence, and more importantly vv 32–33 require just such a transition as v 34 to connect with v 35, which (as we have seen above in *Form/Structure/Setting*) has a strong claim to original and pre-Lukan unity with vv 32–33. So it is better to look in another direction.

The suggestion, in its various forms, of a misunderstanding about time (or a correct understanding that the conception was to be in the immediate future) also has much to commend it (cf. at v 31), but it does leave us with an explanation of the logic of an underlying Hebrew text and not of the existing Greek text and/or with questions about why the Greek translator made no better effort to capture the flow of thoughts (an *ἄρτι* [“now”] for v 31? an *οὐπω* [“not yet”] for v 34?).

At the literary level the problem with taking v 34 in a natural sense comes not so much from Mary’s betrothed state as from its mention at the head of the account. But in the discussion at v 27 we saw reason for treating just this as a secondary insertion from 2:4–5, made by Luke to bind together the two episodes (and not to have any particular role in 1:26–38). The solution to our dilemma seems to be, then, to bracket out of the dramatic development of the narrative in 1:26–38 the mention of the betrothal in v 27, which has quite a different function (for another Lukan example of the juxtaposition of

items that are conceived in relation to different interests and may not successfully be read in close relationship with one another (see Acts 5:13 and 14). It is then quite natural for Mary to ask, “How can this be, since I do not have a sexual relationship with a man?”

In the context (esp. v 45) Mary’s question is not understood to be colored by doubt in the way that Zechariah’s had been.

35 The language *καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ ἄγγελος εἶπεν αὐτῇ*, “and the angel, answering, said to her,” has probably been conformed to that of v 19. The anarthrous *πνεῦμα ἅγιον*, “Holy Spirit,” is Semitic (cf. at 1:15) and is never used in the subject position by Luke. *ἐπέρχεσθαι ἐπὶ*, “to come upon,” is Septuagintal idiom but is used in connection with the Spirit only at Isa 32:15 (A 8) where the MT has *יִפְּרֹשׁ*, *yēʿāreh* (“will be poured out”). Acts 1:8 has *ἐπελθόντος τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς*, “when the Holy Spirit comes upon you.” Since Luke nowhere else refers to the coming of the Spirit in these terms, he is probably drawing attention to the Greek text of Isa 32:15 in both cases: this is the eschatological coming of the Spirit that will cause the wilderness to become a fruitful field. Luke links *πνεῦμα*, “Spirit,” and *δύναμις*, “power,” closely (Luke 4:14; Acts 1:8; 10:38) but never identifies them quite as here. Also, the secondary formation “spirit and power” for the sake of a parallel with v 35, which is noted at v 17, supports an origin in tradition and not Lukan redaction for the parallel clauses of v 35. Note also the traditional linking of “Spirit” and “power” in Rom 1:4. *ὑψίστου*, “of the Most High,” could be Lukan (6:35; Acts 7:48), but the parallel uses of *ὑψιστος* and *θεός* in vv 32 and 35 suggest otherwise. *ἐπισκιάσει*, “will overshadow,” like *ἐπελεύσεται*, “will come upon,” has probably been influenced by the LXX text of Exod 40:35, perhaps via the transfiguration account (Luke 9:34): Mary’s experience is to be compared to the dramatic way in which God’s glory and the cloud marking his presence came down upon the completed tabernacle. *διὸ καὶ*, “therefore,” could be Lukan (Acts 10:29; 24:26). Only the plainly secondary text of Eccl 3:15(A) offers a parallel to *τὸ γεννώμενον* (lit., “the being born”). The use here of *ἅγιον*, “holy,” in connection with Jesus is not Lukan (Luke 4:34 repeats Mark 1:24; Acts 3:14 is traditional [cf. 4:27, 30]). Just possibly *ἅγιον κληθήσεται*, “will be called holy,” reflects the *קָדוֹשׁ יִקְרָא*, *qādōš yēʿāmer*, of Isa 4:3 (LXX has plural). *κληθήσεται υἱὸς θεοῦ*, “will be called Son of God,” repeats the Semitism of v 32 (see there). Overall, then, v 35 would seem to have a Semitic base and structure which has been subjected to considerable Lukan editing.

Where the role of the Spirit in 1:15 is seen more along the lines of prophetic inspiration and here in connection rather with the creative and life-giving role of the Spirit (see in *Form/Structure/Setting* above), in both cases the eschatological activity of the Spirit is in view (against Tatum, *NTS* 13 [1966–67] 187, and others). As we have seen above, the activity of the Spirit in Jesus’ origin is firmly linked to OT statements of God’s activity (Isa 32:15; Exod 40:35). There is not the slightest evidence that either of the verbs involved has ever been used in relation to sexual activity or even more broadly in connection with the conception of a child (cf. Fitzmyer, *TS* 34 [1973] 569; not *ἐπέρχεσθαι* but *ἐπιβαίνειν* would be needed to express the notion of coming upon [mounting] sexually [e.g., Philo, *De Som.* 1.200]).

Because of the orientation to the future of the clause that contains it, and

because of the profound orientation of the Lukan infancy texts to Mary, τὸ γεννώμενον takes its meaning from the use of the verb in connection with the role of the mother and not from its use in connection with the role of the father. The future orientation is best satisfied by a focus on the future birth (as Vicent, *EstBib* 33 [1974] 265–73) rather than on the development in the womb (as Fridrichsen, *SO* 6 [1928] 33–36). We should translate, then, “the child to be born.” The neuter gender is best explained as due to an understood neuter noun for child (cf. 2:40; to have γεννώμενον modify ἅγιον [“the to-be-born holy one”] is grammatically odd [Moule, *Idiom Book*, 107], and the ingenious sense suggested for it by Voss [*Christologie*, 78–79] requires too many steps).

Difficulties with the double predicate (ἅγιον and υἱὸς θεοῦ [“holy” and “Son of God”]) have led many to regard the second as a later addition (made already in a Hebrew original, by Luke, or later). But it is a poor literary sense that would allow a decline from the relational υἱὸς ὑψίστου, “Son of the Most High,” of v 32 to the rather impersonal (even neuter) ἅγιον, “holy,” of v 35. The double predicate corresponds to the ἅγιον, “holy,” of the first clause of the angel’s word in v 35 and the ὑψίστου, “the Most High,” of the second; further, it corresponds with the double predicate of v 32 (μέγας and υἱὸς ὑψίστου [“great” and “Son of the Most High”]). The relationship between Luke 1:32, 35 and the traditional collection of motifs in Rom 1:3–4 also speaks for the originality of υἱὸς θεοῦ (see *Form/Structure/Setting*) here in 1:35. ἅγιον could be predicate to an understood εἶναι (“will be”; cf. v 32), but the word order is best satisfied by linking ἅγιον with κληθήσεται (“will be called”), which also allows for the possible connection with Isa 4:3 (see above). This leaves υἱὸς θεοῦ, “Son of God,” loosely attached, in apposition to ἅγιον. The “holy” is that to which God has special claim (Luke 2:23 cf. Exod 13:2, 12; Num 3:11–13) and to which he is particularly connected (Exod 4:5; 25:8; etc.).

The sense of υἱὸς θεοῦ, “Son of God,” is no different from that of υἱὸς ὑψίστου, “Son of the Most High,” in v 32 (see there and especially *Form/Structure/Setting* above). Different only is the specific grounding here in the activity of God through the Spirit in the creation of the child (cf. in Jer 1:5 the grounding of Jeremiah’s prophetic call in a determination of God prior to Jeremiah’s conception). The child’s incredible origin marks him out as destined for a quite special role in the purposes of God. This special role is expressed first more generally in the recognition that he is “holy,” and then more specifically in the messianically colored affirmation that he is “Son of God.”

The διὸ καί, “therefore,” spans more than one logical step, and the text does not allow us to give it a precisely determined sense. The use of κληθήσεται (“will be called”; cf. at v 32) suggests a reading of διὸ καί along the lines “from what God here begins will flow consequences leading to . . .” rather than as the “therefore” of a strictly logical inference. Probably the child is thought of as being “holy” and “Son of God” from birth, with recognition to come later, but the text does not clearly specify. No doubt we are meant to be left with a good measure of mystery concerning this child whose mode of origin is quite unprecedented.

Perhaps for Luke there is a link between the fresh creative work of the Spirit here, marking the newly created as Son of God, and the place of Adam

as son of God in Luke 3:38 (see there and at 4:3), but this is less than certain. The emphasis of the text is on the total initiative of God: God's choice of the messianic Son is not made out of the stock of existing humanity; it is made rather through a unique creative act which brings into being a child who would otherwise never have existed.

The relationship between Luke 1:32, 35 and Rom 1:3-4, to which appeal has been made earlier, remains teasing. Its adequate discussion involves a wider consideration of Christological development which is not possible here. Rom 1:3-4 is a difficult text, and it is difficult to be sure precisely what role is there attributed to the Spirit in the resurrection identification of Jesus as Son. Luke 1:32, 35 and Rom 1:3-4 exhibit no immediate dependence one way or the other. They probably do not even have a common origin beyond their shared ultimate concern with God's establishing of Jesus as Son. Cross influence is, however, more likely at a later stage. If we may judge from Acts 2:34-36; 11:33, a role for the Spirit is not an original component in the tradition that connects resurrection and sonship. And a role for the Spirit in establishing messianic identity plays no part in Jewish tradition (though the messiah would of course possess the Spirit [Isa 11:2; cf. 61:1]). It is, therefore, possible that the connection between sonship and the work of the Spirit in Rom 1:4 is dependent on a bringing together of these two motifs which goes back ultimately to the tradition behind Luke 1:32, 35. (It is of course possible to understand Rom 1:3-4 in quite other ways and to deny any significance to the cluster of motifs apparently shared by Luke 1:32, 35 and Rom 1:3-4. Nothing in the present study would be drastically disturbed by such a move.)

36 *καὶ ἰδοὺ*, "and behold," is probably for the sake of the parallel in v 20. The sentence is marked by an extreme parataxis which is beyond anything normally produced by Luke (but cf. 19:2). The effect looks Semitic but could be imitative. The use of *καλουμένη*, "called," could well be Lukan (cf. 6:15; 7:11; 23:33; Acts 1:12; etc.). The information of v 36 may all be derived from 1:5-25, while the tradition of the visit (1:39-45, 56) presupposes both some relationship between the two figures (*συγγενίς* is quite vague) and Mary's awareness of Elizabeth's advanced state of pregnancy. It is not unlikely, therefore, that Luke has drawn on other tradition to complete the parallelism between the two annunciations.

The specific relationship established between the two births here encourages the understanding of Jesus' conception as a heightened instance of what had happened in the case of Elizabeth.

37 The language here is very Semitic (R. E. Brown, *Birth*, 292). It is normally referred to the LXX of Gen 18:14 (because of the miraculous birth context), but the language is much closer to the MT of Jer 32:17, whose word order and syntax are also perfectly reflected (LXX is quite different [39:17]). Gaechter is probably correct, however, that in both Jeremiah and Luke 1:37 the usage is proverbial (*ZKT* 91 [1969] 361; but it is proverbial in Hebrew and not Greek [the LXX forms show too little stability]). At most we could claim for the proverb a residual memory of connection with the experience of Abraham (i.e., not the question of Gen 18:14, but the answer to it implied by subsequent events). In any case the language is Semitic, non-Septuagintal, and non-Lukan. If v 36 has been added, then originally v 37 without the *ὅτι*, "because," will have followed v 35.

In the present text (and originally) the words are to be related (as Stock, *Bib* 61 [1980] 484–85) to Mary's pregnancy (future), not Elizabeth's. The motive is, however, not apologetic (as Schürmann, 57), but rather (as Mussner, *Catholica* 18 [1964] 259) to call Mary, as Abraham had been called earlier, to faith in the God of wonders. In Pauline terms she was called to believe in him who calls into being what is not (Rom 4:17; Bornhäuser, *Kindheitsgeschichte*, 88).

38 Mary's words may echo the readiness of Abigail to respond as obedient servant to the word sent her from David (1 Sam 25:41), or perhaps a readiness for what happened to Sarah (Gen 21:1). Closest to "the (female) slave/servant of the Lord" is 1 Sam 1:11; and cf. Pss 86:16; 116:16; Joel 2:29 [3:2]. The language is Semitic (for *γένοιτο* . . . *κατὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου*, "let it be . . . according to your word," cf. Gen 30:34 MT [LXX has *ἔστω*]) and probably not Lukan (*δούλη* only in the quotation in Acts 2:18; optative of *γινεσθαι* only once, and then in the stereotyped *μὴ γένοιτο* [Luke 20:16]). The words of departure correspond to those of arrival in v 28 (see there). In both cases they are probably Lukan.

Stock (*Bib* 61 [1980] 486) notes that a major OT context for the use of servant/slave language is in connection with a task specified by the (a) Lord. Mary's response has developed in response to successive angelic statements from the troubled state of v 29 to the questioning of v 34 to this final unreserved readiness for God's purpose. Mary's final word gains in importance from the fact that in the pattern of OT birth announcements and calls the final word is always given to the supernatural voice. In giving her consent Mary is also making a statement of faith (cf. vv 37, 45). It is too much to say that here the saving purpose of God stands in the balance, dependent on Mary's consent (Zechariah's unbelief was no insuperable barrier), but too little to say that Mary is no more than an (ahead of time) model Christian (Räsänen, *Mutter Jesu*, 106; Vögtle, *BibLeb* 11 [1970] 53 n. 12).

Without the need for explicit statement, it is clear enough that the moment of conception is to be located between vv 38 and 39 (Schürmann, 50).

Explanation

The annunciation to Mary is reported in a form that closely parallels that to Zechariah. However, at every point the experience of Mary surpasses that of Zechariah; and while the Zechariah account stays with the model provided by the OT birth annunciations (Gen 16:7–14; Gen 17–18; Judg 13:2–23), in the case of Mary the birth oracle form has been heavily modified in the direction of a call narrative form (Judg 6:11–24; Exod 3; Jer 1:4–10).

Where the story of John's origins starts in the temple and moves out, the story of Jesus' origins starts in Galilee and moves to climax in the temple.

The various attempts to demonstrate that 1:34–35 is a later addition to the account are not persuasive. The whole shape of the account exhibits an integrity that can be traced back to an underlying Hebrew document. For the most part, all Luke has done is to heighten the parallel with Luke 1:5–25. The origin for this tradition of a virginal conception cannot be found in any of the pagan myths of divine paternity. They move in a totally different world of thought. And there is really no trace in Hellenistic Judaism of any form of these myths domesticated to the needs of Jewish faith. The similarity

regularly claimed between Luke 1:35 and pagan myths is based finally on a superficial reading of the Lukan text. In Luke 1:35 God is not father as Mary is mother. Rather, by the creative power of his Spirit, God miraculously enables a true parthenogenesis, and creates a child who will stand in special relationship to himself as messianic Son. The categories of thought are Jewish. The text is not about how God fathered Jesus.

So far as the historicity of the virginal conception is concerned, (i) an account of it probably circulated much earlier than is frequently suggested; (ii) the idea of a virginal conception has certainly not been borrowed from either paganism or pre-Christian Judaism (the Jews never read Isa 7:14 in this way); and (iii) in the role it plays in Luke 1:26–38 the virginal conception does not make sense as a theological deduction from the Christian assertion that Jesus is Son of God. The best explanation is finally the historical one: Jesus was born without the intervention of a human father.

As in the annunciation to Zechariah, the texture of OT allusions remains strong but the more broadly eschatological ethos of 1:5–25 becomes here focusedly messianic.

“Was sent” (v 26) is the first of a series of echoes of Dan 10:11–12 in vv 26–30. Like Daniel, both Zechariah and Mary receive messages about end-time events from Gabriel. The twice-repeated statement of Mary’s virginity (v 27) prepares the reader for its importance at vv 34–35 (cf. v 7). Betrothals in the thirteenth year were usual, with marriage to be consummated about a year later. “The house of David” prepares for the Davidic descent of the child to be born. The angel’s greeting is a mini-oracle of salvation. Frequent in the OT is a pattern in which there is an address that calls to joy and grounds the call in an attitude or action of God revealed in the words of address (e.g., Joel 2:21; Zeph 3:14; Zech 9:9). As with Gideon (Judg 6:12; and cf. Dan 9:23; 10:11, 19), the form of address, “privileged one,” already states enigmatically God’s purpose for Mary, and like Gideon she is promised God’s powerful presence for her role (Judg 6:12).

Mary’s troubled response (v 29; cf. v 12) is a wordless question, which is answered by the ensuing words of the angel. For both the angel (vv 28, 30–33, 35) and Mary (vv 29, 34, 38) there is a three-step progression to a climax. The angel’s reassuring “do not fear” continues the link with Gideon (Judg 6:26) but is frequent elsewhere and parallels v 13. Only in the case of Moses is there an earlier heavenly affirmation of divine favor (Exod 32:12; cf. Judg 6:17). The idiom “to have found favor” means to have had extended to one the magnanimously bestowed favor of a superior (it is not a statement of Mary’s special virtue). Despite some obvious similarity, v 31 is not to be linked to Isa 7:14 (it is closer to the Hebrew text of Gen 16:11). Conception, birth, and divine naming come together repeatedly in the OT. “He will be great” (v 32) echoes v 15. In Semitic idiom “he will be called” means “he will be recognized to be.” “Son” is here a designation of the messiah (see 2 Sam 7:12–16; Ps 2:7; etc.). Sonship is an exalted status and relationship to God on the basis of which the messiah is enabled to carry out his messianic functions (cf. 3:22). Note how “God” and “Most High” change places between v 32 and v 35. The ideas of vv 32–33 are clearly those of OT and contemporary Jewish messianism. “House of Jacob” is particularly appropriate for an emphasis

rule over the whole twelve tribes. Luke will later show that this Davidic messianism is fulfilled in terms that transcend Jewish (and OT) hopes (cf. Luke 19:14; 24:26; Acts 2:30–36; etc.).

V 34 has been understood in many ways. It seems best to take it that Mary understood the angel to be speaking about the conception of a child while her existing marital situation continued: “I have no sexual relationship with a man.” Well might she ask, “How can this be?”

The answer is that a yet greater miracle than in the case of Elizabeth will occur. The Spirit will come upon her as promised for the eschatological period—that Spirit by means of which the wilderness will become a fruitful field (Isa 32:15, esp. LXX). God’s power will overshadow her as in the dramatic coming down of God’s glory and the cloud to overshadow in the wilderness the newly completed tabernacle (Exod 40:35). By the sheer creative power of God a child will be born whose origin is not that of normal human generation. The child’s incredible origin marks him out as destined for a quite special role in the purposes of God. This special role is first expressed more generally in the recognition that he is “holy” (the holy is that to which God has special claim [Luke 2:23; cf. Exod 13:2, 12] and to which he is particularly connected [Exod 4:5; 25:8]), and then more specifically in the messianically colored affirmation that he is “Son of God.” We are left with a good measure of mystery. What is emphasized is the total initiative of God in providing the messianic Son.

Elizabeth has already conceived miraculously by a special intervention of God’s power, and this becomes a sign to Mary of what she is to experience (v 36). The proverbial statement of God’s unlimited power in v 37 invites Mary in her own situation to believe, as had Abraham of old (cf. Gen 18:14), in the God of wonders.

Mary is given the last word and as a statement of faith (cf. v 45) declares her unreserved readiness for God’s purposes. Mary is here the pattern for Christian faith but also much more: she responds to a call that is unique in human history. Her consent given, Mary conceives before her visit to Elizabeth, which is reported next.

Mary Visits Elizabeth (1:39–56)

Bibliography

FOR THE LUKAN CANTICLES:

Aytoon, R. A. “The Ten Lukan Hymns of the Nativity in Their Original Language.” *JTS*, o.s., 18 (1916–17) 274–88. **Farris, S.** “The Hymns of Luke’s Infancy Narratives: Their Origin, Meaning, and Significance.” Ph.D. diss., Cambridge, 1981. **Flood, E.**

"The Bible and the People: The Magnificat and the Benedictus." *Clergy Review* 51 (1966) 205-10. **Gryglewicz, F.** "Die Herkunft der Hymnen des Kindheitsevangeliums des Lucas." *NTS* 21 (1974-75) 265-73. **Gunkel, H.** "Die Lieder." In *Festgabe von Fachgenossen und Freunden A. von Harnack zum siebzigsten Geburtstag dargebracht*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1921. 48-60. **Haupt, P.** "Magnificat und Benedictus." *AJP* 40 (1919) 64-75. **Jones, D.** "The Background and Character of the Lukan Psalms." *JTS*, n.s., 19 (1968) 19-50. **Machen, J. G.** "The Hymns of the First Chapter of Luke." *PTR* 10 (1912) 1-38. **Marty, J.** "Études des textes cultuels de prière contenus dans le Nouveau Testament." *RHPR* 9 (1929) 234-68, 368-76, esp. 371-75. **Smitmans, A.** "Die Hymnen der Kindheitsgeschichte nach Lukas." *BK* 21 (1966) 115-18. **Spitta, F.** "Die chronologischen Notizen und die Hymnen in Lc 1 u. 2." *ZNW* 7 (1906) 281-317, esp. 303-17. **Winter, P.** "Magnificat and Benedictus—Maccabean Psalms?" *BJRL* 37 (1954) 328-47.

FOR 1:39-45, 56:

Bartsch, H.-W. *Wachet aber zu jeder Zeit!* 29-39. **Beverly, H.** "An Exposition of Luke 1:39-45." *Int* 30 (1976) 396-400. **Hospodar, B.** "Meta spoudēs in Lk 1, 39." *CBQ* 18 (1956) 14-18. **Jacquemin, P.-E.** "La Visitation: Lc. 1,39-45." *AsSeign* 8 (1972) 64-75. **Kopp, C.** *The Holy Places of the Gospels*. New York: Herder & Herder, 1963. 87-96. **Nevius, R. C.** *ATR* 48 (1966) 75-77. **Plassmann, T.** "Cum Festinatione in Luke 1:39." *AER* 137 (1957) 230-34. **Springer, J. F.** "St. Luke 1:64 and 39." *ATR* 4 (1921-22) 332-37. ———, "M'dinah and polis." *ATR* 5 (1922-23) 324-32. ———, "No Mistranslation in Luke 1:39." *ATR* 10 (1927-28) 37-46. **Stanley, D. M.** "The Mother of My Lord." *Worship* 34 (1959-60) 330-32. **Torrey, C. C.** "The Translations Made from the Original Aramaic Gospels." In *Studies in the History of Religions*, FS C. H. Toy, ed. D. G. Lyon and G. F. Moore. New York: Macmillan, 1912. 269-317. ———, "Medina and polis and Luke i. 39." *HTR* 17 (1924) 83-91.

FOR 1:46-55:

Bailey, K. E. "The Song of Mary: Vision of a New Exodus (Luke 1:46-55)." *NESTR* 1 (1979) 29-35. **Bardenhewer, O.** "Ist die Elisabeth die Sängerin des Magnificat?" *BibS(F)* 6 (1901) 187-200. **Barns, T.** "The Magnificat in Niceta of Remesiana and Cyril of Jerusalem." *JTS*, o.s., 7 (1905-6) 449-53. **Benko, S.** "The Magnificat: A History of the Controversy." *JBL* 86 (1967) 263-75. **Bogaert, P.-M.** "Épisode de la controverse sur le Magnificat: A propos d'un article inédit de Donatien De Bruyne (1906)." *RBén* 94 (1984) 38-49. **Burkitt, F. C.** "Who Spoke the Magnificat?" *JTS*, o.s., 7 (1906) 220-27. **Buth, R.** "Hebrew Poetic Tenses and the Magnificat." *JSNT* 21 (1984) 67-83. **Davies, J. G.** "The Ascription of the Magnificat to Mary." *JTS*, n.s., 15 (1964) 307-8. **Delebecque, É.** *Études grecques*. 15-23. **Dupont, J.** "Le Magnificat comme discours sur Dieu." *NRT* 102 (1980) 321-43. **Durand, A.** "L'Origine du Magnificat." *RB* 7 (1898) 74-77. **Forestell, J. T.** "Old Testament Background of the Magnificat." *Marian Studies* 12 (1961) 205-44. **Fraine, J. de.** *Prier avec la Bible: Les antécédents bibliques de grandes prières chrétienne*. Bruges: Ch. Beyerat, 1961. 97-167. **Gomá Civit, I.** *The Song of Salvation. The Magnificat: The Song of Mary*. Tr. Sr. Mary of Jesus. Middlegreen, Slough: St. Paul Publications, 1986. **Grigsby, B.** "Compositional Hypotheses for the Lukan 'Magnificat'—Tensions for the Evangelical." *EvQ* 56 (1984) 159-72. **Guillet, J.** "Le Magnificat." *Maison Dieu* 38 (1954) 56-69. **Hamel, E.** "Le Magnificat, la femme et la promotion de la justice." *Cahiers marials* 113 (1978) 157-77. ———, "Le Magnificat et le renversement des situations: réflexion théologico-biblique." *Gregorianum* 60 (1979) 55-84. **Hamp, V.** "Der alttestamentliche Hintergrund des Magnifikat." *BK* 2 (1953) 17-23. **Harnack, A. von.** "Das Magnificat der Elisabeth (Luc. 1,46-55) nebst einigen Bemerkungen zu Luc. 1

und 2." *SPAW* 27 (1900) 538–56. **Harris, J. R.** "Mary or Elizabeth." *ExpTim* 41 (1930) 266–67. ———. "Again the Magnificat." *ExpTim* 42 (1931) 188–90. **Irgoin, J.** "La composition rythmique du Magnificat (Luc I, 46–55)." In *Zetesis*, FS E. de Strycker. Antwerp-Utrecht: De Nederlandsche Boekhandel, 1973. 618–28. **Jacobé, F.** (= A. Loisy). "L'Origine du Magnificat." *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses* 2 (1897) 424–32. **Jacquemin, P.-E.** "Le Magnificat (Lc 1,46–55)." *AsSeign* 66 (1973) 28–40. **Joüon, P.** "Notes de philologie évangélique: Luc, 1,54–55: Une difficulté grammaticale du Magnificat." *RSR* 15 (1925) 438–41, esp. 440–41. **Karris, R. J.** "Mary's Magnificat and Recent Study." *RevRel* 42 (1983) 903–8. **Koontz, J. V. G.** "Mary's Magnificat." *BSac* 116 (1959) 336–49. **Köstlin, H. A.** "Das Magnificat Lc 1,46–55, Lobgesang der Maria oder der Elisabeth?" *ZNW* 3 (1902) 142–45. **Ladeuze, P.** "De l'origine du Magnificat et son attribution dans le troisième évangile à Marie ou à Elisabeth." *RHE* 4 (1903) 623–44. **McGrath, R. H.** "Who Spoke the Magnificat? An Exercise in Textual Criticism." *TBT* 33 (1967) 2315–20. **Meynet, R.** *Quelle est donc cette parole?* 47–48, 64, 153–55, 173–75. **Monloubou, L.** *La prière selon Saint Luc: Recherche d'une structure.* 219–39. ———. "Le Magnificat: un effort pour voir Dieu, pour dire Dieu." *Cahiers marials* 23/113 (1978) 145–55. **Mussner, F.** "Lukas 1,48 f.; 11,27 f. und die Anfänge der Marienverehrung in der Urkirche." *De primordiis cultus mariani: Acta congressus mariologici-mariani in Lusitania anno 1967 celebrati.* 2nd vol. Rome: Academia mariana, 1970. 25–34. **O'Day, G.** "Singing Woman's Song: A Hermeneutic of Liberation." *CurTM* 12 (1985) 203–10. **Ryan, E. A.** "Historical Notes on Luke 1,48." *Marian Studies* 3 (1952) 228–35. **Schmidt, P.** "Maria in der Sicht des Magnifikat." *GuL* 46 (1973) 417–30. ———. "Maria und das Magnificat: Maria im Heilshandeln Gottes im Alten und Neuen Gottesvolk." *Catholica* 29 (1975) 230–46. **Schnackenburg, R.** "Das Magnificat, seine Spiritualität und Theologie." *GuL* 38 (1965) 342–57. **Schoonheim, P. L.** "Der alttestamentliche Boden der Vokabel in Lukas 1,51." *NovT* 8 (1966) 235–46. **Schottroff, L.** "Das Magnificat und die älteste Tradition über Jesus von Nazareth." *EvT* 38 (1978) 298–313. **Seccombe, D. P.** *Possessions and the Poor in Luke-Acts.* 70–83. **Spitta, F.** "Das Magnificat." In *Theologische Abhandlungen*, FS H. J. Holtzmann, ed. W. Nowack et al. Tübingen: Mohr, 1902. 63–94. **Tannehill, R. C.** "The Magnificat as Poem." *JBL* 93 (1974) 263–75. **Ter-Minassiantz, E.** "Hat Irenäus Lc 1,46 Mariam oder Elisabet gelesen?" *ZNW* 7 (1906) 191–92. **Vogels, W.** "Le Magnificat, Marie et Israël." *Eglise et Théologie* 6 (1975) 279–96. **Wansbrough, H.** "The Lowliness of Mary." *Way* 20 (1980) 176–83. **Wood, I. F.** "τῆς δούλης in the Magnificat, Luke 1.48." *JBL* 21 (1902) 48–50. **Zorell, F.** "Das Magnificat ein Kunstwerk hebräischer oder aramäischer Poesie?" *ZKT* 29 (1905) 754–58.

Translation

³⁹In those days Mary set off^a and went into the hill country with eagerness, into a city of Judah, ⁴⁰and entered into the house of Zechariah. She greeted Elizabeth, ⁴¹and it happened that, as Elizabeth heard the greeting of Mary, the baby leaped in her womb. Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit ⁴²and called out^b in a loud voice,^c "Most blessed of women are you, and blessed is the fruit of your womb. ⁴³Why should this happen to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me? ⁴⁴For,^d as the sound of your greeting came into my ear, the baby leaped for joy in my womb. ⁴⁵Blessed is she who has believed that there would be a fulfillment of what was spoken to her from the Lord."

⁴⁶Mary^e said,

"My soul is magnifying the Lord,

⁴⁷and my spirit has found joy in God my savior,

⁴⁸because he has had regard for the afflicted state of his servant.

*For, see,^f from now on all generations will declare me blessed,
⁴⁹because the mighty one has done great things for me.*

His name is holy,

*⁵⁰and his mercy is for generations upon generations of those who
 fear him,*

⁵¹He has shown might with his arm:

He has scattered those who are proud in the thought of their hearts;^g

*⁵²He has brought down potentates from their thrones,
 and exalted the lowly;*

*⁵³He has filled the hungry with good things,
 and sent away empty those who have become rich;*

⁵⁴He has taken the part of Israel his servant,

In remembrance of his mercy—

⁵⁵just as he spoke to our fathers—

to Abraham and his descendants forever.”

⁵⁶Mary remained with her about three months and then^h returned to her home.

Notes

^aCf. at 4:38.

^b*ἀνεβόησεν* occurs here in \aleph C Θ etc., and could be original.

^cA pleonastic *καὶ εἶπεν*, “and said,” is not translated.

^d*ἰδοὺ*, “behold,” is not translated here.

^e*Elisabet*, “Elizabeth,” is read by it^{a,b,1}, one MS of Irenaeus, and Niceta.

^fLit., “behold.”

^gSingular in Greek.

^h“And then” = *καί*.

Form/Structure/Setting

The visit of Mary to Elizabeth marks the intertwining of the destinies of the two heroes of Luke's infancy gospel and makes yet more explicit the subordination of John to Jesus. At the end of each of the annunciation accounts information has been provided which is preparatory for this meeting (1:24, 36; cf. R. E. Brown, *Birth*, 341). The formal parallelism between the two infancy narratives is maintained at this point of their intersection: both women are miraculously pregnant, and each is aware through supernatural revelation of the other's condition (vv 36, 41–45); Elizabeth's blessing of Mary and her unborn son (vv 42–45) is balanced by Mary's praise of God (vv 46–55; possibly before the insertion of this canticle the balance was one of mutual greeting [vv 39, 42–45]).

While the Magnificat (vv 46–55) is indisputably a tissue of OT allusion, the extent and significance of OT allusion in vv 39–45, 56 is hotly disputed. Building on the connection in v 35 (see there) with the descent of the Shekinah glory into the tabernacle (ark [?]) in Exod 40:34, Laurentin (*Structure*, 79–81; cf. Burrows, *Infancy*, 47–48) has traced a series of allusions in 1:39–45, 56 to 2 Sam 6:2–19, whose persuasiveness he considers to be cumulative, and understands the allusions in terms of a typology which identifies Mary as the ark and the unborn child as the Shekinah glory. Laurentin finds in both accounts

a common location, rejoicing, joyful leaping, a shared use of *κραυγή* ("a cry") and *φωνή* ("a voice/sound"), entry into a house which brings a blessing, a questioning of the appropriateness of a coming, and a three-month stay. This impressive congruence is considerably weakened when we subtract the vaguer and more general agreements for which there could be many OT parallels and when we consider not simply the wording but the role of the similar wording in the respective contexts. Nevertheless, the leaping, the questioning, and perhaps even the three-month stay are suggestive of a link. However, over against Laurentin, we probably should be content with the judgment that more general interest in paradigmatic responses to that which marks the presence and activity of God is what lies behind the probable artistic equation of Mary (or the unborn Jesus) and the ark.

Dibelius ("Jungfrauensohn," 14–15) pronounced Luke 1:39–45 a free composition to be entirely attributed to Luke. Others have generally recognized at least some traditional content, but because of the degree of Lukan style it is difficult to be sure quite how much. Vv 41–43 would seem to have strongest claim to being essentially from a written tradition of Semitic provenance. Vv 39–40 are also likely to be partly traditional. Some variant of v 36 is likely to have introduced the traditional account. V 44 may well have been developed out of v 41, while v 45 is probably a Lukan enhancement of the antithetical parallelism between the responses of Mary and Zechariah to the angelic annunciations.

The Magnificat, like other canticles in the infancy narratives, is only loosely tied into its present context, and the pronoun for Elizabeth and name for Mary in v 56 seem to betray an earlier form of the text that moved from v 45 to v 56 (Schürmann, 77–78, disputes the literary adequacy of a text without a response by Mary, but is misled by his idea that the episode is primarily about the fulfillment of the sign promised to Mary in v 36).

Did the Magnificat come to Luke as a separate tradition? Did he compose it himself? Or did he adapt to some extent an existing psalm? Each view is strongly supported. Least likely is the view that Luke freely composed the hymn. The *Comment* section below identifies a sufficient quantity of non-Lukan diction and non-Septuagintal Semitisms to make free Lukan composition improbable. However, a significant Septuagintal influence is also apparent and shows that the text is more than a simple translation of an underlying Hebrew document. Also, there is enough Lukan diction to suggest some Lukan role in the final form of the Magnificat.

If the eschatological fulfillment thrust of the hymn has been correctly identified below, then it is difficult to provide the original form of the hymn with any adequate pre-Christian life-setting. On the other hand, apart from this sense of eschatological fulfillment there is nothing specifically Christian about the hymn. The very nature of the literary endeavor involved in the formation of such a hymn, working to the degree that it does with preformed OT motifs, probably precludes any definitive statement as to its origins. The emphasis on a privileged individual in vv 46b–49a, along with the fulfillment motif, seems only to be accounted for if the hymn was composed with Mary in mind. Now, it would be possible to excise v 48 (and the *μοι*, "to me," of v 49) to form a hymn that is merely an individual's celebration of eschatological fulfill-

ment. But if this is the case, then the alteration has been made entirely in conformity with the literary conventions of the rest of the hymn and has improved rather than detracted from the balance of the two strophes. Nothing seems to preclude the possibility that a nucleus, or even the major part of the hymn, going back to Mary has been subject to several stages of literary development by authors sensitive to the poetic mode of the original. With slight reservations, the literary unity of the existing poem has been increasingly recognized (cf. Bailey, *NESTR* 1 [1979] 29–35; Tannehill, *JBL* 93 [1974] 263–75; Dupont, *NRT* 102 [1980] 321–43). The most likely life-setting for the transmission and development of such a hymn would seem to be a worship context in which there was a concern to recapitulate the decisive moments of salvation history (the use of the words of institution [Mark 14:22–25 and parallels; 1 Cor 11:23–26] is the classic example of such recapitulation).

The form of the Magnificat has many elements in common with OT psalmody (the move between the individual and the collective [cf. Pss 9; 30; 66; 68; 72; 117; 137], the praise of God, the rehearsal of his deeds, stereotyped ways of expressing God's action, etc.). Gunkel ("Die Lieder," 53–56) considered that the Magnificat had the form of an eschatological hymn (to which category he assigned Pss 46; 47; 48; 76; 98; 149). Others have considered the form to be mixed (Schürmann, 71, maintains that eschatological hymns by their nature always contain a personal praise component). R. E. Brown (*Birth*, 355–57) is content (with qualification) to assign the Magnificat to the hymn-of-praise category (Pss 8; 19; 29; 33; 100; 103; 104; 111; 113; 114; 117; 135; 136; 145–50).

The Magnificat is more oriented to the present than Gunkel was prepared to allow and must therefore be classified, rather, as a celebration of eschatological fulfillment (Schürmann, 71, rightly notes that Gunkel's eschatological hymns characteristically presuppose some experience of preliminary fulfillment, but we have more than this in the Magnificat). Apart from the eschatological ring, the rehearsal of God's deeds is not unlike that of the OT psalms. However, the mode of personal praise with which the hymn begins does not fit the major OT patterns. There is no call to praise, nor address to God, nor address to any audience. Only Pss 111 and 146 can be judged to have a similar form in this respect—and then, only if we can remove as secondary the call to praise which opens the former and both opens and closes the latter. This distinctive "objectivity" (audience detachment) fits well the recapitulation-in-worship setting suggested above.

The whole account as it presently stands (vv 39–56) exhibits the following structure: (i) Mary's journey (vv 39–40a); (ii) her greeting and its effect (vv 40b–41); (iii) Elizabeth's blessing of Mary and child (vv 42–45); (iv) Mary's blessing of God (vv 46–55); (v) Mary's return journey (v 56). While Elizabeth's blessing (vv 42–45) and the Magnificat balance one another in the structure of the pericope, the blessing lacks the poetic structure of Mary's song.

Mary's song divides into two major strophes (vv 46b–50; 51–55). In the first strophe, vv 46b and 47 form a couplet in parallel, expressing Mary's sense of blessedness, which is then backed by a causal statement (v 48a). This unit (vv 46b–48a) is in turn supported by a second affirmation (v 48b) backed by a causal statement (v 49a). Where vv 46b–47 have expressed Mary's sense

of blessedness, the parallel in v 48b speaks of the recognition by others of this blessedness; where the causal statement in v 48a focuses on the plight from which Mary has been rescued, the parallel in v 49a speaks positively of God's mighty activity. The strophe moves to a climax by taking a broader view of Mary's experience as demonstrating the holiness of God's name and as bringing his mercy for all generations (vv 49b–50). It is these sweeping claims which are developed in the second strophe (vv 51–55).

The opening statement of the second strophe picks up the verb of v 49a and reexpresses God's act with allusion to new exodus typology. This opening statement is expanded by vv 51b–54a. The content of God's saving intervention is expressed negatively as the scattering of the proud (in v 51b), and positively as the taking of the part of Israel (in v 54a). Between these two statements as framework are set two pairs of subordinate antitheses (vv 52 and 53) arranged chiasmically (vv 52a and 53b correspond, as do vv 52b and 53a) and having the form of reversal statements. The strophe concludes with vv 54b–55, which takes up the mercy theme from the conclusion of the opening strophe: all of vv 51–54a is in remembrance of God's mercy. The strophe is brought to a climax by a double specification of this move by God to remember mercy: it is the mercy he promised to the fathers (the patriarchs); and it is his mercy to Abraham and his descendants forever.

Comment

The two annunciations correspond finally to one purpose of God. Here the two streams flow briefly together and their relationship becomes explicit. Elizabeth is first to realize that Mary's coming child is none other than the messiah; and her own unborn son, himself a child of destiny, rejoices at the (yet unseen) presence of the one it is his own task to herald. Mary rejoices at her quite undeserved privilege and praises God for his mercy to her, which she identifies as the fulfillment, at least in principle, of all the hopes and aspirations of beleaguered Israel.

39 ἀναστᾶσα . . . ἐπορεύθη, "having arisen . . . she went," is Semitic but also Septuagintal and Lukan. ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις, "in these days," occurs seven times in Luke-Acts and is here likely to be his connective (as in 6:12). The remainder of the verse is free from obvious Lukan influence. There is no good reason for claiming πόλιν Ἰούδα, "a city of Judah," as a mistranslation (Torrey, "Translations," 290–92; *HTR* 17 [1924] 83–91; Jeremias, *Sprache*, 56; opposed by Springer's several articles). For the idiom see *Comment* at Luke 1:26. The traditional form of the pericope was probably introduced with something like, "Mary was told, 'Elizabeth your relative has conceived a son in her old age and this is her sixth month'" (cf. v 36).

The three εἰς, "into," phrases indicate with increasing degrees of precision Mary's destination (Jacquemin, *AsSeign* 8 [1972] 69) and help to mark the duration of a considerable journey. ὄρεινῃ, "hill country," here will embrace both the hill country of Judah (v 65; Josephus, *Ant.* 12.7) and that of Ephraim (1 Sam 1:1), which are part of the same geological formation. σπουδῇ can refer to any kind of committed behavior; the phrase μετὰ σπουδῆς (elsewhere in the NT only at Mark 6:25) is best rendered here by "eagerly" as in 3 Macc 5:24,

27, etc. (Hospodar, *CBQ* 18 [1956] 14–18, provides many references). In the present text Mary's eagerness is to be connected with her sense of shared destiny with Elizabeth in miraculous motherhood.

40 εἰσερχεσθαι εἰς, "to enter into," is Lukan idiom (Luke 4:38, cf. Mark 1:29) but is also frequent elsewhere in the NT and in the LXX. For εἰς τὸν οἶκον Ζαχαρίου, "into the house of Zechariah," cf. Luke 1:23. The threefold εἰς (see at v 39) stands in favor of ascribing these phrases to the traditional source and in favor of punctuation after "Zechariah." A greeting may have appeared in the source and was perhaps discarded by Luke only when he added the Magnificat (vv 46–55), which then replaced it as the parallel to Elizabeth's words.

41 καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ("and it happened when") + aorist + finite verb is Septuagintal, and used by Luke (19:29, cf. Mark 11:1), but is likely to be traditional here. ἐσκήρτησεν, "leaped," probably echoes David's leaping before the ark in 2 Sam 6:16, and since the LXX uses a different verb here, ἐσκήρτησεν is to be considered as traditional and not Lukan (the use in Luke 6:26 is also due to a source). A link with Gen 25:22 LXX is less likely, since the leaping there is an image of struggle and opposition. Schürmann's (pp. 66–67) reference to Mal 3:20 [ET 4:2] is better, but the image is really of health, rather than rejoicing. βρέφος, "baby," is a Lukan word (Luke 18:15, cf. Mark 10:13). ἐπλήσθη πνεύματος ἁγίου, "was filled with the Holy Spirit," is more likely to be Lukan here than the similar phrase in 1:15 (see there), but less likely than in 1:67, which is probably patterned after the use here in 1:41. Luke 1:41 is hardly to be understood as the fulfillment of v 15: the child leaps (obviously filled with the Spirit already) before there is any mention of a filling with the Spirit (against Jacquemin, *AsSeign* 8 [1972] 69; Fitzmyer, 363; etc.). Sahlin suggests (*Messias*, 143) that the two occurrences of "Elizabeth" (not in normal Hebrew word order) were added for clarity in the Greek where the verb forms (which unlike Hebrew have no gender differentiation) cannot help identify the correct subjects.

Jewish tradition is familiar with the idea that unborn children may take part in events of the world and anticipate prenatally their later positions in life (Gen 25:22–23; *Tg. Ket.* Ps 68:27; cf. Str-B, 2:100–101). The Johannine expression of the same attitude for John the Baptist in later life is to be found in John 3:29. John witnesses to the one who comes after him. While Elizabeth responds to the greeting, the unborn John responds directly to the presence of the unborn Jesus: Elizabeth's inspired blessing in v 42 takes account of both. Because she is filled with the Spirit, her words will express the divine perspective and insight. What she says results from an inspired interpretation of the movement of the unborn child (as v 44 makes explicit).

42 ἀναφωνεῖν κραυγὴν μεγάλην, "to cry out loudly," is not in the LXX (κραυγὴ μεγάλη is found only twice) and ἀναφωνεῖν is not used elsewhere by Luke (though he is fond of words with the φων root). ἐγένετο κραυγὴ μεγάλη, "there was a great cry," occurs in Acts 23:9. The double blessing looks traditional and is even thought by some to be liturgical (e.g., Leaney, 86; Strobel, *ZNW* 53 [1962] 109–10). εὐλογημένη ἐν γυναιξίν reflects the Semitic superlative: "most blessed of women" (cf. Judg 5:24; Jdt 13:18). The OT pattern has either a two-lined blessing in which the second line gives the cause of blessedness (especially

but not exclusively when blessing God: Gen 14:19, 20; Deut 7:14; Ruth 2:20; Jdt 13:18; etc.), or a double blessing, where God is blessed as source of the blessedness of the human figure blessed (Gen 14:19–20; Jdt 13:18; etc). The present blessing has elements of both: Mary's blessedness is that she is carrying the messianic child (R. E. Brown, *Birth*, 342), who is in turn blessed because of his unique identity and role. The language *εὐλογημένος ὁ καρπὸς τῆς κοιλίας σου*, "blessed is the fruit of your womb," is close to Deut 7:13; 28:4 (but not LXX). A connection between 1:42, 45 and 11:27–28 is sometimes claimed (R. E. Brown, *Birth*, 343), but the point is quite different (in 11:27–28 hearing and doing are set over against carrying in pregnancy and suckling; in 1:42, 45 faith is not a synonym for hearing and doing, but rather the opposite of doubt [cf. v 20], and is not set over against pregnancy but rather leads to it). The language overlap is small, and the similarity is probably quite fortuitous and based largely on a shared background in the importance of motherhood in Judaism.

Elizabeth's intensity reflects her state of inspiration. *ἀναφωνεῖν*, "to cry out," is used in the LXX (5 times) only in connection with the loud noise of worship, but that is probably not in view here. Mary may be consciously set in the tradition of Jael and Judith (Judg 5:24; Jdt 13:18) as a weak woman through whom God brings deliverance (R. E. Brown, *Birth*, 342). Elizabeth does not wish or offer blessing, but recognizes blessedness. Spitta (ZNW 7 [1906] 282–85) disputes Mary's pregnancy at this point, on the basis of its later mention at 2:5, but that is from a separately transmitted tradition. The nature of the blessedness of the mother and child remains unspecified in Elizabeth's words of blessing but is clearly betrayed in the question of v 43.

43 Elizabeth's question could echo the language of either 2 Sam 6:9 or 24:21. The former is to be preferred as closer in language, but especially as reflecting reverence (fear) in the face of God's action and presence. The MT is closer than the LXX. "My Lord" is a court expression (cf. Dan 4:19) and reflects the messianic use of Ps 110:1 (cf. Luke 20:41–44; Acts 2:34). Luke would have used *τοῦ Κυρίου*, "the Lord." Occasionally v 43 is considered to be a Lukan intrusion breaking the flow of vv 42, 44 (Räsänen, *Mutter Jesu*, 108–9). The difficulty is real, but without v 43 the nature of the blessedness remains unexpressed. It is vv 44–45 which lie under suspicion of Lukan expansion. Elizabeth here expresses her overwhelmed realization that she is being visited by the one who is pregnant with the messianic child.

44 This verse may well be a Lukan reformulation of v 41, making explicit both the rejoicing expressed by the child's movement and the connection between the movement of the child and Elizabeth's prophetic insight. The flow from vv 42 through 45 is awkward, and all the differences between v 44 and 42 suit Lukan style: *ἰδοὺ γάρ*, "for behold," is Lukan (6:23; 17:21; Acts 9:11); *ἐγένετο ἡ φωνή*, "the sound came," reflects Luke's combination of this verb and noun on seven other occasions (Luke adds it to his Markan source at 9:36); *εἰς τὰ ὦτα*, "into the ears," is Lukan (9:44, cf. Mark 9:31; Acts 11:22); *ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει*, "in joy," may reflect 1:14 (see there) and occurs again in Acts 2:46. For Luke, the repetition underlines the importance of the action of the unborn John.

45 Luke has probably formulated this verse out of v 20 in light of v 38.

It is clearly designed to set Mary's response to the angel in antithetical parallelism to Zechariah's, which the language of the second annunciation account does not fully achieve. The language argument is not strong either way. *μακάριος*, "fortunate," is used seventeen times in Luke's writings, and *τελείωσις*, "fulfillment," is not used elsewhere by Luke (but Sahlin [*Messias*, 148] doubts whether there is any adequate Hebrew equivalent). The change to third person after the second person of v 42 (v 44) probably favors a redactional origin.

The *ὅτι* could be either "because" or "that." If the note of completeness in the etymology of *τελείωσις*, "fulfillment," is pressed, then *ὅτι* will be "because" (this also fits best Luke's general use of *πιστεύειν*, "to believe"). Nevertheless, the state of present realization reflected by vv 42, 43, which parallels the state of realization of the word disbelieved by Zechariah, encourages a reading of *ὅτι* here as "that" (and cf. Acts 27:25). It is anticlimactic to see Elizabeth as confirming Mary's faith!

46 The inclusion of *Μαριάμ*, "Mary," in the text here is occasionally still questioned, following a view popularized at the beginning of the century by von Harnack (*SPAW* 27 [1900] 538–56). A small body of Old Latin witnesses to the text attribute the Magnificat to Elizabeth (see R. E. Brown, *Birth*, 334, for a convenient summary). While this evidence is too slight to prefer over the much better attested reference to Mary, it does raise the possibility that the original text had neither name. If no name stood in the text, then (i) the natural sequence, (ii) the connection between *ταπείνωσις*, "afflicted state," and barrenness in the case of Hannah (1 Sam 1:11; Hannah's song in 2:1–10 is at least in part the inspiration for the Magnificat, and in the LXX is introduced by the same *καὶ εἶπεν*, "and she said," that we find in Luke 1:46), and (iii) the reference to Elizabeth by the pronoun in v 56a, would all favor the attribution of the song to Elizabeth.

The evidence for deleting "Mary" is, however, extremely slight. And over against the above considerations are to be set (i) the literary difficulty created by having Elizabeth celebrate her own blessedness in apparent climax after vv 42–45 (and especially compare vv 48b and 45a), (ii) the need to see *ταπείνωσις*, "afflicted state," in connection with the other stereotyped expressions in the song for the reduced circumstances of God's people (vv 52–53), (iii) the possibility of explaining the pronoun in v 56 as evidence for Luke's insertion of vv 46–55 into an account that was originally complete without these verses, and (iv) the connection between vv 48a and 38. The eschatological sense which the hymn almost certainly has and the needs of Luke's larger structure for the infancy narratives require that it be the birth of Jesus, not that of John, which is here celebrated in this climactic position.

μεγαλύνειν, "to magnify," is used elsewhere by Luke (Acts 10:46 with God as object). It is rare in the LXX in the active form and in relation to God (Forestell, *Marian Studies* 12 [1961] 207 n. 6). While *μεγαλύνειν* and *ἀγαλλιάω* ("to rejoice"; v 47) are natural enough synonyms, the combination is not found in LXX idiom (only in Ps 40 [39]:16 are both words used in relation to God, and there *μεγαλύνειν* is used in the passive). The parallelism between *ψυχή*, "soul," and *πνεῦμα*, "spirit," is Hebraic but is also reflected by the LXX (Ps 77:2–3; Job 12:10; Isa 26:9; Wis 15:11). In each case the reference is simply to the "self." The alternation of designations for God in parallel statements

(here *Κύριον*, “Lord”; *τῷ θεῷ*, “God”) is frequent in the OT psalms (e.g., 70:1; 62:11–12; cf. 1 Sam 2:1). *τὸν Κύριον*, “the Lord,” here is not Lukan (cf. at v 6).

Mary “magnifies the Lord” by means of the words of her song (cf. Pss 34:3; 69:30). Schürmann, 72, is mistaken in treating the fulfillment of the sign of v 36 as the starting point for Mary’s praise; rather, Mary responds to Elizabeth’s direction of praise to her rather than to God (so Krafft, “Vorgeschichte,” 219).

47 The active of *ἀγαλλιάω*, “to delight/be overjoyed/rejoice,” is neither Septuagintal nor Lukan (Spitta, “Das Magnificat,” 79). The change of tense with *καὶ ἡγαλλίασεν*, “and [it] delighted,” may reflect an underlying Hebrew *waw* consecutive, but is sufficiently explained in relation to the following aorists as inceptive (= “has found gladness”). *τῷ θεῷ τῷ σωτήρί μου*, “God my savior,” follows LXX and not MT idiom (1 Chr 16:35; Pss 23 [24]:5; 24 [25]:5; 26 [27]:9; Hab 3:18; etc.). Luke does not use *σωτήρ*, “savior,” of God. No specific OT text is clearly in view in vv 46–47. 1 Sam 2:1; Isa 60:10; Hab 3:18; Ps 34 [35]:9 are closest.

Mary has found joy in God’s action of enabling her in a miraculous way to become pregnant with the child of messianic hopes. She recognizes here the intervention of God as savior. Though her language is personal (“my savior”) as in v 48a, the salvation she has in view is that for which the nation had longed (just as her *ταπείνωσις*, “afflicted state,” in v 48a is the common state of God’s people and no predicament specific to Mary). The development of the song makes this clear.

48 *ἐπιβλέπω*, “to have regard for,” is introduced by Luke into a Markan context at 9:38. *ταπείνωσις*, “afflicted state,” he uses elsewhere only in a citation (Acts 8:33, citing Isa 53:8). *ἐπέβλεψεν ἐπὶ τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῆς δούλης αὐτοῦ*, “he has had regard for the afflicted state of his servant,” echoes most closely 1 Sam 1:11 (but cf. also Gen 29:32; Deut 26:7; 1 Sam 9:16; Ps 30 [31]:7; Jdt 6:19; etc.). But this does not mean that *ταπείνωσις*, “afflicted state,” must be connected with childlessness, except perhaps in a metaphorical sense according to which childlessness is the lack of that child who is to be the messianic deliverer (Isa 9:6; cf. 4 Ezra 9.45 where Zion personified as a woman says, “God heard your servant and had regard for my afflicted state, and considered my distress and gave me a son”). *ταπείνωσις* is in any case an objective, unfavorable condition (Forestell, *Marian Studies* 12 [1961] 211). In vv 46–49 the interpreter’s difficulty is to do justice both to the reference to Mary’s unique experience (*μου, μου, τῆς δούλης αὐτοῦ, με, μοι* [“my,” “my,” “his servant,” “me,” “to me”]); and especially the language of v 48b) and to its description in language that makes it typical of Israel’s experience of God’s saving intervention (cf. in v 52 the use of the cognate *ταπεινός*, “lowly.” Mary’s experience is unique, but at the same time Mary is the first to experience in some manner that salvation which is for all Israel. In the present text *τῆς δούλης αὐτοῦ*, “his servant,” echoes v 38.

ἰδοὺ γάρ, “for behold,” is Lukan (see v 44) and is also found in the LXX. The same is true of *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν* (“from now on”; see 5:10; 12:52; 22:18, 69; Acts 18:6). *μακαρίζω*, “to call blessed,” is not Lukan, but is Septuagintal. “All generations,” *πᾶσαι αἱ γενεαί*, is not OT idiom (not in MT, in Tobit only of LXX). It is not used elsewhere by Luke. The nearest OT parallels for the

line are Mal 3:12 and Gen 30:13 (and cf. Judg 5:24), but it is not at all certain that either is in mind.

The logic connecting the clauses is not simple. It is not beatification by the coming generations which is the antithesis of Mary's *ταπείνωσις* (against Mussner, "Lukas 1, 48f.," who takes *ταπείνωσις* as a reference to the modest circumstances of Mary's life as a young woman). Rather, the antithesis is provided by the "great things" (*μεγάλα*) of v 49a, because of which future generations will call Mary blessed. Vv 48b and 49a repeat from a different perspective the sentiment of vv 46–48a. Vv 46b–47 express Mary's sense of her own blessedness. In parallel, v 48b speaks of the recognition by others of this blessedness. V 48a explains in negative terms (i.e., with reference to a previous state of affliction) the cause of this blessedness. In parallel, v 49a speaks in positive terms (i.e., with reference to the "great things" God has done) of that on the basis of which Mary is to be recognized as blessed.

ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν, "from now on," points to the decisive turning point represented by Mary's miraculous pregnancy. In the context it may pick up on Elizabeth's recognition of Mary's blessedness (vv 42, 45) as the recognition of the first of the generations.

Because of the Lukan language and the links with the context v 48 or at least v 48b is frequently suspected of being a Lukan modification of an existing hymn, fitting it to its present use. Spitta's rejoinder still seems pertinent ("Das Magnificat," 88): on the one hand, without v 48 there seems to be no adequate reason for linking the hymn to Mary; on the other hand, v 48 is hardly clear enough in its reference to Mary (witness the attempts to attribute the Magnificat to Elizabeth on the basis of this verse) to justify the judgment that we have here a modification solely designed to connect the hymn to Mary.

49 This substantival use of *μεγάλα*, "great things," does not occur elsewhere in Luke's writings. The thought of the line is close to Ps 70 [71]:19 where LXX uses *μεγαλεῖα* ("magnificent things"; MT מַגְדֹּלוֹת, *gēdōlōt*). Cf. also Deut 10:21; 11:17 where *μεγάλα* occurs. *ὁ δυνατός* ("the mighty one"; lit., "the one who is able") occurs only here in the NT with reference to God, and in the LXX occurs only at Zeph 3:17. It may echo that text or the גִּבּוֹר, *gibbôr* ("mighty one"), of Isa 42:13, and thus contribute to the eschatological tone of the song.

V 49b is closest to Ps 110 [111]:9 (but cf. also Isa 57:15 and Ps 98 [99]:3). The holiness of God is not mentioned elsewhere in Luke-Acts.

In Mary's case *μεγάλα*, "great things," is no true plural (Schürmann, 74) but a stereotypical reflection of OT language of God's saving intervention (especially of the exodus). In the Greek text *μεγάλα* nicely picks up the *μεγαλύνει*, "magnifies," of v 46b. *ὁ δυνατός*, "the mighty one," may echo the cognate *ἀδυνατήσῃ*, "nothing is too hard," of v 37, and is to be contrasted with those other claimants to power, the *δυνάστας*, "rulers," of v 52.

V 49b belongs with v 50 and not with v 49 (each lacks an expressed verb, begins with *καί* ["and"], and moves beyond the specific focus on Mary's experience; also, the "fearing" of v 50b belongs with the holiness of God's name). In the context God's holiness is to be understood as his transcendent mightiness and is taken up in v 51 in terms of the strength shown by God's arm, which

scatters the proud but also brings help to Israel (v 54). God's mercy is an aspect of his holiness (vv 50, 54).

50 The thought is that of Ps 102 [103]:17 (and cf. *Pss. Sol.* 2.37; 15.15), but the language diverges from the LXX, especially in the phrase εἰς γενεάς καὶ γενεάς, "to generation upon generation," which is not found anywhere in the LXX (the phrase occurs in *T. Levi* 18.8). God's "mercy" (τὸ ἔλεος; Hebrew חַסֵּד, *hesed*) is his active faithfulness to his covenant commitment to Israel. Vv 49b–50 are not so much a general statement about the character of God as a declaration of what God has demonstrated in his action upon Mary (cf. Dupont, *NRT* 102 [1980] 332). God's mercy now demonstrated embraces all of the future ("to generations upon generations," and cf. v 48b) and is understood as establishing at least in principle all that God's people had been led to anticipate from his covenant loyalty (cf. Schottroff, *EvT* 38 [1978] 301). The necessary fear of God here is not that which is dispelled by the angelic assurance (vv 13, 30; 2:10), but rather a recognition of and reverent submission to God's transcendent sovereignty. The move from Mary's individual experience to what has been accomplished for all Israel, intimated already by the language chosen to express Mary's experience, is now achieved in the move from first person singulars to third person plurals (cf. the move from individual to collective in certain psalms [Pss 9, 30, 66, 68, 72, 117, 137]).

51 ἐποίησεν κράτος (lit., "he made might") is not natural Greek and is not found in the LXX, but reflects the Hebrew idiom יָפָה עֲשָׂה, 'āśā ḥāyil, which is found in Pss 118:15, 16; 60:14; 108:14; etc. (cf. Winter, *NTS* 1 [1954–55] 116; ZNW 47 [1956] 225–26). βραχίον αὐτοῦ, "his arm," is a frequent OT image for the power of God, especially as manifested in the exodus (e.g., Exod 6:1, 6; 15:16; Deut 3:24; Jer 39 [32]:21; cf. Acts 13:17) and in the new exodus of eschatological salvation (Ezek 20:33, 34; Isa 51:5, 9; 53:1). In OT idiom God scatters his enemies (Num 10:35; Pss 67 [68]:1; 88 [89]:10) and humbles or puts to shame, etc., the proud (Pss 17 [18]:27; 118 [119]:21, 78; Prov 3:24; Isa 1:25; 13:11; etc.). In a fresh coinage the two come together in the Magnificat's διεσκόρπισεν ὑπερηφάνους ("he has scattered the proud"; the idea but not the language can be found in Gen 11:4, 8, and further background is to be found in the oracles against the nations of Isa 13–23; Jer 46–51). διανοία καρδίας, "in the thought of [their] heart," appears twice in the LXX (1 Chr 29:18; Bar 1:22 [in both cases with ἐν]). The underlying Hebrew uses the plural מַחְשְׁבוֹת, *maḥšēbōt* ("thoughts"). The style of vv 51–54 is notable for its complete avoidance of the definite article.

ἐποίησεν (lit., "he has done") picks up the verb of v 49, which makes it unlikely that we have here a move into either the future or the general. What we have is a fresh description from a new angle of the event of v 49a. This transition has been prepared for by vv 49b–50, which find their exposition in vv 51–55. V 51a, with its allusion to new exodus typology, controls and summarizes all that follows (see the discussion of structure in *Form/Structure/Setting* above), and, therefore, should not be read too closely with the immediately following v 51b.

"The proud" (ὑπερηφάνους) do not fear God (v 50) and are neither hungry (v 53) nor afflicted (vv 48, 52). Confident in their own achievements, they exalt themselves above others and have no need of God (cf. Schoonheim,

NovT 8 [1966] 235–46). *διανόια καρδίας*, “in the thought of their heart,” identifies the pride of those scattered as a deeply rooted orientation of the person (cf. Obad 3: “the pride of your heart”; against Forestell, *Marian Studies* 12 [1961] 215, the phrase does not modify the verb to produce a sense like Rom 1:24). Since the proud are the oppressors of Israel, the scattering of the proud (v 51b) and the taking of the part of Israel (v 54a) express negatively and positively the saving intervention of God and establish a framework for the reversal language of vv 52–53.

52 The sentiments of v 52 and their language are familiar from the OT, but none of the connections are close enough to justify a definite allusion (for *καθαίρειν* [“to put down”] cf. Sir 10:14; for *δυνασται* [“potentates”] cf. Job 12:19; Sir 11:6; for *ἀπὸ θρόνων* [“from thrones”] cf. Ezek 26:16; Dan 5:20; for *ὑψοῦν* [“to raise up”] cf. Ezek 21:31 [26] [with *τὸ ταπεινῶν*]; Ps 87 [88]:15; for *ταπεινοί* [“those of low estate”] cf. Job 5:11; 12:21 [LXX]; Ps 33 [34]:18; 101 [102]:17; Prov 3:24; etc.; more generally cf. 1 Sam 2:7; Pss 73; 105:26–42; 113:7–9; 146:6 [LXX]; Sir 10:14; 1 *Enoch* 46.4–8; 94.6–11; 3 *Enoch* 48c.9; 1QM 19.10–11).

The “potentates” are to be identified with “the proud” of v 51b and “those who have become rich” of v 53, while “those of low estate” are equivalent to “the hungry” of v 53a and needy “Israel” in v 54a, and then more remotely to “those who fear him” of v 50. Vv 52–53 elaborate with an internal chiasm (vv 52b and 53a correspond and form antitheses with the other halves of their respective verses) the framework statement made up of vv 51b and 54a.

53 The language connections with the OT are closer for v 53 than for v 52, but once again there is no definite allusion. For all or part of *πεινῶντας ἐνέπλησεν ἀγαθῶν*, “he has filled the hungry with good things,” cf. Ps 106 [107]:9; Ps 21 [22]:26; Jer 31:14, 25; Ps 103 [104]:28; and more remotely 1 Sam 2:5; Ps 33 [34]:10. For *ἐξαπέστειλεν κενούς*, “he has sent away empty,” cf. Gen 31:42; Deut 15:13; 1 Sam 6:3; Job 22:9 (and note Luke 20:10, 11). For *πλουτοῦντας*, “those who have become rich,” the closest point of comparison is Jer 5:27; for the reversal motif in connection with the rich see Ps 33:10 (LXX); Jer 5:27–29; 17:11; Job 15:29. “The hungry” and “those who have become rich” do not form as simple an antithesis as that which we find in v 52. The reversal motif of vv 52–53 is not unknown to classical literature (see Schottroff, *EvT* 38 [1978] 298–300; Hamel, *Gregorianum* 60 [1979] 58–60).

The socio-political language of vv 52–53 should not be spiritualized away, but justice is only done to it when it is seen in relation to the matrix that is established in the poem by the juxtaposition of the ethico-religious (esp. vv 50, 51), the socio-economic (vv 52–53), and the ethnic or national (vv 54–55; cf. Dupont, *NRT* 102 [1980] 335–38). Each must be allowed to interpret the other (see further at Luke 4:18; 6:20–26); values from none of the spheres can be allowed to stand alone. Due weight must also be given to the use of stereotyped OT language here, which should not be pressed (as by Schottroff, *EvT* 38 [1978] 304–5) to drive a wedge between Luke’s attitude to poverty and riches and that brought to expression here in the Magnificat: the Magnificat is a soteriological statement in traditional terms and reflects on poverty and riches solely within that framework. One may speak similarly in relation to the nationalism of vv 54–55. Luke never denies the appropriateness of Israel’s

national hope, but he establishes a cosmic framework for its fulfillment and opens it up for the inclusion of the Gentiles.

54 In the LXX Ἰσραήλ, "Israel," and the verb ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι, "to take the part of," only come together at Isa 41:8–9, where MT has תִּתְרַחֵם, *hehēzaqtikhā* ("I have taken hold of/strengthened"). Only in the same text as well are Ἰσραήλ, "Israel," and παῖς, "servant," juxtaposed (elsewhere παῖς Ἰσραήλ occurs in *Pss. Sol.* 12.7 and 17.23). Some Septuagintal influence seems likely. Isa 41:8–9 belongs to a set of mostly Deutero-Isaianic texts (Isa 41:8–9; 42:19; 43:10; 44:1, 21; 45:4; Jer 26 [46]:27–28) in which "servant" is an epithet for the nation addressed in exile and assured of God's help, of the restoration of their fortunes, of their special standing with God, and of their role as instrument of his purposes. Closely related are the more individualistic servant texts Isa 42:1–4; 49:1–6; 50:4–9; 52:13–53:12.

To speak of God remembering is a standard OT anthropomorphism, especially in the Psalms (e.g., Gen 19:29; Exod 32:13; Pss 73 [74]:2; 104 [105]:8, 42; 118 [119]:49), and in Ps 24 [25]:6–7; Ps 97 [98]:3; and Hab 3:2 (cf. 2 Chr 6:42; *Pss. Sol.* 10.4) it is "mercy" that God is called upon to remember (or celebrated as having remembered). The Lukan phrase μνησθῆναι ἐλέους (lit., "to remember mercy") does not occur in the LXX, but is probably a Semitism (BDF 391 [4]), not denoting purpose but rather defining further God's activity as a remembering of mercy (cf. the construction in Ps 110 [111]:6; see further Gunkel, "Die Lieder," 50–51). Linked not to μνησθῆναι, "to remember," but to the clauses following in v 55, ἐλέους, "mercy," may be part of an allusion to 2 Sam 22:51 and Mic 7:20 (see below). See further on ἐλεος, "mercy," at v 50.

The helping of Israel (v 54a) stands in antithesis to the scattering of the proud in v 52b. Both together with their expansion in vv 52–53 elaborate the might shown by God's arm (v 51a). It is this whole development (vv 51–54a) which in v 52b is said to be in remembrance of God's mercy.

55 That God should remember his commitment to Abraham is the theme of Exod 2:24; 32:13; Deut 9:27 and Ps 104 [105]:8–11, 42. His mercy to the patriarchs or David appears in 2 Sam 22:51; Ps 97 [98]:3; Mic 7:20. Appeal to what was spoken to the patriarchs is also found in Deut 7:8, 12; Josh 1:6; 5:6; etc. In language, "mercy—just as he spoke to our fathers—to Abraham" is close to Mic 7:20, but not closer to LXX than MT; while "mercy to . . . and to his seed forever" could echo 2 Sam 22:51 (for "forever" Luke has εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα [only here in Luke-Acts] rather than LXX ἕως αἰῶνος). The first allusion underlines the eschatological coloring of the Magnificat. The second may draw in a messianic note, but probably only reflects the Jewish application to the nation of OT promises to the royal line.

The syntax of the phrase beginning τῷ Ἀβραάμ, "to Abraham," is not at once clear. It has been understood by Joüon (*RSR* 15 [1925] 440–41) in terms of a dative of advantage (the promise is "in favor of Abraham etc."), by many as a loose apposition to πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν ("to our fathers"), and by others as modifying (after a parenthetical clause) the ἐλέους ("mercy") of v 54b. The last is encouraged by 2 Sam 22:51 and Mic 7:20. The awkwardness of the parenthesis is probably to be explained by the desire to end the poem with reference to the eternal dimensions of God's accomplishment now being cele-

brated. The thought and language of vv 54–55 is very close to that of vv 72–73 in the Benedictus.

56 The repetition here of the name *Μαρίαμ* (“Mary”; cf. v 46) and the reference to Elizabeth by *αὐτῇ* (“her”) suggest that originally v 56 followed v 45. From the time reference we should probably understand that Mary left soon after the birth of the child, but that since she plays no role in the birth and circumcision account to follow, Luke finds it convenient from an artistic point of view to preserve the departure statement’s original connection with the account of the visit (cf. Schürmann, 80). Departure statements are frequent in the infancy chapters but do not seem to play any structural role (cf. at 1:23). An allusion to 2 Sam 6:11 is just possible (see *Form/Structure/Setting* for a discussion of allusions to 2 Sam 6).

Explanation

The interrelationship between God’s plans for John and for Jesus, already intimated by the careful parallelism between the two annunciations (and cf. v 36), now receives concrete expression in this account of the meeting of the two pregnant mothers. The formal parallel between the two infancy narratives is maintained: each mother is supernaturally aware of the other’s condition (vv 36, 41–45); each speaks words of rejoicing that interpret the deep significance of their situation (vv 42–45, 46–55). At the same time the subordination of John to Jesus becomes quite explicit (vv 41, 43, 44).

Echoes of 2 Sam 6:2–19 are to be found in vv 41, 43, 44, and possibly v 56. Except for the last, what we have is a taking up of language that expresses a paradigmatic response to that which marks the presence and activity of God. If the last be granted (v 56; cf. 2 Sam 6:11), then we must go further and say that this taking up of paradigmatic responses has been artistically carried through by treating the presence of Mary (or the unborn Jesus) as equivalent to the presence of the ark of the covenant.

The Magnificat (vv 46–55) is at times marked by specific OT allusions, but more commonly OT motifs and language are used in a fresh coinage which evokes more generally the whole thought world of OT faith and declares its eschatological fulfillment, at least in principle, in God’s present activity with Mary.

The Magnificat would seem to have come to Luke independently of its present setting, but there can be little doubt from its content that it belongs on the lips of Mary as a response to her miraculous conception. It does, however, show signs of more than one stage of literary development, initially in Hebrew, then in Greek prior to Luke, and finally at the hands of Luke as he incorporated it into his present text. The hymn was probably transmitted and adapted in a Christian worship setting.

Alerted to Elizabeth’s pregnancy by the angel Gabriel, Mary sets out eagerly to make the lengthy journey to be with her, sensing her own shared destiny with Elizabeth in miraculous motherhood. Reaching Zechariah’s house, Mary greets Elizabeth, and it is her moment of greeting which precipitates the action of the pericope. In line with a Jewish tradition of such things (Gen 25:22–23; *Tg. Ket.* Ps 68:27) the unborn John anticipates prenatally his later position in relation to Jesus (cf. John 3:29). The language of John’s action echoes

that in 2 Sam 6:16 of David's leaping before the ark of the covenant. While Elizabeth responds to the greeting, the unborn John responds directly to the presence of the unborn Jesus: Elizabeth's inspired blessing in v 42 takes account of both. Elizabeth's words are a Spirit-inspired interpretation of the movement of her unborn child (v 44).

Elizabeth does not wish or offer blessing, but recognizes blessedness. Mary's blessedness is that she is carrying the messianic child who is in turn blessed because of his unique identity and role. Mary may be being consciously set in the tradition of Jael and Judith (Judg 5:24; Jdt 13:8) as a weak woman through whom God brings deliverance. Elizabeth's question (v 43) echoes 2 Sam 6:9 in its expression of reverence (fear) in the face of God's action and presence. "My Lord" is a court expression (cf. Dan 4:19) and reflects the messianic use of Ps 110:1 (cf. Luke 20:41–44). The importance of the action of the unborn John is underlined by the extra attention drawn to it in v 44. Both Zechariah and Mary have been singled out for angelic revelation. Elizabeth, in eulogizing Mary's faith, is implicitly contrasting Mary's glad surrender to the will of God (v 38) with her own husband's unbelief (vv 18, 20): just as Jesus' conception is a greater miracle than is that of John, so also God's move to set it in motion was met by a more appropriate readiness on the part of the human parent than was the case with John.

Elizabeth's recognition of Mary's blessedness is responded to by Mary's own expression of the same sentiment, in which, however, Mary places herself squarely in solidarity with all God's people and recognizes in her own experience the establishing at least in principle of all that the faith of God's people had encouraged them someday to expect from God.

Mary's song opens with the declaration of her intention to magnify God in song (v 46b), which stands parallel to the affirmation that she has found joy in God who, enabling her in a miraculous way to become pregnant with the child of messianic hopes, has now intervened as savior (v 47). This happy state exists because God has had regard for the afflicted state of his servant (v 48a). It is not that Mary has some personal and individual affliction; her affliction is simply that of God's people awaiting his saving intervention on their behalf. Hannah's affliction had been childlessness (1 Sam 1:11); for God's people it may be spoken of as the lack of that child who is to be the messianic deliverer (Isa 9:6).

These opening lines of Mary's song are confirmed and reiterated by a parallel development in vv 48b–49a. Vv 46b–47 have expressed Mary's sense of her own blessedness. Now v 48b speaks of the recognition by others of this blessedness. Where the causal statement in v 48a had focused on the plight from which Mary has been rescued, the parallel in v 49a speaks positively of the action of God's might. "From now on" points to the decisive turning point represented by Mary's miraculous conception. Elizabeth has been the first to participate in this recognition of Mary's blessedness (vv 42, 45). "The mighty one" (lit., "he who is able") should be linked with the cognate "nothing is too hard" of v 37 but also probably contributes to the eschatological tone of the poem by echoing Isa 42:13 (or Zeph 3:17). "Great things" is a stereotyped reflection of OT language of God's saving intervention, especially in the exodus (cf. Ps 71:19; Deut 10:21; 11:7).

In vv 49b–50 the first part of the Magnificat moves to the climax by taking

a broader view of Mary's experience as demonstrating the holiness of God's name, and as bringing his mercy for all generations. V 49b probably echoes Ps 111:9. In the context, God's holiness has overtones of power and may be defined as his transcendent mightiness. V 50 is formed after Ps 103:17 but is here no general truth, but rather an affirmation of what God is accomplishing in his present action upon Mary: this act of God's mercy is for generations upon generations of those who fear him. God's mercy is his active faithfulness to his covenant commitment to Israel.

The second section of the Magnificat (vv 51–55) opens with a statement that picks up the verb of v 49a and reexpresses God's act with allusion to new exodus typology ("his arm" is a frequent OT image for the power of God, especially as manifested in the exodus [e.g., Exod 6:1–6] and in the new exodus of eschatological salvation [e.g., Ezek 20:23; Isa 51:5]). The opening clause controls and summarizes all that follows.

The content of this saving intervention by God's arm is first expressed negatively as the scattering of the proud (v 51b). The proud do not fear God (v 50) and are neither hungry (v 53) nor afflicted (vv 48, 52). Confident in their own achievements, they exalt themselves above others and have no need of God. Since the proud are the oppressors of Israel, the scattering of the proud and the taking of the part of Israel (v 54a; the language here echoes the LXX of Isa 41:8–9) express negatively and positively the same saving intervention of God and establish a framework for the reversal language of vv 52–53. The servant language for Israel (v 54a) evokes a theme of Isaiah in which the nation, addressed in exile, is assured of God's help, the restoration of their fortunes, their special standing with God, and their role as instrument of his purpose.

Within the framework of vv 51b and 54a is set the reversal language of vv 52–53, which is made up of two pairs of antitheses (vv 52 and 53) arranged chiastically (vv 52a and 53b correspond, as do vv 52b and 53a). The sentiments of vv 52–53 are all familiar from the OT, but there are no definite allusions. The socio-political language of vv 52–53 should not be spiritualized away, but neither is it to be separated from its context in ethico-religious and covenantal categories, and some allowance must be made for the use of stereotyped OT language. The Magnificat is a soteriological statement in traditional terms and reflects on such socio-economic issues as poverty and riches only within their framework.

The second part of the Magnificat moves to climax and to the hymn's conclusion in vv 54b–55. Echoing v 50, God's mercy as shown in the future reach of his saving activity once again comes into focus. There seems to be an allusion that conflates Mic 7:20 and 2 Sam 22:51. The first underlines the eschatological coloring of the Magnificat, and the second reflects the Jewish tradition of applying to the nation OT promises to the royal line. All of vv 51–54a is qualified as a remembering of God's mercy, and this move by God to remember mercy is given a double specification: it is the mercy he promised to the fathers (the patriarchs), and it is his mercy to Abraham and his descendants forever.

The episode is rounded off with the mention of Mary's departure for home. We should probably understand that the time of departure is after the events of vv 57–66, but it is easiest to round off the episode by speaking here already

of Mary's departure (she is to play no role in the narrative of vv 57–66). The three months of Mary's stay may allude to the three months in 2 Sam 6:11 of the ark's remaining in the house of Obed-edom.

Birth, Circumcision, and Naming of John **(1:57–66)**

Bibliography

See at 1:5–25.

Translation

⁵⁷*The time arrived for Elizabeth to give birth and she bore a son.* ⁵⁸*When the neighbors and her relatives heard that the Lord had shown greatly his mercy to her, they rejoiced with her.*

⁵⁹*It happened on the eighth day that they came to circumcise the child, and they wanted to call him by the name of his father: Zechariah.* ⁶⁰*His mother responded,^a "No! He^b is rather to be called John."* ⁶¹*They said to her, "There is no one among your relatives who is called by this name."* ⁶²*They signaled to his father to see what it was he would wish him to be called.* ⁶³*He asked for a writing tablet and wrote,^c "His name^d is John."* *They were all amazed.* ⁶⁴*Instantly, his mouth was opened, and his tongue was freed^e and he began to speak, blessing God.*

⁶⁵*Fear came upon all who lived around them, and all these things were talked about throughout the whole of the hill country of Judea.* ⁶⁶*All who heard took these things to heart and said, "What, then, is this child to be?" For the hand of the Lord was^f with him.*

Notes

^aLit., "having answered, she said."

^bC* D etc. read τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, "his name."

^cGreek has a pleonastic λέγων, "saying."

^dThe Greek has been "improved" by the addition of a definite article in R A B² C D etc.

^e"Was freed" is not in the Greek text.

^fThe verb is omitted by D and part of the Old Latin witness.

Form/Structure/Setting

1:57–66 is a natural continuation of 1:5–25 (see there) and does little more than to provide the necessary completion of that account. The time interval between 1:25 and 57 is filled by v 56. All the interest of the telling is focused on the giving of the name (Dibelius, *Johannes*, 73–74). The fierce insistence upon the name John by both Zechariah and Elizabeth (along with the subsequent restoration of Zechariah and the actual pregnancy itself) functions as the publicly

visible outcropping of the supernaturally worked state of affairs (vv 11–20) to which only Zechariah (and Elizabeth?) was privy. The public impact thus created is reinforced by unspecified marks of destiny upon the growing child (v 66).

In the larger Lukan structure 1:57–66 has been separated off from 1:5–25 to provide the structural parallel for the account of Jesus' birth (and circumcision) in 2:1–21, and to allow for the intertwining of the two infancy stories which is achieved by the positioning of 1:26–38 and especially by the recounting of the meeting of the two pregnant mothers (1:39–56).

OT allusion is much less evident in this section than in any thus far (excepting 1:1–4), but allusion to a patriarchal birth is probably present in v 57 (cf. Gen 25:24), and further allusions are evident.

If an extensive Hebrew source underlies 1:5–25 (as argued above), then its completion must be reflected in the present text, which seems, however, to have been much more heavily edited, probably by Luke himself. Lukan influence is most evident in vv 65–66.

The account subdivides naturally into the brief statement about the birth itself and the attendant joy (vv 57–58), the naming episode proper (vv 59–64), and the public response (vv 65–66; this last deserves to be a separate subdivision because it goes much beyond the immediate response of those present, both geographically and chronologically).

Comment

The fulfillment of the angel Gabriel's announcement to Zechariah (1:11–20), already set in motion at vv 24–25, now reaches an initial climax in the birth and naming of the child. Zechariah (with Elizabeth?) already anticipates privately the future greatness of the coming child; now, albeit in a more inchoate manner, the early life of the child leads to a wider circle of expectancy.

57 In connection with the completion of a time period, the passive of *πιμπλάναι*, "to fulfill," occurs in the NT only in Luke 1–2 (cf. Jeremias, *Sprache*, 45) and is probably from Luke's source here. *ὁ χρόνος τοῦ τεκεῖν*, "the time to give birth," is not natural Greek, but reflects Hebrew idiom (e.g., Ps 102:14; Hos 10:12; and esp. Eccl 3:2), as the *αὐτήν*, "her," further suggests (cf. Lagrange, 54). *ἐγέννησεν υἱόν*, "she gave birth to a son," reflects the language of 1:13.

Given the strong echoes earlier of OT infancy material, an allusion to Gen 25:24 is likely (more certain in the parallel statement at 2:6).

58 *περίοικος*, "neighbor," is used only here in the NT. Luke uses *γείτων* in Luke 14:12; 15:6, 9. *μεγαλύνειν ἔλεος*, "to multiply mercy," is not found in the LXX. Luke's *ἐμεγάλυνεν . . . τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ μετ'*, "he has multiplied . . . his mercy to," reflects the MT of Gen 19:19. *συνέχαιρον*, "they rejoiced with," may follow the LXX of Gen 21:6 (given earlier echoes of the birth of Isaac). Luke normally avoids the popular or Semitic parataxis found in the clauses of this verse (Jeremias, *Sprache*, 64).

It is artificial and unnecessary to suggest that Elizabeth's pregnancy was only now revealed (against R. E. Brown, *Birth*, 368; Fitzmyer, 373). Safe delivery culminates God's mercy in this miraculous pregnancy. The neighbors and relatives will only later (vv 65–66) begin to sense that there are deeper dimensions

in what is transpiring in the birth of the child. The eschatological joy anticipated in 1:14 is not yet theirs in 1:58 (with Zahn, 109; against Fitzmyer, 373).

59 The idiom here, *καλεῖν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι*, "to call after the name of," is found in Ezra 2:61; Neh 7:63 [2 Esdr 2:61; 17:63]. For the use of *ἐγένετο*, "it happened," cf. at 1:8.

From patriarchal days circumcision on the eighth day marked incorporation into the covenant (Gen 17:11–12; 21:4; Lev 12:3), and in the contemporary life of the nation established an obligation to live under the commands of the law (Gal 5:3). Only those thus circumcised on the eighth day could claim to have unblemished Jewish credentials (Phil 3:5). Jesus also will be circumcised on the eighth day (Luke 2:21). The unspecified "they" who come to circumcise the child are probably the relatives and neighbors of v 58. While there is precedent for a son receiving the name of his father (Josephus, *Ant.* 14.10; *Mur.* 29.10; etc.; naming after the grandfather is better attested [1 Macc 2:1–2; *Jub.* 11.15; Josephus, *Life* 1.5; etc.]), the motivation for doing so here is the affliction of Zechariah, rather than general custom. The linking of circumcision and naming is not otherwise attested this early in Judaism. In patriarchal times naming occurred at birth (Gen 21:3; 25:25–26). The late rabbinic text *Perke Rabbi Eleazer* (48 [27c]) has Moses named on the occasion of his circumcision, and in later Judaism the practice became general. Naming on the seventh or tenth day was a common Hellenistic practice. This may have facilitated a parallel but theologically motivated (beginning of life under the law) development within Judaism.

60 ἀποκριθεῖσα . . . εἶπεν (lit., "having answered . . . she said") is Lukan (cf. at 1:19). For οὐχί, ἀλλά ("no, but") cf. Luke 13:3, 5; 16:30. Elizabeth's insistence is to be traced back (via Zechariah) to the angelic word (1:13). No special miracle of concurrence need be appealed to (against Dibelius, *Johannes*, 73–74; R. E. Brown, *Birth*, 369, 375; etc.). The reference to Zechariah (vv 62–63) merely confirms that Elizabeth is not determined by a fickle whim.

61 εἶπαν πρὸς, "they said to," is Lukan. Only a name outside the range of all expectation can do justice to the decisive discontinuity in human affairs marked by John's coming. The elaborate stress on the giving of this particular name suits well a Hebrew original in which the etymology of the name ("God has shown favor"; cf. at v 13) forms part of the dynamic.

62 τὸ τί ἂν θέλοι, "what he would want," is Lukan in its use of τό and the optative (cf. Jeremias, *Sprache*, 67). For ἐνένευσον, "they made signs," cf. the cognate κατένευσαν at 5:7. They make signs because Zechariah is both deaf and mute (see at v 22).

63 ἐγράψεν λέγων, "he wrote, saying," is a Hebraism, reflected in the LXX at 2 Kgdms 11:15; 4 Kgdms 10:1, 6; 1 Macc 8:31; 11:57 (and cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 11.26). A πινακίδιον was a small writing tablet normally made of wood with a prepared wax surface. Where Elizabeth's words reflect the certainty of the angelic prophecy, Zechariah's bring that prophecy to fulfillment: his written message functions as the naming ceremony. A chastened and transformed Zechariah is now emulating Mary's faith. The people marvel because of the categorical opposition by the parents to their attempt at honoring stricken Zechariah. As in v 21, they are moved by the peripheral effect of a movement of God to which they are not themselves privy (for Luke's interest here cf. at 4:22).

64 The zeugma which brings together ἀνεώχθη, “was opened,” and γλῶσσα, “tongue,” may reflect a Hebrew text in which the verb פָּתַח, *pātah*, would suit both the “opening” of the mouth and the “setting free” of the tongue (Torrey, “Translations,” 293; Sahlin, *Messias*, 157–58). παραχρήμα, “immediately,” is Lukan, as is εὐλογῶν, “blessing,” with an accusative object (cf. Jeremias, *Sprache*, 70). With Zechariah’s (believing) act of naming, the (disbelieved) words of the angel come to their fruition, and in fulfillment of v 20 Zechariah’s curse is withdrawn. A Zechariah from whom all skepticism has been drained away blesses God with his freshly restored faculties.

65 ἐγένετο ἐπὶ πάντας φόβος, “fear came upon all,” is Lukan (cf. esp. Acts 5:15, 11; the same involuntary response to the divine activity is expressed in different language also at Luke 5:26; 7:16; 8:37; Acts 2:43; 5:5). Luke introduces διαλαλεῖν, “to talk about,” at 6:11. It is not found elsewhere in the NT. In singular or plural τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο, “this thing/word,” occurs eleven times in Luke-Acts, and not elsewhere in the NT. Luke uses it in imitation of the LXX (Jeremias, *Sprache*, 71).

The impact of the divine is sharpest on a first circle of those immediately proximate to the event, and then there is a second circle of impact by spreading report. The public impact of the founding events of Christianity is of considerable importance to Luke (cf. v 63).

66 τιθέναι ἐν, “to place in,” is Lukan (cf. Acts 1:7; 19:21; and with καρδιά, “heart,” Luke 21:14; Acts 5:4). ἔθεντο [τὰ ῥήματα] ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν (lit., “they placed [the matters] in their heart”) is curiously close to 1 Sam 21:12 [LXX 13]. πάντες οἱ ἀκούσαντες, “all who heard,” is also Lukan (Jeremias, *Sprache*, 72). τί ἄρα, “what then,” occurs in the NT only here, in Acts 12:18, and in Matt 19:27 (in the last there is no personal predicate). χεὶρ Κυρίου, “hand of the Lord,” is only found in Luke-Acts in the NT (Acts 11:21; 13:11). The expression is not common in the LXX (with the article it is found at Isa 66:14, without the article at Isa 41:20).

The impact made by the events surrounding John’s birth abides and becomes the question: What do these things portend for this child’s future role? The reader is cast into the role of the privileged insider who knows the answer already from vv 13–17, but the question also prepares for the adult ministry of John in 3:1–20 (esp. v 15). The final γάρ, “for,” clause is a little awkward. It is better taken as a narrative comment than as a continuation of the people’s reflection (against Schürmann, 83 n. 21). The clause functions to extend the scope of the earlier part of the verse: the ponderings of the people are kept alive because of the impression made by the growing child—an impression that Luke explains by saying, “the hand of the Lord was with him” (cf. Acts 11:21). “Hand of the Lord” is an OT anthropomorphism for the active presence of the power of God (Isa 31:3; 66:14; 41:20; 1 Chr 4:10).

Explanation

Interrupted by the annunciation to Mary and the meeting of the mothers-to-be, the account of John’s origins resumes here with the continuation of 1:5–25. The present account finds its focus of interest in the giving to John of the divinely specified name. In the large structure, 1:57–66 stands parallel to 2:1–21, and there are internal language links to reinforce this parallelism (cf. vv 57 and 2:6; cf. 1:65–66 and 2:17–18).

The brief account of the birth echoes the OT account of (barren) Rebekah's delivery (Gen 25:24); Lot's experience of God's mercy (Gen 19:19) is the pattern after which Elizabeth's is described in v 58; the rejoicing with Elizabeth reflects (barren) Sarah's expectation, should she miraculously give birth to a child (Gen 21:6 LXX). For Elizabeth, miraculous pregnancy is culminated by the mercy of a safe delivery.

In faithful observance of the law, John is circumcised on the eighth day (Gen 17:11–12; Lev 12:3) and thus incorporated into the covenant and placed under obligation to live under the commands of the law (Gal 5:3). As became usual in later Judaism, the day of circumcision was also the day of naming. The neighbors and relatives wanted to honor stricken Zechariah by naming the child after him, but Elizabeth insists that is not to be: she, but not they, knows that the child is to bear a divinely given name that marks his destiny (cf. at 1:13). From Elizabeth the well-intentioned relatives and friends appeal to Zechariah. Having once disbelieved the angelic word (1:20), a chastened and more experienced Zechariah in confident faith now fulfills the angelic word by naming the child. He is John, not Zechariah. The people do not understand, but they are impressed by the fierce insistence of Elizabeth and Zechariah. They are not privy to the divine revelation but experience in this way its publicly visible outcropping. The words of the angel have now come to their fruition, and true to that word Zechariah's curse is now withdrawn. No more the skeptic, he blesses God with his freshly restored faculties.

A totally unlikely pregnancy, a strange insistence on a completely unexpected name, and the subsequent instantaneous recovery of Zechariah combine to produce that involuntary response of fear in the presence of the divine activity which Luke is so fond of noting (cf. 5:26; 7:16; 8:37; etc.). Experienced most sharply in the circle of those immediately witnessing the events, the public impact of these events is not contained there, but spreads by word of mouth to a much larger circle. People conclude that in some way this is a child of destiny—an opinion that is sustained and confirmed by the impression made by the growing child, which Luke explains by means of OT idiom in terms of “the hand of the Lord” being with him.

Zechariah's Prophecy (1:67–80)

Bibliography

Auffret, P. “Note sur la structure littéraire de Lc i. 68–79.” *NTS* 24 (1977–78) 248–58. **Delatouche, P.** “Un psaume néotestamentaire, le Cantique Benedictus.” *Annales de philosophie chrétienne* 4 (1904) 175–90. **Fridrichsen, A.** “ΣΟΦΙΑ, ἩΛΙΚΙΑ, ΧΑΡΙΣ (Luc 1:80; 2:40, 52).” *SO* 6 (1928) 36–38. **Funk, R. W.** “The Wilderness.” *JBL* 78 (1959) 205–14. **Gertner, M.** “Midrashim in the New Testament.” *JSS* 7 (1962) 267–92, esp. 273–82. **Geyser, A. S.** “The Youth of John the Baptist: A Deduction from the Break in the Parallel Account of the Lucan Infancy Story.” *NovT* 1 (1956) 70–75. **Gnilka, J.** “Der Hymnus des Zacharias.” *BZ* 6 (1962) 215–38. **Haggemüller, O.** “Der Lobgesang des Zacharias.” *BibLeb* 9 (1968) 249–60. **Jacoby, A.** “ἈΝΑΤΟΛΗ ΕΞ ὙΨΟΥΣ.” *ZNW*

20 (1921) 205–14. **Kasteren, J. van.** “Analecta exegetica—Luc 1, 76s.” *RB*, o.s., 3 (1894) 54–56. **McCown, C. C.** “The Scene of John’s Ministry and Its Relation to the Purpose and Outcome of His Mission.” *JBL* 59 (1940) 113–31. **Rousseau, F.** “*Les Structures du Benedictus* (Luc 1.68–79).” *NTS* 32 (1986) 268–82. **Simon, J.** “The Canticle of Zachary (Lc 1,68–79).” *EcR* 67 (1922) 251–58. **Vanhoye, A.** “Structure du ‘Benedictus.’” *NTS* 12 (1965–66) 382–89. **Vielhauer, P.** “Das Benedictus des Zacharias.” *Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament*. TBü 31. Munich: Kaiser, 1965. 28–46. **Zingg, P.** *Wachsen*. 40–60.

And see further the bibliography for the Lukan canticles at 1:39–56.

Translation

- ⁶⁷Zechariah, his father, was filled with the Holy Spirit and prophesied and said,^a
⁶⁸“Blessed be the Lord,^b the God of Israel,
 Because he has visited and brought redemption to his people,
⁶⁹And has raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of David his
 servant,
⁷⁰Just as he spoke through the mouth of his^c holy^d prophets from of old.
⁷¹Salvation from our enemies and from the hand of all who hate us,
⁷²to show mercy to our fathers
 and to remember his holy covenant!
⁷³The oath which he swore to Abraham our father
 to grant us,⁷⁴without fear (having been rescued from the hand of enemies)^e
 to worship him⁷⁵in holiness and righteousness
 —in his presence all our days!
⁷⁶You, child, will be called prophet of the Most High,
 For you will go before the Lord to prepare his ways,
⁷⁷To grant to his People the knowledge of salvation in the forgiveness of
 their sins,
⁷⁸Because of the tender mercies of our God,
 In which he will visit^f us: a sunrise out of heaven
⁷⁹to shine on those who sit in darkness and the shadow of death,
 to guide our feet into the way of peace.”
⁸⁰The child grew and became strong in spirit, and he was in wilderness areas
 until the time of his manifestation to Israel.

Notes

^aD omits ἐπροφήτευσεν λέγων and reads εἶπεν, “he said.”

^bΚύριος is omitted by P⁴ W etc.

^cIn N W αὐτοῦ is placed after ἀπ’ αἰῶνος, “from of old.” In D (it) ἀπ’ αἰῶνος, “from of old,” is placed terminally with an article and there is no initial article.

^dIn A C K Θ etc. an extra article requires “holy” (ἁγίων) to be read as a substantive (“holy ones”).

^e33 it etc. (A C etc.) read (τῶν) ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν (“of our enemies”; cf. v 71).

^fThe aorist (“has visited”) is read by N² A C D etc., in conformity to v 68.

Form/Structure/Setting

The action of 1:67–80 still belongs to the episode 1:57–66, and is probably to represent the blessings of God in v 64. The informational content of the

hymn, however, plays no role in the story line (the Benedictus neither answers the question of v 66, nor, located in time at v 64, makes such a question unnecessary). Luke creates a separate item out of the canticle so as to be able to offer a structural parallel to 2:22–40 (cf. at 1:5–25): where John is greeted by the inspired Zechariah, Jesus is greeted by the inspired Simeon and Anna. As with the Magnificat, the Benedictus seems to have come to Luke separate from its present context and to have been added by Luke to his account in a later phase of editing (v 80 earlier followed v 66; Luke reworked vv 65–66 so that they could stand as conclusion to vv 57–66, provided a fresh introduction in v 67, and used v 80 as conclusion for the extra section thus created).

Similarities between the Benedictus and Magnificat have been frequently noted (in vocabulary there is a particular concentration of common terms in vv 54–55 of the Magnificat), and common authorship as well as dependence both ways has been claimed. The canticles share a similar method of allusion to the OT, a similar but not identical eschatological orientation (see below), and an interest in a figure secondary to the messiah in the coming of salvation (Mary, John). They are, however, structurally dissimilar, and in the present form the Benedictus does not manifest the Magnificat's degree of conformation to the LXX text; also, while the Magnificat focuses on the speaker's (Mary's) place in salvation history, the speaker of the Benedictus has a quite anonymous role. Gryglewicz (*NTS* 21 [1974–75] 268–70) has documented the close connection between both Magnificat and Benedictus and Peter's speech in Acts 3:12–26 (though note in *Comment* below that the closeness of Acts 3:21 and Luke 1:70 is to be attributed to Luke), and it is perhaps best to see reflected in all three no more than a common world of early Christian piety and worship (see also at 1:46–55).

The original unity of the Benedictus is generally questioned, the most popular views being either (i) that vv 76–77 have been secondarily inserted by Luke (see esp. Benoit, *NTS* 3 [1956–57] 182–91), or (ii) that vv 76–79 were originally independent of vv 68–75. While vv 76–77 are quite similar to other synoptic traditions concerning the Baptist, there is no sign in the verses of any dependence on a Greek form of those traditions (or the LXX), and there is some slight evidence of an independent relationship to the MT (see *Comment*). It would have been quite possible for vv 68–75 to have existed as a separate and complete eschatological fulfillment hymn. Vv 76–79 could also stand alone as a hymn anticipating the visitation of God which John was to herald. However, the *τοῦ δοῦναι*, “to give,” of v 77 and especially the *ἐπισκέψεται*, “he will visit,” of v 78 seem to be resumptive of the same terms in vv 73 and 68, and the *εἰρήνης*, “peace,” of v 79 takes up so well the thought of vv 71, 74–75. Also, vv 68–75 provide just the right larger framework in which to set the development in vv 76–79. So it is most likely that vv 76–79 were composed for their present setting. On the other hand, the only positive argument in favor of vv 68–75 always having had vv 76–79 attached is the fact that the broken syntax of vv 71 and 73 creates a space for the role of the Baptist. And since in the absence of vv 76–79 the broken syntax could be completed differently, we are still left with the possibility that vv 68–75 may originally have stood alone. V 70 is probably a Lukan expansion (see *Comment*).

Vanhoye (*NTS* 12 [1965–66] 382–88) and Auffret (*NTS* 24 [1977–78] 248–

58) have offered complex structural arguments based on chiasmic repetition of key words, which would imply an original unity for the *Benedictus*. But in each case not all repetitions are adequately accounted for, and the structure is decided on a basis that is both too formal and too narrow (cf. Schweizer, "Aufbau," 19–21).

The connection of the *Benedictus* to Zechariah must in the nature of the case remain much less firm than that of the *Magnificat* to Mary (which is only to say that there is no self-reference in the *Benedictus*). The hymn, as we presently have it, presupposes the provision of the Davidic messiah (annunciation to Mary and conception?) and anticipates from the perspective of the infancy of John both John's preliminary eschatological role and the eschatological visitation of God, presumably by the agency of the Davidic messiah already held in reserve in vv 68–69. The present general setting, therefore, if not the particular speaker, is necessary.

Like the *Magnificat*, the *Benedictus* expresses its thought entirely within the categories of traditional Jewish expectations and OT texts. Those used in relation to Jesus have only a limited currency in later Christian tradition, but those used in relation to John continued to be used by Christians. Only in the mention of "forgiveness of sins" (v 77) is there something that might look distinctly like a Christian development. But since it is John who here brings the forgiveness of sins, not even this is to be accounted as a later Christian development. A worship setting similar to that postulated above for the *Magnificat* is a likely transmission context for the *Benedictus*.

Unlike the *Magnificat*, which saw everything as already fulfilled (at least in principle), the *Benedictus* speaks in terms of an eschatology already in process of realization but with a future of fulfillment yet outstanding. The difference is, of course, artistic rather than theological.

Although many of the elements of OT psalms are recognizable in the *Benedictus*, it does not conform closely to any of the OT psalm types. It is a collective psalm in the first person plural. God is not addressed but spoken about, and apart from the very specific address to John in v 76, no audience is addressed. The closest formal parallel to the transition to the personal address and concretely prophetic thrust of vv 76–77 is probably the oracular content of vv 7–9 of Ps 2.

The *Benedictus* divides into two major strophes of unequal length (vv 68–75, 76–79). The first strophe begins with a blessing of God (v 68a) which formally controls the remainder of the canticle: God is blessed both for having inaugurated the period of salvation already (vv 68b–70) and for the anticipated but yet to be realized steps in the program of eschatological salvation (vv 71–75 and vv 76–79). After the introductory blessing, the first strophe divides into three sections. First God is blessed because already the divine visitation that means the redemption of God's people has come to pass in the provision of the Davidic savior (vv 68b–70). But what has already transpired in that event implies and promises much more, so the full flowering of that seed is represented in the two complex ejaculations which constitute sections two and three of the first strophe (vv 71–72, 73–75). On the basis of what has already happened the poet envisages the full experience of salvation to come. This he first pictures negatively as deliverance from all our enemies in fulfillment

of the covenant mercy promised to the patriarchs (vv 71–72). Then, in a second ejaculation, he develops the picture more positively (vv 73–75). This time he grounds God's action in the word of oath to Abraham (v 73), reiterates as presupposition (v 74) the deliverance from enemies of v 71, and then presses on to identify the ultimate achievement of God's saving intervention. This he sees as the pure and undisturbed worship of God by his People. What had been for many centuries the but scantily fulfilled hope for life in the promised land (Josh 24:14) would now become a reality.

Vv 68b–75 have covered the whole scope of eschatological fulfillment but have by no means identified all the stages. In between what has already been accomplished in the miraculous provision of the messianic child and what is eagerly anticipated as ultimate salvation comes the role of this other miraculously provided child. The second stanza gives a preliminary eschatological role to John in which is experienced the beginning of the eschatological outpouring of the mercy of God. The stanza pivots around the mention of “the tender mercies of God,” which concludes the first section of the stanza (vv 76–77) and is taken up by the ἐν οἷς, “in which,” with which the second section (vv 78–79) of the stanza begins. Through John's ministry salvation will be known in the forgiveness of sins by a people who will thereafter await eagerly the sunrise from heaven which will be the completion of their salvation. The achievements of John and Jesus together represent the full realization of the tender mercies of God.

Comment

The stage is now fully set for John's role as a child of destiny. Where the angel Gabriel's words have attributed a preliminary eschatological role as preparer to John (vv 15–17) and the Magnificat has hymned the coming of Jesus as the fulfillment of all eschatological hopes (vv 46–55), it is left to the Benedictus to speak of both together and to establish the nature of their partnership in the bringing of salvation.

67 ἐπλήσθη πνεύματος ἁγίου, “he was filled with the Holy Spirit,” is Lukan (cf. at v 41). The whole verse will have been formulated by Luke to add the Benedictus to his narrative at this point (see *Form/Structure/Setting* above and at 1:5–25). ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ, “his father,” is superfluous after 1:5–24a and especially v 59, but is understandable after v 66 (τὸ παιδίον τοῦτο, μετ' αὐτοῦ [“this child,” “with him”]), especially as a later alteration. Prophecy such as that of Zechariah marks the life of the early church (Acts 2:17–18; 11:27; 13:1; 19:6; 21:9) and is eschatological in character (esp. Acts 2:17–18). The future orientation of vv 76–79 is clearly prophetic, but so too are vv 68–75 which, on the basis of the beginning made with the conception of Jesus, announce the impending fulfillment of all God's promises.

68 εὐλογητὸς Κύριος ὁ θεὸς [τοῦ] Ἰσραὴλ, “blessed be the Lord, the God of Israel,” is a familiar OT blessing used especially at the conclusion of psalms (1 Sam 25:32; 1 Kgs 1:48; 8:15; Pss 40 [41]:13 [14]; 71 [72]:18; 105 [106]:48; and cf. 1 Chr 16:36; 1QM 14.4). The canticle to follow rehearses the basis in God's saving action for such blessing of God and is controlled by the tone set in the opening words (cf. Pss 47:2; 95:3; 96:4; 117:2).

ἐπεσκέψατο, “he has visited,” as in the LXX, represents the Hebrew תָּרַב , *ṭārad*, which is used often to denote God’s gracious visitation, bringing deliverance in various forms (Gen 21:1; Exod 4:31; Ruth 1:6; Ps 79 [80]:14; Ps 105 [106]:4; Jer 15:15; etc.; and cf. CD 1.7; *T. Levi* 4.4; *T. Jud.* 23.5; *T. Asher* 7.3). Ps 105 [106]:4 anticipates the coming of salvation and brings together “visit,” “People,” and “salvation” (cf. Luke 1:69). It may be in view here. Since what is in mind is the raising up of a Davidic savior (cf. Luke 1:69), it is tempting, in light of the connections drawn between Mary’s conception and miraculous OT births (see at 1:26–38), to find in ἐπεσκέψατο, “he has visited,” an allusion to Gen 21:1 and God’s intervention in Sarah’s pregnancy. But this is uncertain. ἐπεσκέψατο may be used absolutely (i.e., without object), but perhaps more likely, reflecting the underlying Hebrew syntax, it governs τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ, “his people.” The language of visitation reappears in 1:78 and 7:16; Acts 15:14 (and cf. Luke 19:44).

ἐποίησεν λύτρωσιν (lit., “made redemption”) is a Semitism (cf. ἐποίησεν κράτος in v 51, and ποιῆσαι ἔλεος in v 72), but with no exact OT parallel (Ps 110 [111]:9 is closest). λύτρωσις often carries the imagery of release at a cost, but the imagery has been weakened by conventional usage and the word need mean no more than “deliverance.” Deliverance for the people of God comes in the person of the deliverer (as v 69).

The blessing of God and redemption (λύτρωσις) are echoed in Luke’s structural parallel to 1:67–80 (i.e., 2:22–40) at 2:28 and 38.

69 κέρας (קֶרֶן , *qeren* [“horn”]) is an OT metaphor for strength or power and is there found not with ἐγείρειν (“to raise up [i.e., set in place]”) but with ὑψοῦν, ἐπαίρειν, ἐξανатέλλειν (“to lift high,” etc.) where the imagery is that of the proudly erect horns of a powerful animal, or something similar. In the Benedictus κέρας carries the image alone, and ἐγείρειν is used as in Luke 7:16; Acts 13:22. In 2 Sam 22:3 (= Ps 17 [18]:3) God is κέρας σωτηρίας μου, “horn of my salvation”; in Ps 131 [132]:17 God promises ἐξανатελῶ κέρας τῷ Δαυίδ, “I will make a horn sprout for David.” In the Benedictus the Davidic connection becomes explicit in v 69b. The language of salvation is important to Luke. His story is that of the coming of salvation to humankind. In the synoptic tradition, the various cognate nouns are peculiar to Luke (also well represented in Acts). The mention of salvation here finds its immediate development in v 71, but cf. also vv 74–75 and v 77. In 2:22–40 the language of salvation surfaces at v 30.

ἐν οἴκῳ Δαυίδ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ, “in the house of David his servant,” echoes the language of 2 Sam 7:26 (= 1 Chr 17:24), from David’s prayer after Nathan communicated to him God’s promise concerning the future of his dynasty, and thus alludes to that promise now brought to ultimate fulfillment in the provision of the messiah.

70 The likeness between v 70 and Acts 3:21 makes it likely that we should consider v 70 a Lukan addition, a judgment which has been supported on metrical (Aytoun, *JTS* 18 [1916–17] 283–84) and structural grounds (Schweizer, “Aufbau,” 21). But these last indicators are quite uncertain, and it is also possible that both Luke 1:70 and Acts 3:21 reflect a common source (R. E. Brown, *Birth*, 383). διὰ στόματος, “through the mouth,” occurs in connection with prophecy also in Acts 1:16; 3:18, 21 (and cf. 4:25; 2 Chr 36:22). To call the prophets “holy” is a late development not evidenced earlier than Wis 11:1 (cf. 2 *Apoc.*

Bar. 85.1; *Eph* 3:5). ἀπ' αἰῶνος, "from of old," is a relatively infrequent Septuagintal idiom, found in the NT only in Luke-Acts. These last observations further support a Lukan origin for the verse (and compare *Luke* 24:27, 44–46). Luke explicates and expands on the allusion in v 69b to the Davidic covenant promises.

71 From v 71 to v 75 the text lacks any principal verb to tie down the time reference (the syntax is quite incomplete, in the manner of ejaculations, and consists only of complex predicates without verbs [vv 71–72; vv 73–75]). The beginning-of-fulfillment tone is best served by linking the statements to the immediately proximate future. ἐχθροί, "enemies," and μισοῦντες, "those who hate," occur as a pair a number of times in the OT (MT uses יָאֵב, 'āyab, and שָׂנֵא, śānē) but *Ps* 105 [106]:10 is closest and is probably echoed (but with the plurals of the LXX; MT has singulars). Vv 71–72 take up and expand the use of σωτηρία, "salvation," in v 69. The thought of v 71 is in turn picked up in v 74.

As with the Magnificat, there is nothing to suggest that the interest in societal conditions is anything but seriously intended, but this concern needs to be kept in closest relationship with that of vv 74–75. Luke's unfolding story suggests a rather more complex and even ambiguous fulfillment than these simple words might suggest.

72 ποιῆσαι ἐλεος μετὰ (lit., "to do mercy with") reflects a Hebrew construction and is found in the LXX (but never in connection with God's covenant mercies; *Gen* 24:12; *Judg* 1:24; 8:35; *Ruth* 1:8; 1 *Sam* 20:8, 14; etc.). "Mercy" and "covenant" are linked in *Deut* 7:9; *Ps* 88 [89]:28; *Isa* 55:3 and cf. *IQM* 14.4. The following "our fathers" and the language of v 73 suggest that *Mic* 7:20 is being echoed. Our text reverses the normal OT pattern of mercy to Abraham (*Gen* 24:27; *Mic* 7:20) and oath sworn to the fathers (*Exod* 13:5; *Deut* 7:8, 12; *Jer* 11:5; 32:22; *Mic* 7:20; but cf. *Gen* 22:16–17; 26:3). On "mercy" see at v 54. What is now anticipated is "mercy to the fathers" in that it fulfills God's commitment made to them, a point which is reiterated in the covenant language of v 72b.

As with "prophets" in v 70, the epithet "holy" (ἅγιος) with "covenant" is a late coinage (cf. 1 *Macc* 1:15, 63). The idea that God should remember his covenant occurs a number of times in the OT (*Exod* 2:24; *Lev* 26:42; *Pss* 104 [105]:8; 105 [106]:45), but no particular text is clearly in view. The covenant with Abraham and the patriarchs is in mind, but no clear distinction from the later Mosaic covenant is intended.

73 As in vv 71–72 we have in vv 73–75 a predicate without an expressed verb. The link with v 72 suggests a dependence on *Mic* 7:20, but the language has also been influenced by *Gen* 26:3 or *Jer* 11:5 (cf. *Exod* 13:5; *Deut* 7:8, 12; *Jer* 32:22), which can suggest for us the missing beginning of the sentence with its principal verb ("now he will perform/fulfill . . ."). For Abraham as father see *Josh* 24:3; *Isa* 51:2. The idea is common in Jewish tradition of the NT period (cf. *Luke* 3:8; 16:24; *John* 8:39; *Acts* 7:2; etc.). The content of the oath is the same as that of the covenant of v 72b (cf. *Deut* 7:8–9, 12; *Pss* 88 [89]:3 [4]; 104 [105]:9; *Ezek* 16:59) but is here articulated in the language of vv 73b–75. As in *Exod* 13:5; *Jer* 11:5 the content of the oath is introduced by δοῦναι (lit., "to give").

74 ἐκ χειρὸς ἐχθρῶν ῥυσθέντας, "having been rescued from the hand of

[our] enemies,” is parenthetical and reiterates in slightly altered language (cf. Ps 96 [97]:10) the negative definition of salvation in v 71, so that the poet can then move beyond that to express in vv 74b–75 his positive vision of the future of God’s People with their God. Sahlin (*Messias*, 291; following in part Gunkel and Torrey), bothered by the separation of ἀφόβως, “fearlessly,” and λατρεύειν, “to serve/worship,” which it modifies, suspects a mistranslation from Hebrew and reconstructs a text that would allow us to link “fearlessness” with the preceding verb. The sense is little altered.

75 λατρεύειν αὐτῷ ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ, “to serve/worship him in holiness and righteousness,” reflects the language of Josh 24:14 which expresses Joshua’s vision for the honoring of God in the promised land. Where the LXX has εὐθύτητι, “uprightness,” our text prefers to render the תָּמִיךְ, *tāmim*, of the MT with ὁσιότητι, “holiness/uprightness.” λατρεύειν has cultic overtones, but the emphasis here is on the whole of life lived in dedication to God. Schürmann’s comment, 88, is apt: “Obedience is the true cult.” ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ, “before him”/“in his presence,” does not connect easily to either λατρεύειν, “to serve/worship,” or δικαιοσύνῃ, “righteousness,” because of the earlier αὐτῷ, “him,” and is best left outside the syntax. For the phrase πάσαις ταῖς ἡμέραις ἡμῶν, “all our days,” cf. Ps 89 [90]:14, but the thought is closer to that of Ps 22 [23]:6b and cf. 1QH 17.14. A reference to all the future frequently terminates the psalms (Pss 15 [16]:11; 17 [18]:51; 22 [23]:6; 27 [28]:9; etc.). Here it rounds off the first major section of the hymn, which is made up of an introductory blessing of God (v 68a) supported by a causal statement (vv 68b–70) and followed by two ejaculatory statements anticipating the full experience of salvation (vv 71–72, 73–75).

76 Vv 68–75 have compassed and celebrated the whole drama of salvation: the child of promise has been miraculously provided, and the fullness of salvation is expected. But in between what has already been accomplished and what is eagerly anticipated comes the role of another miraculously provided child. To this, with the overview firmly in place, our poet now turns, and addresses the infant.

προφήτης ὑψίστου, “prophet of the Most High,” has been found elsewhere only at *T. Levi* 8.15, where it appears in connection with a messianic figure who will bring together in his person the offices of prophet, priest, and king. It is not there a messianic title (as sometimes claimed) and in any case is probably Christian. Since here in Luke 1:76 the term needs to function as the title of an eschatological figure, the best point of comparison is with 1QS 9.11 (“until the coming of the Prophet and the Anointed of Aaron and Israel”), and behind that Deut 18:15–18. The thought is that of Luke 7:26–27. ὑψίστου, “of the Most High,” may be a Lukan touch (replacing τοῦ θεοῦ [“of God”]?) to parallel v 32. The giving of significant descriptive names is a feature of the Isaianic prophecies (Isa 1:26; 58:12; 60:14; 62:4; cf. Jones, *JTS*, n.s., 19 [1968] 35).

προπορεύειν ἐνώπιον Κυρίου, “you shall go before the Lord,” echoes the thought of Mal 3:1 in much the same way as does Luke 1:16 (see there), but with an overlap of language only in ἐνώπιον, “before.” The following ἐτοιμάσαι ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ, “to prepare his ways,” is also dependent on Mal 3:1 (the plural ὁδοὺς, “ways,” may betray an influence from Isa 40:3–4 [cf. Mark 1:2–3]). There is

no reflection of Septuagintal language (there is only the use of *ἐτοιμάζω*, “to prepare,” which is used in the LXX of Isa 40:3), nor of the language in which this tradition appears elsewhere in the synoptic material (cf. Mark 1:2–3; Luke 3:4–6 [this text does use *ἐτοιμάζω*]; 7:26; Matt 3:3; 11:10). An independent relationship to the tradition and the MT is most likely.

The imagery is primarily that of a coming of God for which preparation is to be made; but for Luke this visitation by God takes the form of the coming of Jesus (cf. Luke 7:16), and there may, therefore, be a happy ambiguity about the reference of “Lord” (*Κύριος*) here (see further at 1:17 and 3:4). The preparatory role of the Baptist will be further specified in v 77.

77 The opening *τοῦ δοῦναι*, “to give,” may deliberately parallel the same words in v 73. The language of “knowledge” is not elsewhere used like this by Luke (the Acts uses are rhetorical; cf. Gnika, *BZ* 6 (1962) 234). “Knowledge of salvation” is in Hebrew idiom the experience of salvation (Ps 98:2; cf. Vielhauer, “Benedictus,” 31). For the problem of John granting “forgiveness of sins,” which is also the central benefit of Jesus’ coming, see at 3:3. *ἁφαισις ἁμαρτιῶν*, “forgiveness of sins,” is in the NT dominantly Lukan (Luke 24:47; Acts 2:38; 5:31; 10:43; 13:38; 26:18; cf. Matt 26:28), but not so in relation to John (elsewhere only Luke 3:3=Mark 1:4). The expression does not occur in the OT, though the idea is clear enough (Pss 25:18; 99:8; Isa 55:7; Jer 31:34). Forgiveness here implies the call to repentance of 1:17; 3:3 and thus fits the People of God for the rescue from their enemies of v 71 and lifelong worship of vv 74–75. Or, in the language of v 78 to follow, this forgiveness is a preliminary experience of the eschatologically bestowed mercy of God, preliminary to the full flowering of the same in the shining forth of the *ἀνατολή*, “[sun] rise.”

78 *διὰ σπλάγχνα ἐλέους θεοῦ ἡμῶν*, “because of the tender mercies of our God,” is the linchpin holding together the activities of John and the *ἀνατολή*, “[sun] rise.” For that reason it is best to refer it to the whole of vv 76–77 rather than narrowly to the preceding phrase (Vielhauer, “Benedictus,” 37). The view made popular by Benoit (*NTS* 3 [1956–57] 184–90) that vv 76–77 are a Lukan insertion cannot adequately account for vv 78–79 and their link to v 75. Literally, the *σπλάγχνα* are the upper viscera—the heart, the lungs, and the liver—which were thought of as controlling the emotions. *σπλάγχνα ἐλέους*, “tender mercies,” is not found elsewhere in the NT (but cf. Col 3:12), nor in the LXX. It is found in *T. Zeb.* 7.38; 8.2, 6, and a Hebrew equivalent in 1QS 2.1; 4QS1 39 1.i.23. Note especially the similar eschatological setting of *T. Zeb.* 8.2 (cf. Koester, *TDNT* 7:552–55).

The reading *ἐπεσκέψατο*, “he visited,” of \aleph^2 A C D etc. is best understood as a superficial scribal correction in light of v 68, on the basis that the messiah cannot be spoken of as both having come (v 68) and as yet to come (v 78). The reading *ἐπεσκέψατο* has proved attractive to those interested in the decomposition of the text, but it does not allow us to find sense in the extant text. *ἐπισκέψεται*, “will visit,” requires a personal subject, which is normally taken to be the *ἀνατολή*, “[sun] rise,” understood as a designation for the messiah. This is certainly possible (see below), but the parallel with v 68 and the link through *ἐν οἷς*, “in which,” to the *ἐλέους θεοῦ*, “mercy of God,” point rather to

God as the visitor. More difficult is the question whether we should, therefore, take ἀνατολή as a messianic designation.

The LXX uses ἀνατολή to represent ΠΝΣ, *šemah* (“sprout”/“shoot”), on each of the three occasions when the reference is to the Davidic shoot (Jer 23:5; Zech 3:8; 6:12; but cf. Isa 4:2). So ἀνατολή can be a messianic title (cf. also the “star” [LXX ἀστρὸν] of Num 24:17, and the “light” [LXX φῶς] which the servant of Isa 42:6 is). There is, however, no evidence for this use of ἀνατολή being connected with the imagery of the casting of light as is the case here in Luke 1:78–79 (the “star” of Num 24:17 is so developed in *T. Levi* 18.3–4, but the field of imagery involved in the LXX use of ἀνατολή seems to be that of brightness representing [royal] glory [cf. Isa 14:12; Dan 12:3; Judg 5:31; 1 *Enoch* 104.1; Matt 13:43]). A fresh development (as with Num 24:17 in *T. Levi* 18.3–4) is always possible, but is not positively evidenced. Such a development would in any case only be possible in a Greek text, not in a Hebrew one using ΠΝΣ, *šemah* (“sprout”/“shoot”).

If ἀνατολή does not come from ΠΝΣ, then the messianic uses of ἀνατολή lose their relevance. It is the cluster of Isaianic texts 9:1 [ET 9:2]; 58:8, 10; 60:1–3 (and cf. Mal 3:20 [ET 4:2]; Isa 30:26) which are closest to the sentiment of Luke 1:78b–79a. And at least in Isa 60:3 there is a word that could well be translated ἀνατολή (i.e., ΠῚ, *zarah* [“rising”]) and is best understood of the light which rises to shine upon God’s people (cf. v 2 and Isa 58:8, 10). The cognate verb ΠῚ, *zarah*, is found in Isa 58:10; 60:2; Mal 3:20 [ET 4:2]. That which rises could be equated with God himself (Isa 60:2: “The Lord will arise upon you”; and cf. 2 Sam 23:4) but is mostly thought of more impersonally and metaphorically (in Isa 9:2–7 the happy situation inaugurated by the coming of the messianic deliverer is in view). At the cost of broken syntax (cf. vv 71, 73) this more impersonal representation may be claimed for Luke 1:78; or God himself may be identified with the ἀνατολή. The ἀνατολή comes out of heaven (ἐξ ὕψους; cf. 2 Sam 22:17; Lam 1:13; Pss 101 [102]:19; 143 [144]:7; Gnllka, *BZ* 6 [1962] 230). As in v 68 the form of the divine visitation here is messianic.

79 ἐπιφάναι, “to shine upon,” perhaps reflects Isa 9:1 [ET 9:2], but τοῖς ἐν σκότει καὶ σκιᾷ θανάτου καθημένοις, “those who sit in darkness and the shadow of death,” has been shaped after Ps 106 [107]:10. τοῦ κατευθῆναι, “to guide,” continues the light imagery. For the general thought cf. Ps 118 [119]:105; 2 Sam 22:29. For ὁδὸν εἰρήνης, “way of peace,” cf. Isa 59:8 and the LXX of Ps 13 [14]:3 and Isa 41:3, but the ethical tone of the first two of these is not present in our text. Luke 1:71, 74–75 constitute the best commentary on the present verse (and cf. Isa 9:7).

80 The section concludes with the first of three growth statements which punctuate the infancy gospel (cf. 2:40, 52). It is suggested in *Form/Structure/Setting* for 1:5–25 that 1:80 and 2:52 played a structural role in an earlier form of the text (with 1:80 following v 66), but that in the final form 1:80 parallels 2:40, and 2:52 is no longer a structural marker. Where 2:52 is closely modeled on 1 Sam 2:26, 1:80 exhibits only a general similarity to that text, 1 Sam 3:19–20, and Judg 13:24–25 (and not in LXX form). The verb pair ἤξανε καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο, “grew and became strong,” which is repeated in 2:40, has not been found elsewhere (Zingg, *Wachsen*, 50). πνεύματι is best not referred to

the Holy Spirit here. John's location *ἐν ταῖς ἐρήμοις*, "in the wilderness areas," suggests that John is a person apart, already from his youth. The plural (also at 8:29) does not have the theological significance of the singular (cf. at 3:2, 4) and certainly does not connect John with the Essenes (see at 3:1–6). The use of *ἡμέρα*, "day," for "time" is Hebraic. *ἀνάδειξις* occurs only here in the NT and only once in the LXX. A technical sense of "installation" or "commissioning" is possible, but a nontechnical "manifestation" is perhaps to be preferred (cf. Schlier, *TDNT* 2:31). Luke 1:80 rounds off the account of John's infancy and bridges to the account of his adult ministry in Luke 3.

Explanation

Though logically it belongs at v 64, Zechariah's canticle is set in a separate section to act in Luke's larger structure as the parallel to the greeting by Simeon (and Anna) of the infant Jesus (2:22–40). As with the Magnificat, Zechariah's song has reached Luke independently of its present setting.

Where the angel Gabriel's words (vv 15–17) have attributed a preliminary eschatological role as preparer to John, and the Magnificat (vv 46–55) has hymned the coming of Jesus as the fulfillment of all eschatological hopes, it is left to the Benedictus to speak of both together and to establish the nature of their partnership in the bringing of salvation. The perspective of the Benedictus is that God has in the conception of Jesus visited his people for the purpose of their redemption. But the fruition of that conception in the full realization of the messianic deliverance is yet to come: that will be the visitation of God to end all such visitations; that will be a sunrise out of heaven. Between the two "visits" that have to do with the Davidic savior comes the role of John. In a preliminary experience of the end-time bestowal of God's mercy, John will bestow upon God's people the forgiveness of their sins as he sets them waiting for the sunrise of their hopes.

The Benedictus, like the Magnificat, expresses its thought entirely within the categories of traditional Jewish expectations and OT texts. But more than with the Magnificat there is specific allusion to OT texts.

As was his wife before him (v 41) Zechariah is filled with the Holy Spirit, but in Zechariah's case there is also talk of prophesying, as in the early church (Acts 2:17–18; 11:27; 13:1; 21:9).

Zechariah's prophetic words begin in the form of a familiar OT blessing of God (1 Sam 25:32; 1 Kgs 1:48; Ps 41:13; etc.) and the content of the canticle spells out the reason why God is to be blessed. God is to be blessed fundamentally because he has set in motion the deliverance of his people through the messianic savior, as promised through the prophets (vv 68b–70). Specifically, the conception of Jesus has taken place, and this is spoken of as a visitation by God (cf. Gen 21:1; Exod 4:31; etc., and especially Ps 106:4, to which there is probably allusion). God has now acted for the redemption of his people in that he has begun to activate the final phase of his promise to the dynasty of David (the basic form of the promise is in 2 Sam 7, and examples of prophetic reiteration are frequent, e.g., Ps 89; Ezek 34:23–24; Amos 9:11–12; the words of v 69b echo words from 2 Sam 7:26). "Horn" is a frequent OT image for strength or power (cf. 2 Sam 22:3 and Ps 132:17).

Implied in this beginning God has made is the full flowering of the salvation that he intends for his people. This prospect is anticipated in the two complex ejaculations which now follow (vv 71-72, 73-75). The repeated use of the language of salvation found in the Benedictus is very congenial to Luke, whose whole story is that of the coming of salvation to humankind. The first ejaculation identifies salvation negatively as rescue from enemies and probably echoes Ps 106:10. Though the language is traditional, the interest in societal conditions is seriously intended, but needs to be kept in closest relationship to the concerns of vv 74-75. Luke's unfolding story suggests a rather more complex and even ambiguous fulfillment than these simple words taken alone might suggest. This coming salvation is mercy to our fathers (v 72) in that it fulfills God's commitment made to them, as the following half verse makes clear in covenant language (cf. Exod 2:24; Ps 106:45; etc.).

The second ejaculation (vv 73-75) takes the thought on by tracing the roots of this salvation back to an oath sworn to Abraham (the language of vv 72-73 is influenced by Mic 7:20, with influence in v 73 from Gen 26:3 or Jer 11:5 as well). The original oath is that of Gen 22:16-17. The negative definition of salvation from v 71 is reiterated in v 74, but now is only the presupposition for the positive vision of the future of vv 74-75. Here the language of Josh 24:14 is echoed: what has been for many centuries the but scantily fulfilled hope for life in the promised land is now to become a reality.

But where does John fit into all of this? His place is between what has been accomplished in the miraculous provision of the messianic child and what is now eagerly anticipated as the full experience of salvation. John is to be the preparer who goes ahead (v 76; cf. v 16; 7:26-27; Mal 3:1). John will come ahead of that visitation of God which will be the ultimate sunrise from heaven (v 78) in which messianic salvation will reach its full realization (for the role of Jesus compare the language of 7:16). And as preparer he will be able to extend to the people God's forgiveness of their sins (v 77; cf. 3:3). John in a preliminary and Jesus in an ultimate way will be the instruments of the end-time outpouring of the tender mercies of God (v 78).

The preliminary outpouring of the tender mercies of God gives way to the ultimate, and so the canticle leads us to a final climax in that ultimate visitation of God (v 78) implied already in Mary's conception (v 68). Building on imagery out of Isaiah (9:2; 58:8, 10; 60:1-3 and cf. Mal 4:2), the final denouement is described as a sunrise out of heaven (v 78) shining on those in darkness (v 79; cf. Ps 107:10) and providing a light that will guide into the experience of peace anticipated in vv 71 and 74. After the preparatory work of John, this will be the task of Jesus, the horn of salvation from the house of David (v 69).

After the canticle, the section is concluded with a growth statement about John (cf. the parallel in 2:40) which rounds off the account of John's infancy and bridges to the account of his adult ministry in Luke 3.

The Birth of Jesus (2:1–21)

Bibliography

GENERAL:

- Bailey, K. E.** "The Manger and the Inn: The Cultural Background of Luke 2:7." *NESTR* 2 (1979) 33–44. **Baily, M.** "The Crib and the Exegesis of Luke 2,1–20." *IER* 100 (1963) 358–76. ———. "The Shepherds and the Sign of a Child in a Manger: Lk 2:1–20 and I Sam c. 16." *ITQ* 31 (1964) 1–23. **Beckwith, R. T.** "St. Luke, the Date of Christmas, and the Priestly Courses at Qumran." *RevQ* 9 (1977–78) 73–94. **Benoit, P.** "Non erat eis locus in diversorio' (Lc 2,7)." In *Mélanges bibliques*, FS B. Rigaux, ed. A. Descamps and A. de Halleux. Gembloux: Duculot, 1970. 173–86. **Bishop, E. F. F.** "Bethlehem and the Nativity: Some Travesties of Christmas." *ATR* 46 (1964) 401–13. **Blinzler, J.** *Die Brüder und Schwestern Jesu*. SBS 21. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1967. 57–61. **Brown, R. E.** "The Meaning of the Manger: The Significance of the Shepherds." *Worship* 50 (1976) 528–38. **Burchard, C.** "A Note on *Rhēma* in JosAs 17:1f.; Luke 2:15, 17; Acts 10:37." *NovT* 27 (1985) 281–95. **Byrne, M.** "No Room for the Inn." *Search* 5 (1982) 37–40. **Cadbury, H. J.** "Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts. III: Luke's Interest in Lodging." *JBL* 45 (1926) 305–22, esp. 317–19. ———. *JBL* 52 (1933) 55–65, esp. 61–62. **Daniélou, J.** "Kyrios Christos: Une citation des Lamentations de Jérémie dans les Testimonia." *RSR* 39 (1951–52) 338–52. **Derrett, J. D. M.** "The Manger at Bethlehem: Light on St. Luke's Technique from Contemporary Jewish Religious Law." *Studies in the New Testament*. Leiden: Brill, 1978. 2:39–47. ———. "The Manger: Ritual Law and Soteriology." *Theology* 74 (1971) 566–71. **Déville, R.** "Jésus unique Sauveur du monde (Lc 2,21)." *AsSeign* 12 (1964) 28–43. **Ellingworth, P.** "Luke 2.17: Just Who Spoke to the Shepherds?" *BT* 31 (1980) 447. **Förster, M.** "Nochmals Jesu Geburt in einer Höhle." *ZNW* 4 (1903) 186–87. **Frey, J.-B.** "La signification du terme πρωτότοκος d'après une inscription juive." *Bib* 11 (1930) 373–90. **Galbiati, E.** "La circoncisione di Gesù (Luca 2,21)." *BeO* 8 (1966) 37–45. **George, A.** "Il vous est né aujourd'hui un Sauveur' (Lc 2)." *AsSeign* 10 (1970) 50–67. **Giblin, C. H.** "Reflections on the Sign of the Manger." *CBQ* 29 (1967) 87–101. **Globe, A.** "Some Doctrinal Variants in Matthew 1 and Luke 2, and the Authority of the Neutral Text." *CBQ* 42 (1980) 52–72. **Goetz, K. G.** "Zum Herdenturm von Bethlehem." *ZNW* 8 (1907) 70–71. **Gressmann, H.** *Das Weihnachtsevangelium auf Ursprung und Geschichte untersucht*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1914. **Guillet, J.** "Marie gardait toutes ces paroles dans son cœur." *Christus* 3 (1954) 50–59. **Hann, R. R.** "Christos Kyrios in PsSol 17.32: 'The Lord's Anointed' Reconsidered." *NTS* 31 (1985) 620–27. **Harrie, J.** "Die Anbetung der Hirten." *ARW* 23 (1926) 369–82. **Hengel, M.** "φάρνη." *TDNT* 9 (1974) 49–55. **Jeremias, J.** "ποιμὴν . . ." *TDNT* 6 (1968) 485–502. **Jervell, J.** "Die Beschneidung des Messias." *SNTU A/2* (1977) 68–78. **Jones, D. L.** "The Title *Christos* in Luke-Acts." *CBQ* 32 (1970) 69–76. **Jonge, M. de.** "The Use of the Word 'Anointed' in the Time of Jesus." *NovT* 8 (1966) 132–48. **Kaufmann, L.** "Geburt des Messias: Text und Kontext einer guten Nachricht." *Orientierung* 44 (1980) 250–53. **Kippen, K.** "Translating *Kataluma* in Luke 2.7." *BT* 34 (1983) 442–43. **Kirchschläger, W.** "Die Geburt Jesu von Nazaret (Lk 2,1–20): Zur biblischen Verkündigung der Weihnachtsbotschaft." *TPQ* 131 (1983) 329–42. **LaVerdiere, E.** "Jesus the First-Born." *Emman* 89 (1983) 544–48. ———. "Wrapped in Swaddling Clothes." *Emman* 90 (1984) 542–46. ———. "No Room for Them in the Inn." *Emman* 91 (1985) 552–57. ———. "At the Table of the Manger." *Emman* 92 (1986) 22–77. **Legrand, L.** "L'Evangile aux bergers: Essai sur le genre littéraire de Luc II, 8–20." *RB* 75 (1968) 161–87. ———. "On l'appela du nom de Jésus (Luc, II,

21)." *RB* 89 (1982) 481-91. ———. "The Christmas Story in Luke 2:1-7." *ITS* 19 (1982) 289-317. **McNamara, E. A.** "Because There Was No Room for Them in the Inn." *AER* 105 (1941) 433-43. **Meyer, B. F.** "But Mary Kept All These Things . . ." (Lk 2,19.51)." *CBQ* 26 (1964) 31-49. **Neiryneck, F.** *L'Évangile de Noël selon S. Luc.* Études religieuses 749. Paris/Brussels: Pensée catholique, 1960. ———. "Maria bewaarde al de woorden in haar hart." Lk 2,19.51 in hun context verklaard." *CBG* 5 (1959) 433-66. **Nestle, E.** "Die Hirten von Bethlehem." *ZNW* 7 (1906) 257-59. ———. "The Shepherds of Bethlehem." *ExpTim* 17 (1905-6) 430-31. **Ottey, J. L.** "In a Stable Born Our Brother." *ExpTim* 98 (1986) 71-73. **Pax, E.** "Denn sie fanden keinen Platz in der Herberge": Jüdisches und frühchristliches Herbergswesen." *BibLeb* 6 (1965) 285-98. **Preuschen, E.** "Jesu Geburt in einer Höhle." *ZNW* 3 (1902) 359-60. **Reisener, E.** "Krippe und Kreuz." *TBl* 13 (1934) 71-83. **Rengstorff, K. H.** "Die Weihnachtserzählung des Evangelisten Lukas." In *Stat crux dum volvitur orbis*, FS H. Lilje, ed. G. Hoffmann and K. H. Rengstorff. Berlin: Lutherisches Verlagshaus, 1959. 15-30. **Rieble, M.** "Weihnachten mit Lukas: Auslegung und Anwendung von Lk 2,1-20." *BLit* 59 (1986) 226-32. **Riedl, J.** "Gottes Herrlichkeit—Des Menschen Glück: Biblische Gedanken zur lukanischen Weihnachtsbotschaft." *BLit* 39 (1966) 341-50. **Schmithals, W.** "Die Weihnachtsgeschichte Lukas 2,1-20." In *Festschrift für Ernst Fuchs*, ed. G. Ebeling et al. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1973. 281-97. **Schrage, W.** "Was fällt dem Exegeten zu Weihnachten ein?" *Der evangelische Erzähler* 31 (1979) 338-44. **Schürmann, H.** "Sie gebar ihren erstgeborenen Sohn . . .": Lk 2,1-20 als Beispiel homologetischer Geschichtsschreibung." *Ursprung und Gestalt*. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1970. 217-21. ———. "Es wurde ihm der Name Jesus gegeben . . ." (Lk 2,21)." *Ursprung und Gestalt*. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1970. 222-26. **Stoll, R. F.** "Her Firstborn Son." *AER* 108 (1943) 1-13. **Swaeles, R.** "Des êtres, des choses et des lieux au temps de Noël-Epiphanie." *ComLit* 68 (1986) 323-42. **Unnik, W. C. van.** "Die rechte Bedeutung des Wortes treffen Lukas 2,19." In *Verbum—Essays on Some Aspects of the Religious Function of Words*, FS H. W. Obbink, ed. T. B. van Baaren et al. Utrecht: Kemink, 1964. 129-47. **Veldhuizen, A. van.** "De Kribbe van Bethlehem." *Nieuwe Theol. Stud.* 13 (1930) 175-78. **Vögtle, A.** *Was Weihnachten bedeutet: Meditation zu Lukas 2.1-20*. Freiburg/Basel/Vienna: Herder, 1977. ———. "Die Geburt des Erlösers." *BibLeb* 7 (1966) 235-42. **Westermann, C.** "Alttestamentliche Elemente in Lukas 2,1-20." In *Tradition und Glaube: Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt*, FS K. G. Kuhn, ed. G. Jeremias et al. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971. 317-27. **Wulf, F.** "Sie fanden Maria und Josef und das Kind, das in der Krippe lag" (Lk 2,16)." *GuL* 31 (1958) 401-3.

ON THE CENSUS:

Barnett, P. W. "ἀπογραφὴ and ἀπογράφεσθαι in Luke 2:1-5." *ExpTim* 85 (1973-74) 377-80. **Benoit, P.** "Quirinius (Recensement de)." *DBS* 9 (1978) 693-720. **Bleckmann, E.** "Die erste syrische Statthalterschaft des P. Sulpicius Quirinius." *Klio* 17 (1921) 104-12. **Braunert, H.** "Der römische Provinzialzensus und der Schätzungsbericht des Lukas-Evangeliums." *Historia* 6 (1957) 192-214. **Brindle, W.** "The Census and Quirinius: Luke 2:2." *JETS* 27 (1984) 43-52. **Corbishley, T.** "A Note on the Date of the Syrian Governorship of M. Titius." *JRS* 24 (1934) 43-49. ———. "The Chronology of the Reign of Herod the Great." *JTS* 36 (1935) 22-32. ———. "Quirinius and the Census: A Re-study of the Evidence." *Klio* 29 (1936) 81-93. **Derrett, J. D. M.** "Further Light on the Narratives of the Nativity." *NovT* 17 (1975) 81-108, esp. 82-95. **Dessau, H.** "Zu den neuen Inschriften des Sulpicius Quirinius." *Klio* 17 (1921) 252-58. **Evans, C. F.** "Tertullian's References to Sentius Saturninus and the Lukan Census." *JTS*, n.s.,

- 24 (1973) 24–39. **Groag, E.** “P. Sulpicius Quirinius.” *PW*, 2d ser., 4/A1. 822–43.
- Haacker, K.** “Erst unter Quirinius? Ein Übersetzungsvorschlag zu Lk 2,2.” *BibNot* 38–39 (1987) 39–43. **Hayles, D. J.** “The Roman Census and Jesus’ Birth. Was Luke Correct? Part I: The Roman Census System.” *Buried History* 9 (1973) 113–32. ———. “The Roman Census and Jesus’ Birth. Was Luke Correct? Part II: Quirinius’ Career and a Census in Herod’s Day.” *Buried History* 10 (1974) 16–31. **Hengel, M.** *Die Zeloten: Untersuchungen zur jüdischen Freiheitsbewegung in der Zeit von Herodes I. bis 70 n. Chr.* AGSU 1. Leiden/Cologne: Brill, 1961. 9–34. **Higgins, A. J. B.** “Sidelights on Christian Beginnings in the Graeco-Roman World.” *EvQ* 41 (1969) 198–201. **Hudson, E. C.** “The Principal Family at Pisidian Antioch.” *JNES* 15 (1956) 103–7. **Instinsky, H. U.** *Das Jahr der Geburt Christi: Eine geschichtswissenschaftliche Studie.* Munich: Kösel, 1957. **Jack, J. W.** “The Census of Quirinius.” *ExpTim* 40 (1929) 496–98. **Johnson, T. A.** “The Census of Quirinius.” *IER* 38 (1931) 225–43. **Lagrange, M.-J.** “Où en est la question du recensement de Quirinius?” *RB* 8 (1911) 60–84. **Lee, G. M.** “The Census in Luke.” *CQR* 167 (1966) 431–36. ———. “The New Testament Gleanings. Luke 2,2: ἀπὸ ἀπογραφῆς πρώτης ἐγένετο.” *Bib* 51 (1970) 238. **Lodder, W.** *Die Schätzung des Quirinius bei Flavius Josephus: Eine Untersuchung.* Leipzig: Dörffling & Franke, 1930. **Marquardt, J.** *Römische Staatsverwaltung.* 3 vols. 3rd ed. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1957 [= 2nd ed. of 1884]. 2:180–246. **Martin, E. L.** *The Birth of Christ Recalculated.* 2nd ed. Pasadena: Foundation for Biblical Research, 1980. **Mayer, A.** *Die Schätzung bei Christi Geburt in ihrer Beziehung zu Quirinius: Historisch-krit. Studie zu Lukas 2.2.* Innsbruck: Rauch, 1908. **Moehring, H. R.** “The Census in Luke as an Apologetic Device.” In *Studies in New Testament and Early Christian Literature*, FS A. P. Wikgren, ed. D. E. Aune. NovTSup 33. Leiden: Brill, 1972. 144–60. **Mommsen, T.** “De Sulpicii Quirinii Titulo Tiburtino.” *Res gestae divi Augusti ex monumentis ancyrano et apolloniensi.* 2nd ed. Berlin: Weidmann, 1883; repr. Aalen: Scientia, 1970. 161–78. ———. *Römisches Staatsrecht.* 3rd ed. Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1952 = 1887, 2/1. 415–17; 2/2. 1087–95. **Murphy, F. X.** “The Date of Christ’s Birth: Present State of the Question.” *CHR* 29 (1943) 307–25. **Nestle, E.** “Die Schätzung in Lukas 2 und Psalm 87(86),6.” *ZNW* 11 (1910) 87. **Ogg, G.** “The Quirinius Question To-day.” *ExpTim* 79 (1968) 231–36. **Ramsay, W. M.** *The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament.* 4th ed. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1920. 238–300. ———. “Luke’s Narrative of the Birth of Christ.” *Expos* 8/4 (1912) 385–407, 481–507. **Rees, W.** “Cyrinus the Governor of Syria.” *Scr* 3 (1948) 76–83. **Roos, A. G.** “Die Quirinius-Inschrift.” *Mnemosyne* 9 (1941) 306–18. **Schalit, A.** *König Herodes: Der Mann und sein Werk.* Studia judaica 4. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1969. 256–97. **Schürer, E.** *Jewish People*, ed. G. Vermes and F. Millar. 1:399–427 (older bibliog., 1:399–400). **Sherwin-White, A. N.** “Quirinius: A Note.” *Roman Society and Roman Law in the New Testament.* The Sarum Lectures 1960–61. Oxford: Clarendon, 1963; repr. 1965. 162–71. **Smallwood, E. M.** *The Jews under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian.* SJA 20. Leiden: Brill, 1976. 568–71. **Smith, R.** “Caesar’s Decree (Luke 2:1–2): Puzzle or Key?” *CurTM* 7 (1980) 343–51. **Stauffer, E.** *Jesus and His Story.* Tr. R. and C. Wilson. New York: A. A. Knopf, 1960. 21–32. ———. “Die Dauer des Census Augusti: Neue Beiträge zum lukanischen Schätzungsbericht.” In *Studien zum Neuen Testament und zur Patristik*, FS E. Klostermann, ed. G. Delling. TU 77. Berlin: Akademie, 1961. 9–34. **Steinmetzer, F. X.** “Census.” *RAC* 2 (1954) 969–72. **Syme, R.** “Galatia and Pamphylia under Augustus: The Governorships of Piso, Quirinius, and Silvanus.” *Klio* 27 (1934) 122–48. ———. “The Titulus Tiburtinus.” *Akten des vi. internationalen Kongresses für griechische und lateinische Epigraphik, München 1972.* Vestigia, Beiträge zur alten Geschichte 17. Munich: Beck, 1973. 585–601. **Taylor, L. R.** “Quirinius and the Census of Judaea.” *AJP* 54 (1933) 120–33. **Thorley, J.** “The Nativity Census: What Does Luke Actually Say?” *Greece and Rome* 26 (1979) 81–84. **Turner, H. E. W.** “The Chronological Framework of the Ministry.” In *Historicity and Chronology in the New Testament*, ed. D. E. Nineham. TC 6. London: SPCK, 1965. 59–

74, esp. 60–65. **Weber, W.** "Der Census des Quirinius nach Josephus." *ZNW* 10 (1909) 307–19. **Wilcken, U.** "ἈΠΟΓΡΑΦΑΙ." *Hermes* 28 (1893) 230–51. **Wiseman, T. P.** "There Went out a Decree from Caesar Augustus . . ." *NTS* 33 (1987) 479–80. **Zahn, T.** "Die syrische Statthalterschaft und die Schatzung des Quirinius." *NKZ* (1893) 633–54.

ON THE GLORIA (2:14):

Berger, P.-R. "Lk 2:14: ἄνθρωποι εὐδοκίας. Die auf Gottes Weisung mit Wohlgefallen beschenkten Menschen." *ZNW* 74 (1983) 129–44. ———. "Menschen ohne 'Gottes Wohlgefallen' Lk 2:14?" *ZNW* 76 (1985) 119–22. **Bishop, E. F. F.** "Men of God's Good Pleasure." *ATR* 48 (1966) 63–69. **Böcklen, E.** "Eudokia in Lukas 2,14." *Deutsches Pfarrerberblatt* 36 (1932) 308–10. **Deichgräber, R.** "Lc 2,14: ἄνθρωποι εὐδοκίας." *ZNW* 51 (1960) 132. **Delebecque, É.** "Le 'Gloria' des anges (2,14)." *Études grecques sur l'évangile de Luc*. 25–38. **Doeve, J. W.** "De 'ere Gods' in de engelenzang (Luc 2:14)." *Homiletica et Biblica* 20 (1961) 177–83. **Eulenstein, R.** "' . . . und den Menschen ein Wohlgefallen' (Lk 2,14): Ein Beispiel für Sinn und Umfang philologischer Arbeit am Neuen Testament." *WD* 18 (1985) 93–103. **Feuillet, A.** "Les hommes de bonne volonté ou les hommes que Dieu aime: Note sur la traduction de Luc 2,14b." *Bulletin de l'association Guillaume Budé* 4 (1974) 91–92. **Fitzmyer, J. A.** "'Peace upon Earth among Men of His Good Will' (Luke 2:14)." *TS* 19 (1958) 225–27; repr. in *Essays*, 101–4. **Flusser, D.** "Sanktus und Gloria." In *Abraham unser Vater*, FS O. Michel, ed. O. Betz et al. Leiden: Brill, 1963. 129–52. **Goetze, A.** "Peace on Earth." *BASOR* 93 (1944) 17–20. **Hansack, E.** "Luk 2,14: 'Friede den Menschen auf Erden, die guten Willens sind'? Ein Beitrag zur Übersetzungstechnik der Vulgata." *BZ* 21 (1977) 117–18. **Harnack, A.** "Über den Spruch: Ehre sei Gott in der Höhe und das Wort εὐδοκία." *SAWB* 51 (1915) 854–75. **Hennen, B.** "Textkritisches über den Vers 'Ehre sei Gott in der Höhe' Luk 2,14." *Pastor Bonus* 31 (1918–19) 145–47. **Hunzinger, C.-H.** "Neues Licht auf Lc 2,14 ἄνθρωποι εὐδοκίας." *ZNW* 44 (1952–53) 85–90. ———. "Ein weiterer Beleg zu Lc 2,14 ἄνθρωποι εὐδοκίας." *ZNW* 49 (1958) 129–30. **Jeremias, J.** "ἄνθρωποι εὐδοκίας (Lc 2.14)." *ZNW* 28 (1929) 13–20. **Kilpatrick, R. S.** "The Syntax of Luke 2.14." *NTS* 34 (1988) 472–75. **Kusch, H.** "Friede den Menschen—sprachgeschichtlich betrachtet." *OrChr* 45 (1961) 109–14. **Luke, K.** "Luke 2:14 in Some Ancient Versions." *ITS* 24 (1987) 185–219. **Mueller, T.** "An Application of Case Grammar to Two New Testament Passages." *CTQ* 43 (1979) 320–25. **O'Neill, J. C.** "Glory to God in the Highest." In *Biblical Essays*, FS W. Barclay, ed. J. R. McKay and J. F. Miller. London: Collins, 1976. 172–77. **Rad, G. von.** "Noch einmal Lc 2,14 ἄνθρωποι εὐδοκίας." *ZNW* 29 (1930) 111–15. **Ropes, J. H.** "'Good Will toward Men' (Luke 2,14)." *HTR* 10 (1917) 52–56. **Rusche, H.** "'Et in terra pax hominibus bonae voluntatis': Erklärung, Deutung und Betrachtung zum Engelchor in Lk 2,14." *BibLeb* 2 (1961) 229–34. **Schwarz, G.** "Der Lobgesang der Engel (Lukas 2,14): Emendation und Rückübersetzung." *BZ* 15 (1971) 260–64. ———. "' . . . ἄνθρωποι εὐδοκίας?' (Lk 2:14)." *ZNW* 75 (1984) 136–37. **Smother, E. R.** "Ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας." *RSR* 24 (1934) 86–93. **Smyth, K.** "'Peace on Earth to Men. . . .' (Luke 2.14)." *IBS* 9 (1987) 27–34. **Vogt, E.** "'Peace among Men of God's Good Pleasure' Lk. 2,14." In *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. K. Stendahl. New York: Harper, 1957. 114–17. **Walker, N.** "The Renderings of *Rāsôn*." *JBL* 81 (1962) 182–84. **Wobbe, J.** "Das Gloria (Lk 2,14)." *BZ* 22 (1934) 118–52, 224–45; 23 (1935–36) 358–64.

Translation

¹It happened in those days that a decree went out from Caesar Augustus for all the world to be registered. ²This registration happened before^a Quirinius was governor of Syria. ³All went to be registered, each to his own city.^b ⁴Joseph also went up from Galilee, from the city of Nazareth, into Judea to the city of David, which is

called Bethlehem, because he was of the house and lineage of David, ⁵to be registered with Mary his betrothed,^c who was pregnant.

⁶It happened that, while they were there, the days were completed for her to give birth, ⁷and she gave birth to a son, her firstborn. She wrapped him in swaddling cloths and laid him in a manger, because they had no space [for him]^d in the lodgings.

⁸There were shepherds in that region staying out in the fields and keeping night-watch over their flock. ⁹An angel of the Lord appeared to them and the glory of the Lord shone around them, and they were deeply frightened. ¹⁰But the angel said to them, "Do not be afraid. For, see,^e I announce to you good news of a great joy which will be for the whole People, ¹¹because today there has been born to you, in the city of David, a savior who is Christ, the Lord.^f ¹²This is the sign for you: you shall find a baby wrapped in swaddling cloths and lying^g in a manger." ¹³Suddenly there was, with the angel, a multitude of the heavenly^h host, praising God and saying,

¹⁴"There is glory for God in highest heaven,
and on earth there is peace among the people whom God has favored."ⁱ

¹⁵It happened that, as the angels departed from them to heaven, the shepherds^j began to speak to one another: "Let us go across to Bethlehem and see this thing which has happened, which the Lord has made known to us." ¹⁶So^k they came in haste and found Mary and Joseph, and the baby lying in a manger. ¹⁷When they had seen the sight, they made it known about the message which had been spoken to them concerning this child. ¹⁸All those who heard marveled about what had been spoken to them by the shepherds. ¹⁹Mary^l stored up all these things, trying in her heart to penetrate their significance. ²⁰Then^m the shepherds returned glorifying and praising God for all that they had heard and seen—just as it had been told them.

²¹When the eight days were completed for him to be circumcised, they called his name Jesus, the name he was called by the angel before he was conceived in the womb.

Notes

^a℣* D place ἐγένετο, "it happened," before πρώτῃ, "first"/"before," perhaps indicating that they read the text as here translated.

^bA series of variants for ἐαυτοῦ πόλιν, "his own city," attest to the difficulty for the scribes of both Bethlehem and Nazareth having this status for Mary and Joseph.

^cγυναῖκί αὐτοῦ, "his wife," is read by aur b c sy^s; μεμνησθευμένη αὐτῷ γυναῖκί, "his betrothed wife," by (A) C³ Θ etc.

^dLit., "there was not a space to them."

^eLit., "behold."

^fThe order of these two terms is reversed by W sy^{a,p}; Χριστὸς Κυρίου, "the Lord's Christ," is read by β r¹ sy^{h,pal}; and there are other readings.

^gκαὶ κείμενον, "and lying," is missing from ℣* D and may have come in from v 16.

^hB* D* read οὐρανοῦ, "of heaven."

ⁱThe Greek text has no word for God: lit., "men of good pleasure." Instead of the genitive, the nominative εὐδοκία is read by ℣² B² L Θ sy etc. sy also witnesses to a reading of καί, "and," for ἐν, "among." The ἐν is missing also in it vg^{cl} Ir^{lat}.

^jIn A D K P etc. καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι, "and the men," is added before "the shepherds."

^kGreek: καί, "and."

^lΜαρία rather than the more Hebraic Μαριάμ is read by ℣* B D etc. and is probably original. Other texts have conformed the usage of that of v 16.

^mGreek: καί, "and."

Form/Structure/Setting

The account of John's birth and circumcision has focused on the circumcision and naming of the child (1:57-66). The parallel account here of Jesus' birth and circumcision is centered upon the angelic announcement to the shepherds of the messianic identity of the newborn child. The parallelism here is much looser than in the case of the respective annunciations (reflecting the state of Luke's sources). But in each case there is a statement about the pregnancy reaching term (v 6, cf. 1:57), a simple birth statement (v 7, cf. 1:57), marveling onlookers to subsequent events (v 18, cf. 1:63), the taking to heart of what had happened (v 19, cf. 1:66), and the circumcision and giving of the angelically determined name on the eighth day (v 21, cf. 1:59). Jesus' birth is clearly the more important. The account concerning John climaxes with intimations of the future possibility of the child (1:66). The account concerning Jesus marks his birth as already eschatological fulfillment: the messianic savior has been provided (v 11); God has gained himself glory in heaven (v 14); and his glory has shone upon the earth (v 9). This episode is the center and high point of the infancy gospel.

In the first form of Luke's infancy gospel (see *Form/Structure/Setting* at 1:5-25) the unit is likely to have included also vv 21-24 (note the repetition in vv 21 and 22 of the ἐπλήσθησαν (αἱ) ἡμέραι, "the days arrived") and v 39 (which rounds off the theme of vv 21-24).

The source question for this section is complicated by the heavy Lukan vocabulary of the account, especially in the second half (see Morgenthaler, *Statistik*, 62-63, 187). While it is still possible to identify traditional features, the language is markedly more Lukan than any thus far in the infancy narratives. Always tentative, under these circumstances source analysis must be much more tentative.

Over against the various attempts that have been made to separate the census section from the shepherd account, it can be said that Bethlehem as the city of David is much too important in an identical way to both sections for such a separation to be likely. Too much of what is presently in 2:1-5 would need to have been included in the putative lost opening of the shepherd account to provide an adequate dramatic setting for the shepherd narrative.

The pre-Lukan form of 2:1-20 probably (i) lacked v 2; (ii) had Mary and Joseph introduced before v 4 in a form of which part is preserved in 1:27 (see *Comment* on 2:4); (iii) lacked "the days arrived for her to give birth" from v 6; and (iv) lacked v 19. As well, a good part of the remainder has been influenced by Lukan diction and style, and this leaves uncertain the extent to which other elements in the narrative may have been contributed by Luke. The final verse, 2:21, has all the marks of Lukan composition.

The anthological style, so evident in much of the rest of the infancy narratives (see *Form/Structure/Setting* for 1:5-25), is almost totally lacking in this section (the anthological touch in v 6 is Lukan), a fact which suggests a different provenance for the story. The main OT reference for the account is a strong and pervasive allusion to Mic 5:2, whose fulfillment is confirmed by the words of the angel. Isa 9 also seems to play a significant role.

The shape of the account conforms generally to the annunciation form

discussed at 1:5–25 above. Distinctive, however, is the orientation to the present (v 11) and the heightening achieved by the brilliant display of glory (v 9) and the angel chorus (vv 13–14). Also, the intermediary role of the shepherds has no true parallel (cf. Judg 13:6). Though the content is very Jewish, a formal similarity to Greco-Roman infancy accounts is not to be denied (cf. Suetonius, *Life of Augustus* 94; *Life of Nero* 6; cf. Talbert, “Prophecies of Future Greatness,” 133–36), and may be intended.

Luke’s statements concerning the Augustan census raise a series of important historical questions, which have generated a great deal of scholarly controversy. The starting point for the modern discussion of these issues is conveniently provided by the critical objections to Luke’s account raised by D. F. Strauss in his 1835 study *Das Leben Jesu* (see *Life of Jesus*, 152–56). According to Strauss, (i) there was no general census ordered by Augustus; (ii) in any case, such a census is improbable in a client kingdom such as that of Herod the Great; (iii) furthermore, Quirinius governed Syria not during the reign of Herod but only later (beginning in A.D. 6–7); (iv) as well, the account, in requiring Joseph to report to Bethlehem, goes contrary to Roman census practice, (v) and is wrong in implying that Mary, too, needed to be present for the registration. (The same objections have been recently repeated in Schürer [ed. Vermes and Millar], *Jewish People*, 1:399–427.)

Are these objections based upon a misinterpretation of Roman history? Are they based on a misreading of Luke? Or does Luke have it quite wrong here, despite his generally excellent reflection of the affairs of the Roman Empire? After all the discussion, all three options remain possible; though if the third is to be preferred, then it is important to see that the extent of Luke’s error is considerably less than the impression created by the formidable list of objections above. We will consider the objections briefly in turn.

There is no solid evidence for an imperial edict requiring an empire-wide census in the time of Augustus. Assertions to the contrary are generally based on a confusion between a census of Roman citizens and a census of noncitizens of the empire (Braunert, *Historia* 6 [1957] 193–96, 203–4). At the same time, Augustus did manifest an unprecedented zeal for rationalizing the financial affairs of the empire by setting up a register of the resources of the whole empire (Tacitus, *Ann.* 1.11; Dio Cassius 53.30.2; Sherwin-White, *Roman Society*, 168 n. 1, takes this to imply the completion of the census of the whole provincial area of the empire in some form) and is known to have been responsible for wide-ranging census activity in the provinces (Corbishley, *Klio* 29 [1936] 89; Braunert, *Historia* 6 [1957] 204). Luke’s words may intend no more than to express simply the fact that the census in Palestine took place as part of a coordinated empire-wide policy of Augustus. Indeed there is no good reason for denying the possibility that reference to such a general policy formed part of the edict for each particular provincial registration (cf. Sherwin-White, *Roman Society*, 168).

The evidence concerning the extent of imperial intervention in client kingdoms is confused. There clearly was a general Roman respect for the internal autonomy of such kingdoms, but this must be qualified in various ways (Stauffer, *Jesus*, 26–28, cites evidence of Roman fiscal interference in Nabatea and Apamea and points to the fact that Herod’s administration was permitted to mint only

copper coinage). The terms in which Josephus (*Ant.* 18.1-4) reports the census under Quirinius in Palestine in A.D. 6-7 do, however, strongly suggest that no registration so closely identified with Roman rule and taxation had taken place in the time of Herod (or of Archelaus, his son). What is not clear from Josephus is whether the scandalous novelty is the registration of property as such or, in the context of the annexation into the province of Syria of the territories of Archelaus' rule that was taking place, the immediate Roman involvement in the registration and its implication of direct Roman control and taxation. A census conducted by Herod (even if instigated from Rome and promulgated as being required by Rome) and used for his own domestic purposes (even if reported to Rome, at least in general terms) may have been experienced quite differently. We know nothing of any census conducted by Herod (Schalit's argument [*Herodes*, 256-97] for Herod's use of a six-year census cycle has no solid evidential base), but such a census would not be impossible. A census as both Herod's and the emperor's may have its analogue in the oath of loyalty to Caesar and to the king's (i.e., Herod's) government which the Jewish people were called upon to swear in the latter part of Herod's reign (Josephus, *Ant.* 17.42).

Quirinius' post as *legatus* in Syria (i.e., governor of an imperial province answering directly to the emperor, and not to the Roman senate) is solidly attested (Josephus, *Ant.* 18.1; *ILS* 2683), as is his role in a census in Syria which embraced also the newly annexed territory of Archelaus (Josephus, *Ant.* 17.35; 18.1-2, 26; *ILS* 2683). An earlier posting as *legatus* in Syria lacks solid evidence. Josephus' words in *Ant.* 18.1 suggest that he was not aware of any such previous posting. Quirinius certainly had an earlier connection with the eastern part of the empire. From Tacitus, *Ann.* 3.48, we learn that Quirinius gained high honors for his part in putting down the Homonadensians in Cilicia (cf. also Strabo, *Geography* 12.6.5), and it is not impossible that governorship of Syria was the post from which Quirinius campaigned against the Homonadensians. Or, since we know little else about Quirinius' career between his becoming consul in Rome in 12 B.C. and his appointment as advisor to Gaius Caesar (Augustus' adopted son) in around A.D. 1, a governorship at another period could be suggested. But here the difficulty is finding a gap when the post was not filled by a known occupant. The possible gaps are too early or too late, unless we abandon either the connection with Herod's reign or the approximation of Luke 3:23 (cf. Schürer [ed. Vermes and Millar], *Jewish People*, 1:257-59). Ramsay's suggestion that a co-governorship might be involved (*Recent Discovery*, 4th ed., 293) is not supported by any concrete analogy from Roman administration of the period. The broken inscription *titulus tiburtinus* (*ILS* 918), which has been frequently claimed to support two periods of governorship in Syria for Quirinius, may only refer to two governorships, one of which is in Syria (the syntax for *iterum*, "again," is disputed), and in any case, since the name is missing, the inscription has also been claimed for various other figures. While the extent of our knowledge is too limited for definite assertion (for the identity of, and the chronology for, the governors before Varus, Josephus is the sole source and his chronology can be disputed [cf. the articles of Corbishley and also W. E. Filmer, "The Chronology of the Reign of Herod the Great," *JTS* 17 (1966) 283-98; T. D. Barnes, "The Date of Herod's Death," *JTS* 19

(1968) 204–9; Martin, *Birth of Christ*, 106–31]), it seems unlikely that Quirinius served an earlier term as governor of Syria. Tertullian (*Adv. Marc.* 4.19.10) places the nativity census in the governorship of C. Sentius Saturninus (ca. 9–3 B.C.), and this possibility should not be overlooked.

Joseph's reporting to Bethlehem is hardly the problem that it seemed to Strauss. It is true that in the census of A.D. 6 the inhabitants of Galilee (then under the rule of Antipas) would not have been included. But those with links to ancestral lands in Judea may have seen those links legally forfeited if they had not chosen to include themselves in such a census. Even if a period of many years was involved, Joseph would no doubt have understood himself as only temporarily absent from Bethlehem. Detailed information on a Roman provincial census of the period is only available for Egypt. So it is hardly clear how much variation there was from province to province according to local custom. Local custom among the Jews would have highlighted the importance of ancestral connections, but even in Egypt an *idæa*-edict directing people to return to their main or perhaps their original residence was associated with the census edict (cf. Braunert, *Historia* 6 [1957] 201–2, 205–8; *ibid.*, “*ΙΔΙΑ. Studien zur Bevölkerungsgeschichte des ptolemäischen und römischen Ägypten*,” *The Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 9–10 [1956] 211–328, esp. 305–18).

It is not clear from Luke's account that Mary's presence was required by the census edict. But since, unlike in Egypt where women were not subject to poll tax, in Syria (and, therefore, after its annexation in A.D. 6 also in Judea) women were subject to this tax from the age of twelve (Ulpian, *Digest* L 15, 3, cited in Schürer [ed. Vermes and Millar], *Jewish People* 1:403 n. 12), their personal appearance for the census would seem to be as necessary as that of the men.

It would seem, then, that the greatest difficulty for the Lukan account is posed by the attempt to locate an earlier governorship of Quirinius in Syria during the final years of Herod's reign. Otherwise, despite the objections raised, Luke's account squares well with what is known from other sources of the Roman history of the period.

Now it is possible to translate Luke 2:2 in a manner that obviates any need for seeking an earlier governorship for Quirinius. Well represented in the history of the discussion, it has been argued most carefully by Lagrange (*RB* 8 [1911] 80–84) and has been taken up in several more recent studies (Higgins, *EvQ* 41 [1969] 200; Barnett, *ExpTim* 85 [1973–74] 379; cf. N. Turner, *Grammatical Insights*, 23; Brindle, *JETS* 27 [1984] 48–50). Lagrange has shown that there is no decisive objection from word order or from the use of the genitive participle to translating Luke 2:2 as “This registration happened before Quirinius became governor of Syria.” (On the basis, however, of the critique by E. Power, “John 2:20 and the Date of the Crucifixion,” *Bib* 9 [1928] 286, it is clear that Lagrange's appeal to Sophocles, *Antigone* 2.637–38, must be dropped.) As a clarifying aside, such a statement would fit well. The governorship of Quirinius was an important turning point in Judean history, marking as it did the annexation of Judea, which was made profoundly visible by the census registration with which Quirinius' governorship began. That registration was “the registration” (cf. Acts 5:37), and it is natural that Luke should distinguish from it a preliminary

registration in the time of Herod the Great. On any reading, the Greek of Luke's sentence is awkward (cf. Fitzmyer, 400), and perhaps no more so on the reading suggested here. This seems better than forcing an earlier governorship on Quirinius and more likely than the contradiction in the Lukan infancy narratives created by an identification of the census here as that of A.D. 6.

The material of this unit may be divided into (i) an introductory section (vv 1-5) which explains the presence of Mary and Joseph in Bethlehem and evokes the messianic promise of Mic 5:2 connected with that city; (ii) a sparsely reported birth scene (vv 6-7); (iii) a pastoral scene outside the city (vv 8-15) in which shepherds learn of the birth and its messianic nature; and (iv) a scene of climax in which the protagonists of vv 1-7 and vv 8-15 meet and the angelic word to the shepherds is confirmed by the sign of the manger baby. These sections constitute a dramatic unity, but v 21, which, following the birth, continues to provide an outline account of the early life of the child, is drawn into this unit to assist in the structural paralleling of 1:57-66 and 2:1-21. In a final separate scene, it tells in briefest terms of the circumcision and naming of Jesus.

Within the section vv 8-15 the structuring of v 14 deserves separate attention. The words of the angelic chorus have been analyzed according to a variety of suggested structures. The three-line structure reflected in the *kjv* depended on the poorly attested reading *εὐδοκία* (see *Notes and Comment*), and with the growing consensus that the genitive *εὐδοκίας*, "of [God's] favor," is the correct reading, this structuring has been all but abandoned (Flusser, "Sanktus," 129-30, repeats a variant of the argument of Ropes, *HTR* 10 [1917] 52-56, for treating *εὐδοκία* as the more difficult reading). Various speculative structures depend on an alteration of wording or word order in the text, but there is little to commend such efforts. Most generally accepted is a two-line structure in which *καί*, "and," begins the second line. This structure allows *θεῷ*, "God," and *ἀνθρώποις*, "people," to be paralleled (though we probably should read an unbalancing *ἐν*, "among," before *ἀνθρώποις*), and *δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις*, "glory in the highest [heaven]," to be paralleled chiastically by *ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη*, "peace on earth." *εὐδοκίας* remains to overbalance the second line and has been interpreted on the one hand as a later restrictive addition in light of early post-Easter Jewish disbelief (Schwarz, *BZ* 15 [1971] 260-64) and on the other hand as throwing the weight of poetic structure onto the second member (Berger, *ZNW* 74 [1983] 143). Neither explanation is entirely satisfactory.

An alternative two-membered structure was proposed by Harnack (*SAWB* 51 [1915] 854-75), which began the second line with *εἰρήνη*, "peace." It has not been followed, and the linking of *εὐδοκίας* with *εἰρήνη* which it required is made much less attractive by the Semitic parallels to *ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας*, "men of [God's] favor," that have come to light since Harnack's study (see *Comment*). A modified form of Harnack's structuring, proposed by Delebecque (*Études grecques*, 25-38), is free of this defect, and offers an attractive alternative, though not one built upon parallelism. The thrust of Delebecque's proposal can be grasped in the following paraphrase: "The glory which God possesses in heaven is now also upon the earth. Salvation has come among the people of God's choice."

The more common two-line analysis is finally to be preferred as more obvious,

and as allowing for an easier retroversion into Hebrew, which seems desirable in this most Semitic element of the birth account.

Comment

With the help of v 21, Luke is able to set the account he has of the circumstances of Jesus' birth and of the angelic announcement to the shepherds which accompanied it in parallel with the fulfillment half of his John the Baptist tradition (1:57–66), which mentions John's birth but focuses on his naming. While the John account augurs much for the future of the child (cf. 1:66), the Jesus account clearly identifies this second birth as already the fulfillment of the messianic hope of Israel and the point at which the eschatological glory of God is revealed.

1 *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις*, "in those days," is Lukan and has overtones of fulfillment (see at 4:2). The shared motif of fulfillment is yet one more element in the binding together by Luke of the infancies of John and Jesus. The chronological connection here is vague, but 1:39–56 (see there) assumes that Mary is already pregnant and thus allows us to identify Jesus' birth date as approximately six months later than that of John. *δῶγμα* is used here as in Acts 17:7 of an imperial edict, a usage which is paralleled in Josephus (*War* 1.393) and papyri (PFay 20.22). Caesar Augustus was born Gaius Octavius. He was one of the triumvirate set up to rule the Roman world in 43 B.C. In a series of military and political moves he gained sole control of the reins of power, and finally in 27 B.C. the Roman senate bestowed on him the title *Augustus*, acknowledging his supreme position. From this date is reckoned the reign of the emperor Caesar Augustus. Originally a title (and as such normally translated into Greek as *Σεβαστός*, as in Acts 25:21, 25), Augustus came to serve as here also as the emperor's proper name and as a name is simply transliterated into Greek. Augustus died in A.D. 14 and was succeeded by the Tiberius of Luke 3:1. *ἀπογράφειν* (in the middle or passive) is used of census registration, normally for purposes of taxation (BAGD, 89). *ἡ οἰκουμένη* means "the inhabited world" but in imperial usage often referred simply to the Roman Empire (cf. Acts 11:28; BAGD, 561).

For details and problems connected with the census see *Form/Structure/Setting* above. No single census embraced the whole Roman world, but each particular census was an expression of a consistent policy of the emperor for the whole of his empire. The supreme power figure of the Roman world, unbeknownst to himself, is instrumental in the fulfillment of messianic prophecy. Later (see esp. vv 10–11) there will be an implicit contrast between the rule of Augustus and the rule of the Christ. Though recently championed by R. E. Brown (*Birth*, 417–18) there is little to commend the suggestion by Nestle (ZNW 11 [1910] 87) that the census is connected with the birth of Jesus on the basis of a midrashic reading of the messianically understood Psalm 87 (esp. v 6).

2 *αὕτη ἀπογραφή*, "this registration," can only refer to the particular local census (or better to the Palestinian part of the broader census activity) in response to which Joseph and Mary traveled. The translation of the verse is made difficult by the lack of definite articles in the opening phrase. But if

the translation favored above (see *Form/Structure/Setting*) is adopted ("this registration happened before . . ."), then the reference will be to a registration undertaken by Herod the Great under Roman direction, perhaps in the period 8-6 B.C. Luke distinguishes this census from the better known and rather infamous census that marked the beginning of the governorship of Quirinius in Syria and the annexation of Judea to that province of the Roman Empire (cf. Acts 5:37). The verse is probably a Lukan addition and is to be compared to the historical interest expressed more elaborately by Luke in 3:1-2.

3 Registration required a personal appearance at one's principal place of residence, which among the Jews is likely to have been ancestrally determined (cf. v 4). Different definitions of the term produce the apparent tension between vv 3-4 and v 39, but Matthew does not seem to have been aware of any earlier domicile in Nazareth (2:20-23).

4 At 1:26-38 above it has been suggested that Luke borrows the words ἐμνηστευμένην ἀνδρὶ ᾧ ὄνομα Ἰωσήφ, "betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph," in v 27 from an introduction of Mary and Joseph which stood originally before 2:4. In this introduction Mary would have had the priority over Joseph which is apparent in vv 6-7, but which in the absence of such an introduction does not seem to be the perspective of vv 4-5.

"To go up," ἀναβαίνειν, is used in OT idiom of going to Judea (Isa 7:6; 2 Kgs 18:13; 2 Sam 2:1; etc.). On Nazareth see at 1:26. Bethlehem is not πόλις Δαυίδ, "city of David," in OT usage: Jerusalem is (2 Sam 5:7, 9; 6:10, 12, 16; 2 Kgs 9:28; 12:22). But Bethlehem is the city of David's origin (1 Sam 16; 17:12, 58), and 1 Sam 20:6 is close to the idiom here. More importantly, Bethlehem is connected in Mic 5:2 to the messianic fulfillment of God's covenant with David's royal line (texts at 1:32): the messiah is to come forth from Bethlehem. Bethlehem is about five miles from Jerusalem and about eighty-five miles from Nazareth. For "house . . . of David" cf. at 1:69. οἶκον καὶ πατρὶός, "house and family," is probably a hendiadys. For ἐξ . . . πατρὶός, "from . . . the family," cf. Tob 5:10. The conditions are met for the fulfillment of the messianic promise. The present text of Luke 1:27 reminds us that we cannot infer from this interest in Joseph's ancestry that the account originally assumed him to be the natural father of Jesus (cf. at Luke 3:23).

5 While not definitely demanded by the text, it is best to understand that Mary too needed to present herself for registration. ἐμνηστευμένη αὐτῷ, "betrothed to him," is to be preferred as the more difficult and better-attested reading to γυναικὶ αὐτοῦ, "his wife," or the conflate μεμνηστευμένη αὐτῷ γυναικί, "betrothed to him wife." On marriage customs in first-century Judaism see at 1:27. This is an odd way to speak of a couple obviously living together and traveling as man and wife. The word is probably chosen to suggest what Matthew expresses quite directly in 1:24-25: Mary and Joseph were living together but had no sexual union prior to the birth of the child. To one already familiar with the tradition of a virginal conception (especially in a more Matthean form), the final οὔση ἐγκύω, "being pregnant," would provide a cryptic explanation for the fact that Mary and Joseph had formed a family unit, although not really (i.e., sexually) married.

6 What is important here is that Mary be in Bethlehem at the time of the birth ("while they were there"). The case for treating Jesus' birth in Bethlehem as no more than a theological deduction is not strong (cf. R. E. Brown,

Birth, 513–14; Schürmann, 103) and no necessary difficulty is posed by Jesus' strong connection also with Nazareth (Luke 4:16, 22–23; Mark 1:24; Matt 2:23; John 19:19; etc.). The birth in Bethlehem has good claim to historicity; but since a knowledge of Jesus' birthplace only survives because the location had theological potential, the more skeptical viewpoint cannot be absolutely ruled out. ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ τεκεῖν αὐτήν, "the days arrived for her to give birth," echoes the language of Gen 25:24 (LXX uses ἐπληρώθησαν) concerning Rebekah, and in the present structure is paralleled by 1:57. The clause could well be Lukan, since ἐπλήσθησαν (αἱ) ἡμέραι also functions to bind to 2:1–20 the following v 21 and vv 22–24.

7 The account of Jesus' birth is spare in the extreme. In the present Lukan context the message of the annunciation (vv 26–38) interprets ahead of time this birth of a Davidide in Bethlehem. As an originally independent narrative, dramatic resolution only comes with the angelic message to the shepherds (vv 10–14): the allusion to Mic 5:2 connotes possibility; only the heavenly message brings the assurance of actuality. πρωτότοκος, "firstborn," prepares for v 23 and establishes for this child the status and privileges in Mosaic law of the firstborn child (Exod 13:2; Num 3:12–13; 18:15–16; Deut 21:15–17). The word provides no basis for a decision concerning possible further children born later to Mary (see Blinzler, *Brüder*, 57–61; Frey, *Bib* 11 [1930] 373–90; etc.). Wrapping in swaddling cloths (ἐσπαργάνωσεν αὐτόν) is a mark of maternal care and is what any ancient Palestinian mother would have done for her newborn (Wis 7:4; Ezek 16:4). The similarity to the wrapping of a body at the end of life (cf. Luke 23:53) is there to be noted, but there is no indication that Luke intends to compare the birth and death of Jesus, despite the extensive comparison proposed by Derrett ("Manger at Bethlehem," 43–44; and cf. Laurentin, *Évangiles*, 222).

The newborn in a φάτνη will be the sign for the shepherds (see at vv 12, 16). A φάτνη is generally an animals' feeding trough, but sometimes by extension can mean a stall (Hengel, *TDNT* 9:49–55). The former will be intended here. The explanation given for this unusual resting place is cryptic and carries no great weight in the story. κατάλυμα is a flexible word and can denote any kind of place where one might stay, from a primitive inn (Exod 4:27; 1 Kgdms 1:18) to a guest-room of a house (cf. Luke 22:11) to a totally unspecified place where one might stay (Sir 14:25; and cf. Exod 15:13). If we are to understand that Mary and Joseph were excluded from the κατάλυμα, then the definite article favors reference to the public inn at Bethlehem (cf. Jer 41:17), though the guest-room of the family home remains possible (K. E. Bailey, *NESTR* 2 [1979] 33–44).

There is better correspondence, however, between the explanation clause and what is explained, if the explanation clause is understood as excluding not Mary and Joseph, but only the child from the κατάλυμα. The sense is then, "There was no space available to them [for him] in the κατάλυμα." (Cf. Benoit, "Non erat," esp. 184; Dibelius, "Jungfrauensohn," 60; τόπος means "space" also at Luke 14:22.) The child could not be fitted in the κατάλυμα, so he was placed in the nearby manger. On this reading it is best to think of an overcrowded Palestinian peasant home: a single-roomed home with an animal stall under the same roof (frequently to be distinguished from the family living-quarters only by the raised platform floor of the latter). The manger could

be free-standing in the stall or attached to the wall (it could also be on the floor of the living area adjacent to the stall area, but this would not fit with the exclusion of the child from the living quarters). *κατάλυμα* will, then, refer to the living quarters provided by a single-roomed Palestinian home in which hospitality has been extended to Mary and Joseph.

As a family of modest means, the parents have responded flexibly to the exigencies of their situation and have made such provision for their child as lay within their grasp. The result is a curiosity and, in light of the child's identity, a paradox (as Schürmann, 104-5), but it is doubtful whether we should claim more. Stories of humble origins have a firm place in reports of other famous figures as well (cf. Exod 2:3). Perhaps, given the known identity of the child, we should speak of a paradox of divine condescension.

8 The scene switches now to a group of shepherds keeping night-watch over their sheep. *ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τῇ αὐτῇ*, "in that region," provides a circumstantial link between the shepherds and the birth scene. *ἀγρᾶν λείν* means "to live out of doors" and is frequently linked to the life of a shepherd (cf. BAGD, 13). The plural *φυλακάς*, "watches," suggests that watch was kept by turns, so only one shepherd need have been awake. The night setting prepares for the spectacular illumination of v 9. Shepherds suit the pastoral setting of David's origins in Bethlehem (1 Sam 16:11; 17:15; Ps 77 [78]:70). Royal figure though he is, the entire drama that surrounds the birth of Jesus takes place with no part given to the secular or religious rulers of the land.

It might seem attractive to link shepherds watching over a flock with the "Tower of the Flock" of Gen 35:21 and Mic 4:8 which, on the basis of the latter text, is understood messianically in *Tg. Ps.-J.* to Gen 35:21 (so R. E. Brown, *Birth*, 421-23; Laurentin, *Structure*, 86-88; Schürmann, 108; etc.). But the key word is missing ("tower"), and it is not "dominion" (Mic 4:8) that comes to the shepherds' lookout point, and, further, keeping watch is only the natural night activity of shepherds.

9 On *ἄγγελος Κυρίου*, "an angel of the Lord," see at 1:11. There is a general similarity in this scene to the annunciation pattern in 1:5-25 (see there) and cf. 1:26-38, but not sufficient to identify this scene as parallel to the earlier annunciations in the structure of the infancy narratives. *ἐφιστάσθαι*, "to appear"/"to come up and stand by," is a favorite Lukan word and is used of the arrival of supernatural persons in Luke 24:4; Acts 12:7; 23:11. Coordinated with the appearance of the angel is a dazzling display of the glory of the Lord which illumines the area all around the shepherds (*περιλάμπειν*, "to shine around," is only used elsewhere in the NT at Acts 26:13). Compare the imagery of 1:78-79. *δόξα*, "glory," is the splendor associated with God's perceptible presence (Exod 16:7, 10; 24:17; 40:34; Ps 63:3; Isa 60:1; etc.). Fear is the standard reaction to divine manifestations (cf. at 1:12).

10 The angelic messenger first deals with the fear provoked by this supernatural visitation and assures the shepherds that God's intentions are gracious (cf. at 1:12, 30). *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*, "to announce," is Lukan and implies the Christian gospel (see at 1:19). The ultimate basis for the use of the verb is in the language of Isaiah and the Psalms. The joy of eschatological fulfillment has already surfaced at 1:14. Here *ἥτις* is perhaps to be distinguished from the simple relative and has the force: "which is of a kind which." "The whole

People" (παντὶ τῷ λαῷ) is the whole People of Israel, as earlier in the infancy narratives (1:17, 68, 77).

11 The basis for this gospel of joy is that a child has been born, as in Isa 9:3, 6. *σήμερον*, "today," occurs also at 4:21; 5:26; 12:28; 13:32, 33; 19:5, 9; 22:34, 61; 23:43. Luke often uses the word to suggest the beginning of the time of messianic salvation. Here for the first and only time in the Gospel *σωτήρ*, "savior," is used of Jesus (but cf. 1:69; 2:30; for comment on Luke's pervasive interest in the theme of salvation see at 1:47). The term *σωτήρ* is applied to God in 1:47. It is used in reference to Jesus again in Acts 5:31 and 13:23 where the context suggests that when used of Jesus by Luke the term is used in some relationship to its use of the judges of Israel (Judg 3:9, 15; Neh 9:27; and cf. Isa 19:20). But Jesus is more than just another deliverer like one of the judges of Israel, so the sentence continues *ὃς ἐστὶν Χριστὸς Κύριος*, "who is Christ, the Lord." *Χριστὸς Κύριος* is not paralleled elsewhere in the NT (only in Lam 4:20 and *Pss. Sol.* 17.36, probably as mistranslations, do we find a parallel), and since the rather similar *Χριστὸς Κυρίου*, "Christ of the Lord," occurs at 2:26, a corruption has been suspected (*Κύριος* is God elsewhere in the episode [vv 9, 15]). *Χριστὸς Κυρίου* is attested by β¹. Since Luke elsewhere uses the definite article with *Κύριος* of Jesus (cf. Winter, *ZNW* 49 [1958] 70–71; but see Acts 2:36), *Χριστὸς Κύριος*, if it is not a corruption, is likely to be pre-Lukan. *Χριστός* can have a much broader meaning (cf. de Jonge, *NouvT* 8 [1966] 132–48) but here clearly is a title for the royal figure who would fulfill the eschatological hopes attached to the Davidic covenant (cf. 1:32–33, 69). *ἐν πόλει Δαβὶδ*, "in the city of David," reinforces the context in Davidic messianology of the angel's words (cf. at v 4).

The material is thoroughly Jewish, but at the same time it is difficult to deny that a first-century Hellenistic reader would find in the configuration created by good news (v 10) concerning the birth of one who is to be a savior and bringer of peace (v 14) an echo of the language in which Augustus had been honored. An altar to *pax Augusta* ("Augustan peace") stood in Rome. The Asiatic Greek cities had decided to rearrange the calendar to begin the year on Augustus' birthday, on the basis that Augustus had been sent as savior (*σωτήρ*) to make an end to all war. The day of his birth had marked the beginning of the message of good news (*εὐαγγέλια*) for the world (*OGI* 2:458). Schmithals goes too far in making the contrast between the command of Augustus (v 1) and the message of the angel (v 11) the central dynamic of the account ("Weihnachtsgeschichte," 286). But Luke 23:2 and Acts 17:7 show that it was quite possible to compare the Christ and the Caesar. And what is offered in Luke 2 in the name of the Christ is recognizably kin to what was offered elsewhere in the name of the Roman emperor. That Christ and Caesar, however, were in any sense to be considered as antagonists in the realpolitik of the day is clearly denied by the development of Luke's story (the accusations in Luke 23:2 and Acts 17:7 are presented as patently false). Both Christ and Caesar offered a golden age, but there is no clear reflection in the account here on their respective programs for the introduction of the golden age, nor on the exact nature of the golden ages proposed.

12 What is given the shepherds as sign is prepared for in the narrative at v 7. *ἐσπαργανωμένον* ("wrapped in swaddling cloths"; cf. at v 7) is incidental;

the sign is the manger baby (cf. v 17). That the sign is certainly more than just the means of recognizing the child is indicated by the importance in v 20 of what the shepherds have seen (Giblin, *CBQ* 29 [1967] 97-98). But it is difficult to be sure precisely what is signaled by such a sign. The lowliness of his later life as one who had nowhere to lay his head could be in mind (Luke 9:58) but is certainly not clear. A wordplay on Isa 21:3 with its reference to "the manger of its Lord" could signify that now the curse of that text is overturned and Israel, in the persons of the shepherds, will know "the manger of its Lord." Best is simply the humility of the divine condescension. The omission of the definite article before *σημεῖον*, "sign," in B Ξ sa may be a response to the difficulty.

13 R. E. Brown (*Birth*, 403, 425-27) suggests that vv 13-14 were added at a second stage of editing. This is possible but hardly necessary. Unlike the OT theophany accounts to which Brown (following Westermann, "Alttestamentliche Elemente," 323-25) likens vv 13-14 (along with the role of the glory of the Lord in v 9), here the doxology is not from a scene in heaven, nor does it reflect the timeless praise of God in heaven to which there is momentary privileged access (as Isa 6). It is God's new initiative which is here praised; and a better—though still not adequate—comparison point is with the new song of Rev 5:9-10 (see also Rev 12:10, etc., and the hymn of the angels at creation in *Jub.* 2.2-3; and cf. 11QPs^a Creat 5). The verses are, then, not such a foreign body as has been suggested. After the message of the angel has gone out to the shepherds, on the basis of its content praise goes up to God.

ἐξαίφνης, "suddenly," is mostly Lukan in the NT and is used to heighten the effect of what comes. *σπαριαὺς οὐρανόυ*, "heavenly host," reflects *שְׂבָא' הַשָּׁמַיִם*, *šēba' haššamayim* (1 Kgs 22:19; Jer 19:13; Hos 13:4; 2 Chr 33:3, 5). The LXX does not use *οὐράνιος* in these contexts, but this adjective is found at Acts 26:19, and so may be Lukan. *αἰνεῖν*, "to praise," is mostly Lukan in the NT. On angels praising God see Ps 148:2.

14 The language of the angelic chorus is cryptic in the extreme, using neither definite articles nor verbs to control the syntax. The structure of the verse is discussed above in *Form/Structure/Setting*. There are two parallel lines, the second beginning "and on earth" (*καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς*). Since *εἰρήνη*, "peace," is what God has achieved (at least in a preliminary manner) in the birth of the child, with *δόξα*, "glory," too we must be speaking of the achievement of God. The sense is best represented by supplying an initial "there is" (with Jeremias, *ZNW* 28 [1929] 19; Schürmann, 113; and against Westermann, "Alttestamentliche Elemente," 325 n. 17). In a use a little different from that in v 9, the word *δόξα*, "glory," here refers to God's good reputation as in Isa 43:7; 48:11; Jer 13:11, etc. *ἐν ὑψίστοις*, "in the highest [parts]," is a synonym for heaven also in Luke 19:38 and parallels. The usage is found in *Pss. Sol.* 18.10 and cf. Ps 70 [71]:19. The heavenly visitors indicate that heaven is impressed by what God has achieved. *εἰρήνη*, "peace," is here the OT *שָׁלוֹם*, *šālôm*. It is not simply an inner disposition or the absence of war, but evokes a whole social order of well-being and prosperity, security and harmony (cf. *Pss* 29:11; 86:8-10; Isa 26:3; 32:17; 48:18; 54:10; Jer 16:5; Ezek 34:25-31). In Isa 9:5-6, 52:7, etc., and cf. Acts 10:36, peace is specially linked with the coming messianic salvation (cf. Kusch, *OrChr* 45 [1961] 109-14; Fitzmyer, 224-25).

The recipients of the messianic peace are said to be *ἄνθρωποι εὐδοκίας*, “people of good pleasure,” a phrase which has occasioned a good measure of dispute (the nominative form *εὐδοκία* [read by L Θ Ξ etc. and a corrector of R B] is poorly attested textually and is to be accounted for by the strangeness in Greek of the Semitic idiom involved). Attention has been drawn to Hebrew and Aramaic parallels by Hunzinger (ZNW 44 [1952–53] 85–90; ZNW 49 [1958] 129–30), Fitzmyer (TS 19 [1958] 225–27), and Deichgräber (ZNW 51 [1960] 132). See esp. 1QH 4.33 and 11.9 (these texts use “sons of” and have a pronominal suffix [“his”] with רִצּוֹן, *rāṣōn* [“pleasure”], to make clear that God’s pleasure is in view) and 4Qh^cA^c 18 (here “men” [ἄνδρες, *ēnōdē*] is used as in Luke 2:14). In Qumran usage רִצּוֹן, *rāṣōn*, even when used alone, is to be referred to the good pleasure of God (cf. 1QS 8.6, 10; 9.23). And to be “of God’s good pleasure” is to be established in a favored relationship with him in which his mercy and power are experienced through his faithfulness to the covenant (see further 1Q34 3 ii 5–6). The Lukan text, then, reflects a semitechnical Semitic expression referring to God’s people and having overtones of election and of God’s active initiative in extending his favor. *ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας* means “among the people whom God has favored.”

15 The departure of an angelic figure is mentioned also at 1:38 in similar language. The messenger and the chorus together are the *ἄγγελοι*, “angels.” The heavenly destination corresponds to the heavenly origin specified in v 13. The force of the imperfect *ἐλάλουν* is probably inceptive: “They began to speak.” *διέλθωμεν*, “let us go over,” is Lukan. The “city of David” of the angel’s words (v 11) becomes here “Bethlehem.” *ὁ Κύριος ἐγνώρισεν ἡμῖν*, “the Lord has made known to us,” neglects to mention the intermediary role of the angel, but intends nothing different from 1:45 (against R. E. Brown, *Birth*, 406).

16 *σπεύσαντες*, “in haste,” marks the eagerness of the shepherds to view the promised sign (cf. 1:39). Their hurrying to Bethlehem shifts the scene back to where the birth has taken place. *ἀνευρίσκειν*, “to find,” is found elsewhere in the NT only at Acts 21:4. The mention of the parents indicates that the manger child is in no sense an abandoned child. The precedence of Mary is observed (see at v 4). The shepherds find the baby *ἐν τῇ φάτνῃ*, “in the manger,” i.e., in the manger spoken of by the angel (v 21). The narrative sheds no light on how the shepherds were to find the manger child.

17 The role of the sign is served in the “seeing” (*ιδόντες*) of the shepherds. Nothing further is expected of the newborn, and no further attention is paid to him. The angelic message is the focus of attention. What has been made known to them (v 15) they now make known, presumably to all who were sharing the use of the peasant home (v 18, and cf. at v 7). Translated in v 15 as “thing,” *ῥῆμα* here is translated “message.” The double connotation is that of the Hebrew דָּבָר, *dābār*. *παιδίον*, “boy”/“servant,” now replaces the *βρέφος*, “baby,” of vv 12, 16.

18 *ἐθαύμασαν*, “they were amazed,” is a regular response in Luke to a divine initiative (1:21, 63; and see at 4:22), indicating the impressiveness of what is encountered. It is wrong to psychologize and to suggest that the messianic identity of the child is in the original form of the story a surprise to Mary as to all the rest.

19 It is likely, as suggested in *Form/Structure/Setting* for 1:5–25, that inspired

by 2:51 Luke has added this verse (cf. Räisänen, *Mutter Jesu*, 118) as a structural parallel to 1:66. Where v 5 uses the Hebraized *Μαριάμ*, here *Μαρία* is the best-attested reading for Mary's name. A similar response to a form of divine revelation is noted in Gen 37:11 and Dan 7:28. *πάντα . . . τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα*, "all these things," generalizes from the immediate episode to Mary's other experiences of revelation (1:26–38, 39–45). *συνετήρει*, "she kept," is no more than a synonym for the *διετήρει* of v 51. The importance of the revelations is marked, along with Mary's continuing engagement with them. Van Unnik ("Lukas 2,19") has shown that in a context of divine revelation *συμβάλλειν* means to hit upon the right interpretation of what has been divinely revealed. He fails, however, to attend to the following *ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῆς* ("in her heart"; cf. Räisänen, *Mutter Jesu*, 121 n. 6) and misses the likely conative force of the participial use here (cf. Fitzmyer, 413), which would give the sense "trying to interpret/penetrate the significance of." Luke nowhere else uses *συμβάλλειν* with quite that sense, but the usage in Acts 4:15 is not too far removed (cf. the relationship between *διαλογίζεσθαι* used of an individual's internal thought process [e.g., Luke 1:29: "she pondered/wondered"] and used of group interaction [e.g., Luke 20:14: "they discussed with one another"]).

20 Dramatic completion is achieved by the departure of the shepherds, full of praise for God. They praise God as earlier the angelic chorus had praised him (v 13), and they glorify God, thus repeating on earth the heavenly recognition that in the birth of this child God has gained glory for himself (v 14). The same verb pair *ἀκούειν* and *ὁρᾶν* ("to hear" and "to see") occurs at Acts 4:20. They have heard the angelic words. They have seen the sign of the manger baby. The final *καθώς* ("just as") clause logically applies only to the second of the verbs: the shepherds have *heard* nothing confirmatory in Bethlehem. The activities of Jesus' ministry to come will also frequently lead to the glorifying of God (5:25; 7:16; 13:13; 17:15; 18:43 and cf. 23:47 and Acts 11:18).

21 For the sake of the parallel with 1:57–66, the separate episode of v 21 is bound into a unit with 2:1–20 by the repetition of *ἐπλήσθησαν (αἱ) ἡμέραι*, "[the] days were completed," of v 6. (The unit would originally have included also vv 22–24, 39—so the repetition again in v 22—but the extra materials of vv 25–38 have enabled vv 22–40 to become a separate unit [cf. *Form/Structure/Setting* at 1:5–25].) *καὶ ὅτε*, "and when," is Lukan. *ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦς*, "his name was called Jesus," is formed after the idiom of 1:31 (and v 13).

The mention of circumcision and naming is primarily for the sake of the parallel with John. However, it also helps further to unify the stories of disparate origin used by Luke—here by providing a specific fulfillment for 1:31—and in light of 2:39 (see there) allows the reader to see that Jesus' legal credentials were from infancy impeccable (Jervell, *SNTU A/2* [1977] 68–78, while he burdens the verse with more than its syntax will allow, is on the right track). On circumcision see further at 1:59.

Explanation

Luke's step-parallelism between John and Jesus continues with this equivalent for Jesus of the account in 1:57–66 of John's birth, circumcision, and naming.

Jesus' birth alone is the moment of messianic fulfillment (v 11) in which God's eschatological glory is revealed (vv 9, 14).

Although no single imperial census embraced the whole Roman world as Luke might seem to be suggesting, yet each particular census initiated by Augustus (emperor from 27 B.C. to A.D. 14) was an expression of a consistent empire-wide policy. Luke's words need mean no more than to express this setting in broader imperial policy. Although we cannot be certain, the census involved probably occurred before the end of Herod the Great's reign while Palestine was still a client kingdom to the Roman Empire (perhaps 8–6 B.C.). In A.D. 6, at the time when Quirinius became governor, Judea was annexed to the Roman province of Syria and a very well remembered and extremely unpopular census was conducted in Judea (and throughout Syria). Luke distinguishes the nativity census from the better known one. Augustus, the supreme power figure in the ancient world of the day, is God's instrument in the fulfillment of messianic prophecy.

Return to one's ancestral city for census registration (vv 3–4) will be a distinctly Jewish twist to the general Roman pattern, but something a little similar is evidenced for Roman census practice in Egypt where return to one's primary or original domicile is required. Probably Mary needed to report as well, since in Syria (though not in Egypt) poll tax was levied on women as well as men.

In OT usage Jerusalem, not Bethlehem, is the "city of David" (e.g., 2 Sam 5:7, 9), but Bethlehem is the city of David's origin (1 Sam 16; 17:12; 20:6), and more importantly Bethlehem is connected in Mic 5:2 to the messianic fulfillment of God's covenant with David's royal line (cf. at 1:32). Bethlehem is about five miles from Jerusalem and eighty-five miles from Nazareth.

Mary and Joseph are living together and traveling as man and wife, but Luke speaks of them (v 5) as "betrothed." This is probably to suggest, in line with the Matthean tradition (1:24–25), that although they lived together they had no sexual union prior to the birth of the child that Mary was carrying.

Luke speaks of Mary's pregnancy coming to term in words that echo the experience of Rebekah at the time when she was to give birth to Esau and Jacob (Gen 25:24). The birth account itself is spare in the extreme. The birth is like any other birth. It is the origin (1:35), identity (2:11), and destiny (1:32–33) of the child that are significant.

The baby is wrapped in swaddling cloths as a mark of maternal care (Ezek 16:4; Wis 7:4). The best that can be managed for a bed is an animal's feeding trough. The sentence is cryptic, but it is most likely that Mary and Joseph have for accommodation the shared use of a one-room Palestinian peasant home. Because fitting everyone in is a squeeze, when the baby comes there is no spot for him in the room. A spot, however, could be found for him under the same roof by making use of a manger on an adjacent wall of the animal stall that formed part of such a peasant home (the stall was frequently distinguished from the family living area only by the raised platform floor of the latter). Those who know the identity of the child will be impressed by this paradox of divine condescension.

From the birthplace of Jesus, the scene switches to the fields outside Bethlehem where a group of shepherds are taking turns in keeping night-watch over their sheep. Shepherds suit the pastoral setting of David's origins in Bethle-

hem (1 Sam 16:17; 17:15). The darkness about them was dispersed by the dazzling splendor of the glory of God (cf. 1:78-79; Exod 16:7, 10; etc.), and there standing by them is an angel of the Lord. The shepherds' experience echoes partly the annunciations of 1:5-25, 26-38, but is heightened by its orientation to the present (v 11), the display of glory (v 9), and the angelic chorus (vv 13-14).

The angel's announcing of good news and joy echoes the language of the Psalms and Isaiah (e.g., Isa 61:1; 9:3). What is involved here is no special blessing for an individual or group, but God's saving purpose for the whole nation. Now, "today," with the birth of the child (cf. Isa 9:3, 6) this saving purpose has moved from promise to at least the beginning of actuality. The child born is savior as the judges earlier had been saviors (Judg 3:9, 15; Neh 9:27). But Jesus is more than just another such deliverer as one of the judges of Israel. He is the final eschatological deliverer, the Messiah who will rule as Lord over the restored kingdom.

It is likely that a first-century Hellenistic reader would find in the configuration created by good news (v 10) concerning the birth of one who is to be savior and bringer of peace (v 14) an echo of the language in which Augustus had been honored. It is Christ who in truth and at a deeper level offers the golden age that human aspiration connected with the reign of Augustus. In no sense, however, are Caesar and Christ to be seen as political antagonists in the power structure of the ancient world (Luke 23:2 and Acts 17:7 report patently false accusations).

The sign by which the shepherds are to recognize the Christ-child is a paradoxical one and probably signals the humility of the divine condescension: God allows his Christ to be without outward splendor.

After the angel's message is delivered, he is joined by a section of the heavenly entourage of God who praise God for that about which the angel has been speaking. By what he has now done God has gained glory for himself in heaven (cf. Isa 48:11; 43:7; etc.), and he has established on earth the basis for the messianic peace which he extends to all his chosen people. Peace here has the full OT sense, and beyond the absence of war or some merely inner disposition evokes a whole social order of well-being and prosperity, security and harmony. In Isa 9:5-6; 52:7 peace is specially linked with the coming messianic age. "Those whom God has favored" are the same group as "all the people" of v 10. It is a semitechnical way of speaking of the People of God with overtones of election and of God's active initiative in extending his favor.

With eager haste the shepherds hurry to Bethlehem and find Mary, Joseph, and the manger baby. Having seen the promised sign, they pay no further attention to the child. The angelic revelation is all-important, so they make known to all in the house what had been made known to them. As is usual in Luke, what God has done sparks amazement: what God does is impressive (1:21, 63; 4:22; etc.). But while Mary is also part of the "they" who were amazed, her further response is separated out for special mention. The shepherds' words are added to her other experiences of the revelation of God and safely stored up in Mary's mind (cf. Gen 37:11; Dan 7:28) as she seeks to understand fully what was being made known in these acts of revelation.

The episode is rounded off with the departure of the shepherds, full of praise for God. This is the appropriate response to what God had now done, and echoes the angelic activity of vv 13–14.

Though a separate incident, v 21 is bound to vv 1–20 by verbal repetition of language from v 6. The inclusion of v 21 helps to sustain the parallel between 1:57–66 and 2:1–21. Jesus is circumcised and named as John had been, and thus incorporated into the Jewish covenant. It is important for Luke that Jesus' legal credentials under the Mosaic law be from infancy impeccable (cf. 2:39).

Presentation and Recognition in the Temple (2:22–40)

Bibliography

GENERAL:

- Andriessen, P.** "Simeon's Profetie aangaande Maria." *Nederlandse Katholieke Stemmen* 55 (1959) 179–89. **Benoit, P.** "'Et toi-même, un glaive te transpercera l'âme!' (Luc 2,35)." *CBQ* 25 (1963) 251–61. **Brown, R. E.** "The Presentation of Jesus (Luke 2:22–40)." *Worship* 51 (1977) 2–11. **Cutler, A.** "Does the Simeon of Luke 2 Refer to Simeon the Son of Hillel?" *JBR* 34 (1966) 29–35. **Feuillet, A.** "L'épreuve prédite à Marie par le vieillard Siméon (Luc. II,35a)." In *À la rencontre de Dieu*, FS Albert Gelin. Bibliothèque de la faculté catholique de théologie de Lyon 8. Le Puy: Mappus, 1961. 243–63. ———. "Le jugement messianique et la Vierge Marie dans la prophétie de Siméon (Lc. 2,35)." In *Studia mediaevalia et mariologica*, FS P. Carolo Balić OFM, ed. P. Capkun-Delić et al. Rome: Antonianum, 1971. 423–47. **Figueras, P.** "Syméon et Anne, ou le témoignage de la loi et des prophètes." *NovT* 20 (1978) 84–99. **Fulford, F. W.** "Signum contradictionis." *ExpTim* 32 (1920–21) 267–69. **Galbiati, E.** "La presentatione al Tempio (Luca 2,22–40)." *BeO* 6 (1964) 28–37. **Grogan, G. W.** "The Light and the Stone: A Christological Study in Luke and Isaiah." In *Christ the Lord: Studies in Christology*, FS D. Guthrie, ed. H. H. Rowdon. Leicester/Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity, 1982. 151–67. **Groot, A. de.** *Die schmerzhaftige Mutter und Gefährtin des göttlichen Erlösers in der Weissagung Simeons* (Lk 2.35). Kaldenkirchen: Steyler, 1956. **Harrington, W.** "The Presentation." *DL* 14 (1964) 366–72. **Hatch, W. H. P.** "The Text of Luke II, 22." *HTR* 14 (1921) 377–81. **Herranz, A. A.** "Presentación de Jesús en el Templo (Lc 2,22–39)." *CB* 6 (1949) 35–42. **Jeremias, J.** "Miszelle: ἱεροσολήμι/ἱεροσόλυμα." *ZNW* 65 (1974) 273–76. **John, M. P.** "Luke 2.36–37. How Old Was Anna?" *BT* 26 (1975) 247. **Lagrange, M.-J.** "La présentation de Jésus au Temple." *VSpir* 26 (1931) 129–35. **Michel, R.** "La purification de la Vierge, la chandeleur et les relevailles." *Revue diocésaine de Tournai* 2 (1947) 385–95. **Miyoshi, M.** "Jesu Darstellung oder Reinigung im Tempel unter Berücksichtigung von 'Nunc Dimittis' Lk II 22–38." *AJBI* 4 (1978) 85–115. **Moule, C. F. D.** "Some Reflections on the 'Stone' Testimonia in Relation to the Name Peter." *NTS* 2 (1955–56) 56–58. **Reicke, B.** "Jesus, Simeon, and Anna [Luke 2:21–40]." In *Saved by Hope*, FS R. C. Oudersluys, ed. J. I. Cook. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978. 96–108. **Varela, A. T.** "Luke 2:36–37: Is Anna's Age What Is Really in Focus?" *BT* 27 (1976) 446. **Vogels, H. J.** "Die 'Eltern' Jesu (Textkritisches zu Lk 2,33 ff.)." *BZ* 11 (1913) 33–43.

———. "Lk 2,36 im Diatessaron." *BZ* 11 (1913) 168–71. **Winandy, J.** "La prophétie de Syméon (Lc, ii, 34–35)." *RB* 72 (1965) 321–51. **Winter, P.** "'Nazareth' and 'Jerusalem' in Luke Chs i and ii." *NTS* 3 (1957) 136–42.

ON THE NUNC DIMITTIS:

Berger, K. "Das Canticum Simeonis (Lk 2:29–32)." *NovT* 27 (1985) 27–39. **Charue, A.** "La prophétie de Siméon. Luc., II, 22–39." *Collationes namurcenses* 26 (1932) 65–72. **Grelot, P.** "Le Cantique de Siméon (Luc, II, 29–32)." *RB* 93 (1986) 481–509. **Gurney, T. A.** *Nunc Dimittis, or the Song of the Watcher for the Lord's Christ*. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1906. **Joüon, P.** "Notes philologiques sur les évangiles: Luc 2,31." *RSR* 18 (1928) 345–59, esp. 352. **Kilpatrick, G. D.** "ΛΑΟΙ at Luke ii. 31 and Acts iv. 25–27." *JTS*, n.s., 16 (1965) 127. **Vincent, L.-H.** "Luc ii, 32." *RB*, o.s., 9 (1900) 601–2.

See further the bibliography for the Lukan canticles at 1:39–56.

Translation

²²When the days for their^a purification according to the law of Moses were completed, they brought him up to Jerusalem to present to the Lord ²³(just as it is written in the law of the Lord: "Every male that opens the womb shall be called holy to the Lord") ²⁴and to give a sacrifice according to what is said in the law of the Lord: "a pair of turtledoves or two young pigeons."

²⁵Now,^b there was a man in Jerusalem whose name was Simeon, and this man was righteous and devout,^c waiting expectantly for the consolation of Israel, and the Holy Spirit was upon him. ²⁶It had been revealed to him by the Holy Spirit that he would not see death before^d he had seen the Lord's Christ. ²⁷He came in the Spirit into the temple, and when the parents^e brought in the child Jesus to act, concerning him, in accord with what was made customary by the law, ²⁸he received him into his arms and blessed God and said,

²⁹"Now, Master, you are releasing your servant [from duty],

In accord with your word, in peace,

³⁰Because my eyes have seen your salvation,

³¹Which you have prepared in the presence of all peoples,

³²A light for revelation to the Gentiles^f

And glory for your people Israel."

³³His father,^g and his mother,^h marveled at the things that were being said about him.

³⁴Simeon blessed them, and said to Mary his mother: "This oneⁱ is placed as the fall and rise of many in Israel and as a sign opposed—³⁵and of you yourself also^j a sword will go through the soul—that the thoughts of many hearts might be revealed."

³⁶Now,^k there was a prophetess, Anna, daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Asher. She was very advanced in years, having lived with her husband seven years^l from her virginity, ³⁷and she was a widow^m until she was eighty-four years of age, who did not leave the temple, worshiping night and day with fasting and prayer.ⁿ ³⁸At

that very hour she came up and gave thanks to God and spoke about him to all those who were waiting expectantly for the redemption of Jerusalem.^o

³⁹When they had finished all their duties^p under the law of the Lord, they returned to Galilee, to their own city, Nazareth.

⁴⁰And the child grew and became strong, filled with wisdom; and the grace of God was upon him.

Notes

^aαὐτοῦ, "his," is read by D. The reading in lat sys would support either αὐτοῦ or αὐτῆς, "her."
435 bo^{pt} Ir^{lat} omit the personal pronoun.

^bLit., "behold."

^c℣* K Γ etc. read εὐσεβῆς.

^dB Θ omit ἡ. W (f¹³) 1424 omit ἡ ἄν. A D 0130 omit ἄν. ℣* e read ἕως ἄν.

^eOmitted by 245.

^f"To the Gentiles" is omitted by D.

^gἸωσήφ, "Joseph," is read by (A) Θ (Ψ) etc.

^hαὐτοῦ, "his," is added by ℣* A L Θ.

ⁱἰδοῦ, "behold," has been omitted in translation.

^jThe translation is based on the presence of the δε omitted by B L W Ξ Ψ etc., but present in ℣ A D Θ etc.

^kκαί.

^lThis is pushed to an extreme by sys Ephr, which reflect the reading ἡμέρας, "days."

^mThe difficulty in the Greek syntax is reflected in the translation. An alternative translation is, "This woman, very advanced in years, having lived with her husband seven years from her virginity, was a widow. . . ." In this translation a resumptive καὶ αὐτῇ is not represented.

ⁿBoth "fasting" and "prayer" are plurals in the Greek.

^oA D L Θ Ψ etc. read ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ, "in Jerusalem."

^p℣ D L N etc. omit τὰ. The sense would then be "everything in accord with the law."

Form/Structure/Setting

In the Benedictus (1:67–80) Zechariah has recognized the role of the infant John in salvation history; in 2:22–40 Simeon and Anna perform the same function for Jesus. It seems that the materials for 2:25–38 were added to Luke's infancy narrative at the later stage of editing when Luke also added the Magnificat (1:46–55) and the Benedictus (1:67–79). Before these additions, vv 22–24, 39 completed the section 2:1–21, expanding on the legal interest of v 21, and were still part of the parallel to the section 1:57–64 on John's birth, circumcision, and naming (see further *Form/Structure/Setting* at 1:5–25).

It is difficult to see how vv 22–24, 39 could have been transmitted as a separate tradition. The Lukan hand is evident, and even though the relationship to the LXX is not as close as one might expect for Lukan composition, it seems best to treat the whole of vv 21–24, 39 as a Lukan product with no underlying written source. Nevertheless, the confusion about Jewish customs regularly attributed to Luke from these verses is not at all evident. At the most, in accommodation to Hellenistic idiom, he has spoken loosely of a purification that pertained only to Mary, as "their purification" (see *Comment*). Luke is well informed about Jewish customs and will have received a tradition that affirmed Jesus' full conformity to them from birth (cf. Gal 4:4).

Luke's hand is also quite evident in the Simeon and Anna accounts. Here, however, there is a much better basis for positing source material. It is likely that in Luke's source Simeon was more simply introduced and that the links between v 25 and v 38 are to be attributed to Luke. Despite R. E. Brown (*Birth*, 446, 454-56) it is best not to treat the *Nunc Dimittis* (vv 28-33) as a later insertion (see *Comment* at v 29). On the other hand it is at least possible that the focus on Mary in v 34, along with the words addressed specifically to her in v 35a, is a secondary expansion, perhaps by Luke. V 33 may also be Lukan. The description of Anna (vv 36-37) is probably traditional and transmitted quite separate from the Simeon tradition, in which case it must originally have introduced something more than v 38 has preserved (perhaps a canticle: the prophetesses Deborah and Miriam are credited with canticles [Judg 5; Exod 15:21]).

The frequent allusion to the OT that has marked much of the infancy narratives thus far (anthological style) continues to be evident in this section. The Simeon account certainly owes something to the OT account of the bringing of the child Samuel to Eli at the temple (see esp. 1 Sam 1:24-28; 2:20, 21, 26). A series of echoes of Isaiah are to be noted especially in the *Nunc Dimittis* and vv 25 and 38. Much less likely is the dependence of vv 22-23 on Dan 9:21-24 with its anointing of the holy of holies (Laurentin, *Structure*, 50-51; R. E. Brown, *Birth*, 445-46) or on Mal 3:1-2 with its coming of the Lord to his temple (Laurentin, *Structure*, 58-60; R. E. Brown, *Birth*, 445). The connections here are based on general considerations that are too imprecise. Also unlikely is the elaborate correlation made by Figueras (*NovT* 20 [1978] 84-99) between Simeon and Moses (and therefore the Law) and Anna and Elijah (and therefore the Prophets). Certainly Simeon and Anna represent the best of OT faith witnessing to Jesus, but Luke intends nothing more precise.

The material of this section divides naturally after the introductory section which establishes a basis for the presence of the infant Jesus in the Jerusalem temple (vv 22-24). Following this, vv 25-36 form one coherent scene, but we may subdivide this unit into vv 25-26 which introduce Simeon, vv 27-28a which describe the meeting of Simeon with the holy family, vv 28b-32 which report Simeon's subsequent response to God (to which the parents respond in v 33), and vv 34-35 in which Simeon addresses his attention to the parents and especially to Mary. Then, vv 36-38 constitute a separate scene in which vv 36-37 introduce Anna and v 38 constitutes the action of the scene. The section is concluded with a departure to Galilee (v 39) and a statement about the subsequent development of the child (v 40). The *Nunc Dimittis* itself is made up of six lines, which are best grouped in pairs (v 29; vv 30, 31; v 32).

Comment

The shepherds recognized the child by a sign, but now the spiritual eyes of Simeon and Anna perceive directly the place of the child in the eschatological hopes of Israel. Where the dramatic movement of John's story has been from the temple, that of Jesus' story is to the temple. Where conformity to the law had been noted in passing in the case of John, now in the case of Jesus the fulfilling of all righteousness as required by the law achieves a considerable prominence.

22 The repetition of *καὶ ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν (αἱ) ἡμέραι*, “and when the days were completed,” from v 21 (and cf. v 6) reflects an earlier sectioning of the material (see at v 21). Since *καὶ ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ*, “and when the days for the purification were completed,” follows so closely the language of Lev 12:6 (and cf. v 4 [not LXX wording]), the influence will have been from this verse back to vv 21 and 6. The ritual purification of a woman after childbirth took place in the temple in Jerusalem forty days (eighty in the case of a female child) after the birth. Prior to the purification, the mother was not free to touch anything sacred or to enter the temple (see Lev 12:1–8). The plural *αὐτῶν*, “their,” is a puzzle, since only the mother underwent purification. Variant readings (see *Notes*) attest to early scribal recognition of the difficulty. The sense could be: “for the Jewish purification ritual” (cf. at 4:15). Despite the imprecise language, it is not likely that Luke thinks of the mother and child as those purified. Closest to hand are the unspecified “they” (Mary and Joseph) who brought Jesus to the temple (Fitzmyer, 424). It is probably best to consider that Luke speaks loosely of the purification as a family matter (cf. Machen, *Virgin Birth*, 73), or that his more general language is an accommodation to a Hellenistic manner of speaking (cf. Räisänen, *Mutter Jesu*, 127). This is hardly an adequate basis for accusing Luke of being uninformed about the Jewish custom. On the importance of the fulfillment of the stipulations of the law of Moses see already at v 21 and see further vv 24, 27, 39 in this section. *κατὰ τὸν νόμον Μωϋσέως*, “according to the law of Moses,” is Lukan (cf. Jeremias, *Sprache*, 90).

The purification is the occasion for bringing Jesus to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord, just as in v 21 the circumcision was the occasion for the naming. The Grecized form of the name Jerusalem is used here (*Ἱερουσόλυμα*) but not in v 25, suggesting that vv 22–24 were not originally united to vv 25–40. In the Gospel, Luke shows a strong preference for the more Hebraic *Ἱερουσαλήμ* (twenty-six versus four), and a slight preference in Acts (thirty-six versus twenty-three). The studies regularly deny that there is any basis in the OT or in Jewish tradition for such a presentation of the firstborn at the temple (e.g., Fitzmyer, 425). Neh 10:35–36 seems to have been overlooked (but cf. Benoit, *CBQ* 25 [1963] 258 n. 27): “We obligate ourselves . . . to bring to the house of our God, the firstborn of our sons . . . , as it is written in the law” (cf. Exod 22:29). In light of other possible allusions to 1 Sam 1–2 (see at vv 34 and 40), *τῷ Κυρίῳ*, “to the Lord,” here may echo 1 Sam 1:28: this child will be dedicated to the service of the Lord as was Samuel (*ἀνήγαγον αὐτόν*, “they brought him up,” could echo the language of 1 Sam 1:24, but not LXX). The allusion, however, should not be used to argue that the lack of specific mention of the required redemption of the child (Exod 13:15; Num 18:15–16) is to be interpreted in terms of Jesus’ being uniquely left in the service of God and, therefore, having no need of the normal monetary redemption. The allusion remains secondary to the interest in the observance of the law (cf. esp. v 27). Without specifying details vv 22, 23, and 27 intend to encompass all that was legally involved with a firstborn male.

23 *καθὼς γέγραπται*, “as it is written,” is a common NT introduction for citation of Scripture and reflects OT (and Qumran) idiom, though this exact form is rare in the LXX. The fuller form *καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ Κυρίου*, “as

it is written in the law of the Lord," reflects an idiom found in 2 Chr 31:3; 35:26 (but not LXX wording). In vv 24 and 39 the law is also the "law of the Lord." The quotation is closest to Exod 13:12 (cf. vv 2, 15) which has *πάν διανοίγον μήτραν . . . τῷ Κυρίῳ*, "everything opening the womb . . . to the Lord." *ἅγιον . . . κληθήσεται*, "shall be called holy," paraphrases the consecration language of Exod 13:2 (cf. v 12) in words that echo Luke 1:35 (cf. Reese, *Alttestamentliche Motive*, 140-42): the presentation to the Lord of this firstborn as holy according to the law of primogeniture serves also as reminder of the unique holiness of this miraculously provided child (cf. the connection to Samuel in v 22). It is notable that vv 23 and 24 contain the only explicit citations from the OT in Luke 1-2.

24 The chiasmic pattern used by Luke to present what pertains to the purification (vv 22a and 24) and to the presentation (vv 22b and 23), if missed, can easily create confusion about the referent for v 24. Those who identify the quotation as from Num 6:10 and connect it with a Nazirite vow for the infant (e.g., Laurentin, *Évangiles*, 94; Miyoshi, *AJBI* 4 [1978] 100) do not seem to realize that Num 6:9-12 is a provision for the *failure* of a Nazirite vow. In view rather is the postnatal purification sacrifice of Lev 12:8 (though in the LXX the phrase with *ζεύγος*, "a pair," is found only at Lev 5:11 [in each case MT is the same]). While the fact receives no emphasis in Luke's text, the use of pigeons in sacrifice as an alternative to the usual sacrificial animals was a special concession to the poor. No close parallel has been offered for the idiom *δοῦναι θυσίαν* (lit., "give a sacrifice"; cf. Ps 50 [51]:16 [17]). *τὸ εἰρημένον*, "what is said," is Lukan (Acts 2:16; 13:40) and not Septuagintal. For *ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Κυρίου*, "in the law of the Lord," see at v 23.

25 It is suggested in *Form/Structure/Setting* above that vv 25-38 were not part of Luke's first edition of the infancy narrative. They lack strong links with vv 22-24 and probably came to Luke as a separate tradition. See at v 22 for the different form used for "Jerusalem" in the two verses.

καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνθρωπος (lit., "and behold a man") occurs also at Luke 14:3 but may be traditional (*Jeremias, Sprache*, 92-93). For *ὥ ὄνομα*, "whose name," compare at 1:26, 27. Simeon is otherwise unknown. The name is a commonly used Jewish name. *δικαίος*, "righteous," is earlier applied similarly to Zechariah and Elizabeth (see at 1:6), and later to Joseph of Arimathea (23:50) and Cornelius (Acts 10:22). *εὐλαβής*, "devout," is Lukan (elsewhere in NT only in Acts 2:5; 8:2; 22:12) and belongs to the language of Hellenistic piety. Luke uses the term positively of religious uprightness in a Jewish framework. Simeon's attitude of expectant waiting (*προσδεχόμενος*) is shared by the circle around Anna (v 38) and by Joseph of Arimathea (23:51). *παράκλησιν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ*, "the consolation of Israel," is rooted in the consolation language which in Isaiah is connected with God's eschatological restoration of his people (Isa 40:1; 49:13; 51:3; 52:9; 57:18; 66:10-11). "Waiting for the consolation of Israel" at the beginning here in v 25 and "waiting for the redemption of Jerusalem" at the end in v 38 act as a pair of brackets (an *inclusio*) holding together the Simeon and Anna episodes. *πνεῦμα ἦν ἅγιον ἐπ' αὐτόν* (lit., "Spirit was holy upon him") is quite distinctive and probably pre-Lukan. Only here in the infancy narratives is the Holy Spirit not immediately the Spirit of eschatological fulfillment; and Simeon's enduring possession of the Spirit is to be distinguished from the

filling of Elizabeth (1:41) and Zechariah (1:67). It is doubtful, however, whether Luke makes anything of the distinction.

26 *χρηματίζειν* is used regularly of the imparting of divine revelations. The idiom “to see death” (*ιδεῖν θάνατον*) is used in Ps 88 [89]:48. “The Lord’s Christ” (*τὸν Ἐριστὸν Κυρίου*) is an OT expression (1 Sam 24:7, 11; 26:9, 11; etc.) but is used here in a messianic sense, as is probably the case in *Pss. Sol.* 18.8. The double use here of the language of seeing prepares for that of v 30. The classical construction *πρὶν ἂν* (“before”)+subjunctive is not used in the LXX or elsewhere by Luke.

27 Closest to *ἦλθεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι*, “he came in the Spirit,” is Luke 4:1 (cf. Acts 20:22, which may, however, not refer to the Holy Spirit). His presence in the temple at this moment is divinely ordered. *ιερόν* is used broadly of the temple precincts. As a woman, Mary could not go into the temple area beyond the court of women.

Having made quite clear in chap. 1 the nature of Jesus’ origin, Luke has no problem with using the word “parents” (*τοὺς γονεῖς*) here of Mary and Joseph (cf. vv 33, 41, 43, 48). As an independent tradition, the Simeon (and Anna) episode, like the following episode of the finding of Jesus in the temple (vv 41–51), betrays no awareness of the tradition of a virginal conception. The use of *εἰσάγειν* is in the NT mostly Lukan. *κατὰ τὸ εἰθισμένον τοῦ νόμου*, “in accord with what was made customary by the law,” occurs only here in the NT and is not found in the LXX, but Luke is fond of *κατὰ τὸ* phrases (cf. esp. 1:9; 2:42; 4:16; 22:39; Acts 17:2). Despite its position *περὶ αὐτοῦ*, “concerning him,” should be linked to *ποιῆσαι*, “to act,” and not to *νόμου*, “law.”

28 It is likely that the theme of acting in accord with the law is here continued, and if such is the case, Simeon receives the child as the (priestly) representative of God (cf. v 22). The introduction of an apodosis with *καί* (lit., “when . . . and he received”) is Semitic (BDF 442 [7]), as is the unstressed *αὐτός*, “he,” that follows. Simeon blesses God as had Zechariah (1:64). Since the words that follow are not strictly a blessing, we should probably understand that the words of blessing preceded the Nunc Dimittis (vv 29–32).

29 Simeon’s words are addressed to God and are his witness to the fulfillment of what had been revealed to him by the Spirit (v 26). The Nunc Dimittis is too well prepared for by vv 25–26 to make it likely that it is a later insertion (against R. E. Brown, *Birth*, 446, 454–56). While it is true that the passive *ἀπολύειν* can be a Hellenistic euphemism for “to die” (e.g., Num 20:29; Tob 3:6, 13), it is likely that interpretation of the active here has been unduly influenced by the mention of “death” in v 26. As a comparison with 9:27 indicates, the promised “seeing” need not imply impending death.

νῦν, “now,” marks the decisive turning point in Simeon’s life. This patient slave (*δοῦλος*) is now being released by his Master (*Δέσποτα*) from his duty as watchman (v 25; cf. R. E. Brown, *Birth*, 457), because the goal of his watching is now accomplished (compare the use of *ἀπολύειν* in POxy 2760.2–3 of a cavalryman’s discharge [see BAGD, 96]). As God has promised (v 26), his release comes *before* death. The slave is now “in peace” (*ἐν εἰρήνῃ*) because the time of messianic salvation has come (cf. at v 14).

30 Simeon has now seen God’s promised salvation in that his eyes, opened by the Spirit of God (Schürmann, 125), have been enabled to recognize in

this child the promised messiah (cf. v 26). Salvation is thought of as embodied in the messiah, as the resumption with "light" in v 32 makes evident. "Salvation" is "seen" in Ps 97 [98]:3; Isa 40:5; 52:10; Bar 4:24. The allusion is almost certainly to Isa 52:10, which is further alluded to in v 31 (though the LXX of Isa 52:10 is not followed in v 30). For the emphasis on seeing cf. Luke 10:23-24.

31 The emphasis in *ἡτοιμάσας* is not on a process of preparation (carried on in public); rather the usage is Semitic (as often in LXX) and suggests that God has set up or established this figure (on the public stage). *κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν λαῶν*, "in the presence of all peoples," echoes Isa 52:10. *λαῶν* does not reflect the LXX *ἔθνων*, "nations," but it is a less literal rendering of the *גוֹיִם*, *haggōyim*, of the MT. *κατὰ πρόσωπον* follows perhaps the Hebrew text variant that lies behind the LXX (יְהוָה, *lēp̄nē*, for MT יְהוָה, *lēʾenē*). Luke uses the plural of *λαός*, "people," elsewhere only in Acts 4:25-27 where the word means the "tribes" of Israel, but since in the Nunc Dimittis v 32 seems to be an exposition of v 31, it is best (against Kilpatrick, *JTS* 16 [1965] 127) to take *τῶν λαῶν* here as embracing both the Gentiles (*ἔθνων*) and the people of Israel (*λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ*). For Luke, only in the singular is *λαός* a technical term for the People of God (against Schürmann, 125 and n. 40).

32 This verse carries further the thought of v 31 and, like that verse, is grammatically linked to the *σωτήριον*, "salvation," of v 30. *εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν*, "for revelation," is to be seen as an explanatory gloss to *φῶς . . . ἔθνων* ("light . . . of [the] Gentiles") which echoes language used for the role of the Servant of the Lord in Isa 42:6 and 49:6. The gloss explains that the light will be for revelation to the Gentiles. Grammatically, *δόξαν*, "glory," could be parallel to either *φῶς*, "light," or *ἀποκάλυψιν*, "revelation." "Glory" and "light" are paralleled in the OT (Isa 60:1-2, 19-20; 58:8). Also, while "glory" for a "light" is what we might expect (cf. Bar 5:9), "a light" for "glory" is less intelligible. The text echoes the thought of Isa 60:1-2 (or possibly the LXX of Isa 46:13; cf. further Sir 49:12), and it is best to follow its lead and treat "glory" as parallel to "light," with both in apposition to "salvation" (v 30). "Glory for . . . Israel," but "light for revelation to the Gentiles" recognizes that the Gentiles come to the light from pagan darkness while Israel is already God's People and by God's gracious commitment destined for glory.

The setting of Jews and Gentiles in parallel here corresponds to the pattern Luke develops in Acts where Jews and Gentiles are seen as parallel beneficiaries of that salvation which is offered in the name of Jesus (Acts 9:15; 11:15, 18, 20; 14:1; 15:9, 16-18; 18:4; 19:10, 17; 26:18, 23; cf. further Nolland, "Luke's Readers," 90-128). The Jews have priority, but salvation is there just as much for Gentile as for Jew.

33 The mixed singular and plural form of the periphrastic verb *ἦν . . . θαυμάζοντες*, "was [sing.] . . . marveling [pl.]," is odd, but is explicable on the basis of the position of the composite subject between the two parts (cf. BDF 135). As in v 27, the suggestion here that Joseph is the father of Jesus has led to textual alterations (see *Notes*). As earlier in 2:18 (cf. 1:63) the astonishment of the parents is a formal marker for the presence of the activity of God. The present tense *λαλουμένοις*, "being spoken," could be taken literally, so that what was said earlier by the shepherds is also to be included.

34 As it is likely that Simeon is a priestly figure (see at v 28), the blessing

here will be a priestly blessing like that given by Eli to the parents of Samuel (1 Sam 2:20; cf. Num 6:23). See further links with the infancy of Samuel at vv 22 and 40. After the blessing of the parents, the focus of Simeon's attention narrows to Mary, whose own future will be spoken of in v 35a—it would be awkward to indicate the change of addressee at the beginning of v 35. After the joy of vv 29–32 the tone is markedly somber.

Though the language is not close, the thought is dependent on the “stone” texts Isa 8:14–15; 28:16; Ps 118:22. A Christian tradition of combining these texts is evidenced in Rom 9:32–33; 1 Pet 2:6–8; Luke 20:17–18. Isa 8:14–15 referred originally to God, but an earlier Jewish antecedent for this Christian combination of stone texts in application to the messiah is perhaps evidenced by the application of Isa 8:14 to the messiah in *b. Sanh.* 38a. Winter (NTS 1 [1954–55] 118–19) has pointed out that Luke 2:34 is dependent on the MT of Isa 8:14 and not the LXX, but the dependence could be by way of the Christian tradition (R. E. Brown, *Birth*, 461 n. 47) or even the Jewish tradition. *κεῖται*, “placed,” should probably be understood in terms of the imagery of the laying of building-stones. The imagery of stumbling over the stone and falling is clear enough from the OT background, but *ἀνάστασιν*, “rise,” seems to have been provided as a natural opposite to *πτῶσιν*, “fall,” which lacks a strong connection with the building metaphor (for the opposites cf. Amos 5:2; 8:14; Jer 8:4). By metonymy *πτῶσιν καὶ ἀνάστασιν* stands for the cause of this falling and rising, so the second *εἰς* phrase can speak of Jesus directly as a sign (*σημεῖον*; cf. Schürmann, 128 n. 217). *πολλῶν*, “many,” is used Semitically. It stresses the wide-ranging effects but does not imply that any will be left unaffected. Jesus' presence will lead to a division in Israel. This same division is pointed to by the paradox of a “sign opposed” (*σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμενον*). The sign is a sign of salvation (perhaps the imagery is of the ensign as signal and/or rallying point: OT *נֵס*, *nēs*), but when it is resisted the result is precisely the opposite.

35 For a convenient listing of the wide variety of senses proposed for this difficult verse see R. E. Brown (*Birth*, 262–63), to which list Brown adds his own proposal (463–66). The proposals most worthy of serious attention seem to be those which take their point of departure from one or more of three texts: Ezek 14:17; Zech 12:10; 13:7. But even these proposals retain a degree of artificiality.

The emphatic opening *καὶ σοῦ δὲ αὐτῆς*, “and of you yourself also,” indicates that Mary is being aligned in some manner with the experience anticipated in v 34. The perspective of the immediately antecedent phrase *σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμενον*, “a sign opposed,” with its passive construction favors a comparison between the fate of the sign and the fate of Mary: Mary stands with her son as one opposed. But how precisely is she understood to be affected? And why is this particular language chosen to describe her fate? The immediate text and its wider Lukan context offer little enough to direct us in seeking an answer to these questions.

It hardly does justice to the emphatic introduction and dramatic imagery to see Mary simply as a mother pained by the opposition experienced by her son; on such a view v 35a does not add materially to v 34 (obviously a loving mother would be hurt). With Feuillet (“L'épreuve,” 249) it seems we must find mirrored in the words concerning Mary the full degree to which her son

will be “opposed” (*ἀντιλεγόμενον*): a sword will pass through her soul (she will suffer the loss of her son in death) because the opposition to her son will reach such a pitch that by the hands of his opponents a sword will pass through his soul (he will be put to death). The imagery comes most likely from Ps 22:21 (ET v 20), but could also be influenced by Zech 12:10 or 13:7 and cf. Ps 37:15. (While it is Ezek 14:17 [LXX] which contains the right verb [*διέρχασθαι*], the idea of judgment it would introduce does not fit the context, once we have aligned Mary’s experience with that of the “sign opposed.”) V 35a has, then, an “indeed things will get so bad that . . .” role in the thought sequence and makes more definite (though with oblique expression) the extent and outcome of the opposition to the sign.

The final clause of the verse, then, is controlled by “a sign opposed,” a phrase which has, however, in the meanwhile been made more definite by v 35a. Opposition to the sign is what reveals the true state of affairs in the hearts of many. *διαλογισμοί*, “thoughts,” is used here, as consistently in the NT, in a negative sense (in Luke cf. 5:22; 6:8; 9:46, 47; 24:38). As in the Nunc Dimittis (vv 29–32) Johannine thought is called to mind. In the body of the Gospel to follow, Jesus’ interaction with Pharisees and other religious leaders provides its own commentary on these words.

36 Vv 36–38, with the introduction of Anna, resume the positive note set by vv 25–32. As the Spirit upon Simeon provided the basis for the subsequent action in v 25, so here Anna is labeled as prophetess in preparation for her inspired identification of the child (v 38). In the OT Miriam, Deborah, Huldah, and Isaiah’s wife are called prophetesses (Exod 15:20; Judg 4:4; 2 Kgs 22:14; Isa 8:3). The balancing of a male and female figure occurs in the infancy gospel also with Zechariah and Mary (1:5–38) and elsewhere in Luke’s Gospel (e.g., 4:25–27; 7:36–50; 15:3–10 [N. M. Flanagan, “The Position of Women in the Writings of St. Luke,” *Marianum* 40 (1978) 292–93, finds thirteen man-woman parallel stories in the Gospel]). It may not be without significance that Anna is from a tribe of the Northern Kingdom. A dignity attaches to Anna’s extreme old age (cf. at 1:7 for a similar expression). The description of Christian widows in 1 Tim 5:3–16 (but cf. also Josephus, *Ant.* 18.180) has some striking similarities to the present description of Anna (cf. R. E. Brown, *Birth*, 467–68). This may suggest either that the Christian ideal of widowhood was formed after a Jewish ideal, or that the description of Anna has been influenced by the later developed Christian ideal. On Jewish marriage customs see at 1:27.

37 The use of *αὐτή*, “she,” is unexpected and probably indicates that the participle construction of v 36 is being continued with an (understood) finite verb (cf. BDF 468 [3]). The pairing of *ἀπό*, (“from” [v 36]) and *ἕως* (“until”) encourages us to take the “eighty-four years” as the total age of Anna, but it would be possible to understand it as the length of her widowhood: *ἕως ἐτῶν ὀγδοήκοντα τεσσάρων* = “for all of eighty-four years.” Compare the extreme old age of Judith (Jdt 16:22–23). There may be symbolism in the twelve-times-seven years (cf. Laurentin, *Structure*, 50 n. 1). That Anna “never left the temple” should not be pressed to mean that she slept there (cf. Luke 24:53). Anna was fully taken up with worshiping God in the Jerusalem temple. Fasting and praying are paired as religious exercises in the longer text of Mark 9:29, and by implication in Matt 6:5–18 (cf. 1 Esdr 8:49; *j. Ta’an.* 65c). Judith also

was taken up with fasting in her widowhood (Jdt 8:6). For “worshiping night and day” cf. Acts 26:7. The sequence reflects the Jewish reckoning of the day as from sundown to sundown. The credibility of Anna’s witness to the identity of the child is given a double basis: (i) she is a prophetess; (ii) her Jewish piety is outstanding. Luke is very attentive to the Jewish credentials of Christianity.

38 αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ (lit., “at the hour itself”) is used nine times by Luke. ἐπιστᾶσα, “came up,” is also Lukan. ἀνθομολογεῖσθαι, “to praise/thank,” is not used elsewhere in the NT. It is used in Ps 78 [79]:13 LXX, at the conclusion of a psalm praying for the restoration of Jerusalem, to indicate the grateful praise that will follow God’s accession to the people’s prayer. προσδεχόμενοις λύτρωσιν Ἰερουσαλήμ, “expecting/waiting for the redemption of Jerusalem,” acts as closing bracket (cf. at v 25) clamping together the Simeon and Anna episodes. Anna speaks only to a select public (cf. at v 25) of those who expectantly wait for God’s messianic intervention. For “the redemption of Jerusalem” cf. Isa 59:9 where (using verbs) the “consolation” of v 25 and the “redemption” of v 38 are set in parallel. On “redemption” see at 1:68. Fitzmyer (432) points to the way in which dates are given in documents from the period of the second Jewish revolt against Rome (A.D. 132–35) in terms of the years of “the redemption of Israel” or of “the freedom of Jerusalem.”

39 Since the introduction of Simeon, the fulfillment of the requirements of the law with which the section began (vv 22–24 and cf. v 27) has been overshadowed by the supernatural recognition of the messianic identity of Jesus by those exemplary figures of Jewish piety, Simeon and Anna. The section is rounded off, however, by a return to that starting point with the umbrella statement, “when they had finished all their duties under the law of the Lord” (ὡς ἐτέλεσαν πάντα τὰ κατὰ τὸν νόμον Κυρίου). The present text creates the impression that Jerusalem has been visited on the way back from Bethlehem to Nazareth. It thus rounds off not only the unit in vv 22–40, but also the larger unit 2:1–40. Luke knows nothing of an intervening trip to Egypt (Matt 2:13–23).

40 This verse appears to be a Lukan creation, inspired by v 52 and 1:80, to function in the second phase of editing as a parallel to the latter (see discussion of structure in *Form/Structure/Setting* at 1:5–25). τὸ δὲ παιδίον ἤξανε καὶ ἐκραταιοῦτο, “the child grew and became strong,” is repeated exactly from 1:80 (see there). πληρούμενον σοφίας, “being filled with wisdom,” is a paraphrase of προέκοπτεν ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ, “he advanced in wisdom,” in v 52. The seven in Acts 6:3 needed to be men “full of wisdom” (πλήρεις . . . σοφίας). χάρις θεοῦ ἦν ἐπ’ αὐτό, “the grace of God was upon him,” is inspired by χάριτι παρὰ θεῷ, “in favor [i.e., grace] with God,” from v 52, but uses χάρις in a characteristically Lukan manner (see at 4:22 and cf. the idiom at Acts 4:33). Via 2:52 and 1:80, the present verse has some relationship to OT growth statements. Note the relationship to Samuel (1 Sam 2:21, 26; 3:19).

Explanation

Where in the Benedictus (1:67–80) inspired Zechariah has recognized the role of the infant John in the unfolding of God’s saving purposes, now in 2:22–40 the spiritual eyes of Simeon and Anna perceive in the infant Jesus God’s provision of the key person in bringing to reality all the hopes of Israel.

The story of John's infancy moves out from the temple, that of Jesus' infancy here reaches the temple. Conformity to the Jewish law, noted in the case of John, achieves a measure of prominence in the case of Jesus.

Lev 12 required that a Jewish woman who gave birth to a son should forty days after the birth go to Jerusalem and offer for the purposes of ritual purification two sacrifices in the temple. In the case of a firstborn son there was also a requirement that he be acknowledged as belonging to the Lord in a special way (Exod 13:2, 12, 15). In fact the child had to be redeemed by the payment of a fee of five shekels (Num 18:15-16). Though this payment could be made anywhere in the land, the ideal was to present the child at the temple (Neh 10:35-36). And when this was done, the purification and presentation would be done together. To use two turtledoves or young pigeons for the sacrifice instead of the usual lamb and one turtledove or pigeon was actually a concession for poor folk (Lev 12:8).

The story of the bringing of Jesus to the temple is told somewhat under the influence of 1 Sam 1-2 where Samuel is brought to the temple (note esp. 1 Sam 1:24, 28 compared to Luke 2:22): this child will be dedicated to the service of the Lord as was Samuel. The quotation in v 23 is also modified by Luke to make it remind the reader of Jesus' special holiness mentioned in 1:35.

Simeon is introduced as a man of exemplary Jewish piety, rather like Zechariah and Elizabeth. But going beyond those figures, his life is said to have been already firmly focused on the promised future intervention of God on behalf of his people (see esp. Isa 40:1; 51:3; 52:9). And more than that again, he is a man on whom the Spirit of God rests and to whom the Spirit has revealed that the Christ would be born in his lifetime.

When the holy family is brought to the temple by the need to fulfill the law, Simeon is brought into the temple by an impulse of the Spirit. And so it is divinely conspired that they should meet together. With a spiritual sight born of his closeness to God, Simeon at once recognizes the child. The parents pursue their purpose by passing the child into the arms of this priest. They do not yet realize that something more is happening. But Simeon, with the child in his arms, speaks to God, blessing him and expressing his realization that God is now dismissing him from the duty of watching for the arrival of the messianic era. His duty is done. The great day has come. He holds in his hands (the instrument of) God's salvation, and in a preliminary way he already experiences the messianic peace. Simeon recognizes that God has set this messianic child in place in a public arena which embraces all peoples: this child is a light for the Gentiles and glory for Israel. Simeon's words echo the universalism of Isaiah (see esp. Isa 42:6; 49:6; 52:10; 60:1-2) and the role of the Servant of the Lord in this universal salvation. They also anticipate the pattern developed in Acts by Luke of seeing the Jews and Gentiles as parallel beneficiaries of that salvation which is offered in the name of Jesus (Acts 9:15; 11:15, 18, 20; etc.). The Jews have priority, but salvation is there just as much for Gentiles as for Jews. "Glory for . . . Israel" but "light for revelation to the Gentiles" recognizes that the Gentiles come to the light from pagan darkness, while Israel is already God's People.

The astonished response of Joseph and Mary marks the fact that here God has been miraculously at work yet again.

Now Simeon attends to the parents. In priestly fashion he blesses them (as Eli blessed Samuel's parents in 1 Sam 2:20; cf. Num 6:23). Then he speaks especially to Mary. A somber tone replaces the joy of vv 29–32. Jesus, the bringer of salvation, is also the bringer of tragic division in Israel. Placed like a rock (the thought is based on Isa 8:14–15; and cf. Isa 28:16; Ps 118:22), he may be stumbled over, or one may raise oneself up upon this rock. This possibility is again referred to with the imagery of a sign opposed. The sign signals salvation, but what it signals may—and will—be resisted. Both images reveal the twofold possibility present in the rock who is a sign. But where the first concerns itself with the effect of the stone on those who encounter it, the second interests itself in what those who encounter it will do with the sign. The thought of opposition to the sign is then carried on and made more precise by what follows in v 35. This can be so because what is said here to be Mary's coming experience mirrors the coming opposition to her son: a sword will pass through her soul (she will suffer the loss of her son in death) because the opposition to her son will reach such a pitch that by the hand of his opponents a sword will pass through his soul (he will be put to death). The imagery comes most likely from Ps 22:20. Opposition pushed to murderous lengths reveals the true state of affairs in the hearts of many.

There is yet another figure in the temple precincts capable of recognizing the true identity of Jesus. A male figure (Simeon) is balanced by a female figure (Anna), as earlier Zechariah and Mary were somewhat parallel figures (1:5–38). This happens also elsewhere in the gospel. With Anna we return to the positive note set by vv 25–33. Anna is a prophetess (cf. Deborah and Miriam in Judg 4:4 and Exod 15:20) and an extremely godly, very elderly widow. She is described partly in terms that echo the early Christian ideal of widowhood (see 1 Tim 5:3–16). Her age (seven-times-twelve years) may symbolize the completion of her waiting for the messiah. The dignity of old age, a deep passion for God, and prophetic inspiration stand behind and give credibility to her witness to Jesus. Perceiving the true identity of the child, she gives grateful thanks to God and speaks of him to all those who like herself were waiting expectantly for the “redemption of Jerusalem.” The phrase echoes Isa 52:9 and along with the language of expectant waiting takes us back to v 25 where Simeon was introduced and the same verse from Isaiah echoed in “the consolation of Israel.” Thus, Luke finishes off and pulls together his account of Simeon and Anna.

V 39 reminds us how it is that Mary and Joseph were in the temple for all this to happen. It rounds off the trip to Jerusalem as a whole, but also the larger section that began with Mary and Joseph leaving Nazareth to take part in a census (2:1–40). Just as at the end of the account of John's early life there stood a statement about his growth (1:80) so too here in v 40. And as Jesus grew, those marks of the presence of the Spirit—wisdom and grace—were evident in him.

In the House of His Father (2:41–52)

Bibliography

- Argyle, A. W.** "A Parallel between Luke ii. 51 and Genesis xxxvii. 17." *ExpTim* 65 (1953–54) 29. **Bover, J. M.** "Una nueva interpretación de Lc 2,50." *EstBib* 10 (1951) 205–15. **Brown, R. E.** "The Finding of the Boy Jesus in the Temple: A Third Christmas Story." *Worship* 51 (1977) 474–85. **Cortés, J. B., and Gatti, F. M.** "Jesus' First Recorded Words (Lk. 2:49–50)." *Marianum* 32 (1970) 404–18. **Couroyer, B.** "À propos de Luc, II, 52." *RB* 86 (1979) 92–101. **Döderlein, J.** "Das Lernen des Jesusknaben." *NJDT* 1 (1892) 606–19. **Dupont, J.** "L'Évangile (Lc 2,41–52): Jésus à douze ans." *AsSeign* 14 (1961) 25–43. **Elliott, J. K.** "Does Luke 2:41–52 Anticipate the Resurrection?" *ExpTim* 83 (1971–72) 87–89. **Field, F.** *Notes on the Translation of the New Testament*. Cambridge: University Press, 1899. 50–58. **Glombitza, O.** "Der zwölfjährige Jesus: Lk ii 40–52. Ein Beitrag zur Exegese der lukanischen Vorgeschichte." *NovT* 5 (1962) 1–4. **Goodman, P.** "The Mother of Jesus: Thoughts on Her Role." *TBT* 87 (1976) 1006–9. **Hamlyn, F. C.** "The Visit of the Child Jesus to the Temple." *ExpTim* 27 (1915) 43–44. **Haubst, R.** "Über das Seelenleben des Kindes Jesus." *GuL* 33 (1960) 405–15. **Hoenig, S. B.** "The Supposititious Temple-Synagogue." *JQR* 54 (1963) 115–31. **Horst, P. W. van der.** "Notes on the Aramaic Background of Luke II 41–52." *JSNT* 7 (1980) 61–66. **Iersel, B. M. F. van.** "The Finding of Jesus in the Temple: Some Observations on the Original Form of Luke ii 41–51a." *NovT* 4 (1960) 161–73. **Jansen, J.** "Exposition: Luke 2:41–52." *Int* 30 (1976) 400–404. **Jonge, H. J. de.** "Sonship, Wisdom, Infancy: Luke ii. 41–51a." *NTS* 24 (1977–78) 317–54. **Kilgallen, J. J.** "Luke 2:41–50: Foreshadowing of Jesus, Teacher." *Bib* 66 (1985) 553–59. **Laurentin, R.** *Jésus au temple: Mystère de Pâques et foi de Marie en Luc 2,48–50*. EBib. Paris: Gabalda, 1966. **Manns, F.** "Luc 2,41–50 témoin de la bar Mitswa de Jésus." *Marianum* 40 (1978) 344–49. **Michel, A.** "La divinité de Jésus fut-elle connue par Marie?" *Ami du Clergé* 74 (1964) 654–56. **Pesch, R.** "'Kind, warum hast du so an uns getan?' (Lk 2,48)." *BZ* 12 (1968) 245–48. **Power, M. A.** "Who Were They Who 'Understood Not'?" *ITQ* 7 (1912) 261–81, 444–59. **Radermacher, L.** "Christus unter den Schriftgelehrten." *RM* 73 (1920) 232–39. **Renié, J. E.** "'Et Iesus proficiebat sapientia et aetate et gratia apud Deum et homines' (Lc II, 52)." In *Miscellanea biblica et orientalia*, FS R. P. Athanasio Miller, ed. A. Metzinger. Studia anselmiana 27–28. Rome: Herder, 1951. 340–50. **Schmahl, G.** "Lk 2,41–52 und die Kindheitserzählung des Thomas 19,1–5: Ein Vergleich." *BibLeb* 15 (1974) 249–58. **Smothers, E. R.** "A Note on Luke II 49." *HTR* 45 (1952) 67–69. **Spadafora, F.** "'Et ipsi non intellexerunt' (Lc. 2,50)." *Divinitas* 11 (1967) 55–70. **Steinmetz, F.-J.** "Jesu erste Wallfahrt nach Jerusalem: Auslegungen zu Lukas 2,41–52." *GuL* 46 (1973) 60–64. **Sylva, D. D.** "The Cryptic Clause *en tois tou patros mou dei einai me* in Lk 2:49b." *ZNW* 78 (1987) 132–40. **Temple, P. J.** *The Boyhood Consciousness of Christ: A Critical Examination of Luke ii. 49*. New York: Macmillan, 1922. ———. "What Is to Be Understood by *en tois*, Luke 2,49?" *ITQ* 17 (1922) 248–63. ———. "'House' or 'Business' in Lk. 2:49?" *CBQ* 1 (1939) 342–52. ———. "Christ's Holy Youth according to Lk. 2:52." *CBQ* 3 (1941) 243–50. ———. "Origen and the Ellipsis in Lk 2,49." *ITQ* 21 (1954) 367–75. **Thibaut, R.** *Le sens des paroles du Christ*. Paris/Brussels: Desclée, 1940. **Watkin, R.** "'Why Hast Thou Done So to Us?'" *Clergy Review* 27 (1947) 304–6. **Weinert, F. D.** "The Multiple Meanings of Luke 2:49 and Their Significance." *BTB* 13 (1983) 19–22. **Winter, P.** "Luke 2,49 and Targum Yerushalmi." *ZNW* 45 (1954) 145–79. ———. "Lk 2,49 and Targum Yerushalmi Again." *ZNW* 46 (1955) 140–41.

Translation

⁴¹ His parents^a went year by year to Jerusalem for the feast of Passover. ⁴² When he was twelve years old, when they went up again according to the custom of the

feast ⁴³ and had completed the festival days, as they were returning, the child Jesus stayed behind in Jerusalem, and his parents^b did not know. ⁴⁴ Thinking him to be in the traveling-party, they went a day's journey and were looking for him among their relatives and acquaintances. ⁴⁵ When they did not find him, they returned to Jerusalem to look for him.

⁴⁶ It happened that after three days they found him in the temple seated in the midst of the teachers listening to them and asking them questions. ⁴⁷ All who heard him were astonished at his understanding and his observations. ⁴⁸ When his parents^c saw him they were amazed, and his mother said to him: "Child, why have you done this to us? Look,^d your father and I^e have been in agony looking for^f you." ⁴⁹ He said to them: "Why is it that you were looking for me? Didn't you know that I would have to be in my Father's house?"^g ⁵⁰ But they did not understand the word which he spoke to them.

⁵¹ Then^h he went back home with them and came to Nazareth and was obedient to them. His mother stored up all the things in her heart. ⁵² And Jesus advanced in wisdom and in stature, and in favor with God and man.

Notes

^a δ τε Ἰωσήφ καὶ ἡ Μαριάμ, "both Joseph and Mary," is the reading supported by 1012 a b l r¹, once again in order to avoid calling Joseph the parent of Jesus.

^b As in v 41, "parents" is avoided here by some texts (A C Ψ etc.).

^c No change of subject is indicated by the Greek text.

^d Lit., "behold."

^e The reference to Joseph as "father" is avoided in various ways by C^{vid} β e syc a b etc.

^f The present tense is read here by R* B 69 and may be original.

^g The Greek text has no word for "house."

^h καὶ (lit., "and").

Form/Structure/Setting

In this final episode of the infancy gospel, for the first time Jesus, the central hero of Luke's story, plays an active role. In a minor way, Jesus' counterpart John has already done so as a baby in his mother's womb (1:39–56). In the structuring of 1:5–2:52, 2:41–52 corresponds to 1:39–56 and allows also the child Jesus (2:43) to express in a preliminary manner the role that is to be uniquely his. The final growth statement in 2:52 takes cognizance of the years that must intervene before Jesus' adult role and takes us to the threshold of the main body of Luke's narrative.

Once again the Lukan hand is more than evident in the narrative, but there is also broad agreement in the scholarship that the story is not of Lukan coinage. There is a possibility that v 44 is a Lukan expansion and v 47 almost certainly is (see *Comment* for both verses). Only in v 47 does the motif of the precocious childhood achievements of a hero clearly appear. This motif is widespread in the Greco-Roman biographical tradition (see de Jonge, *NTS* 24 [1977–78] 340–42) and may have been suggested to Luke by the mention in the episode of Jesus' age as twelve, a favorite age for the childhood exploits of heroes (see *Comment* at v 42). With the note in v 40 of Jesus' wisdom as a growing child, the scene of v 46 would lend itself to the expansion found in v 47. It is hard to be sure of the extent of Luke's responsibility for vv 50–52,

but they are so integrated into the thought development of the pericope that it is quite likely that in some form the various elements here were all part of the pre-Lukan formulation of this episode.

Especially without v 47 (and v 44?) the basic pronouncement story form of the episode is clear, though the story may always have shown more biographical interest than is normally to be expected in a narrative built around a key saying (cf. van Iersel, *NovT* 4 [1960] 172; Fitzmyer, 438).

OT echoes continue to play some role in this episode (see *Comment* at vv 41, 51, 52) but are not as prominent as in other sections of the infancy gospel. A dependence on Mal 3:1 is no more likely here than it was found to be in 2:22–40.

In various forms a proleptic anticipation of Jesus' later career is frequently claimed (a trip from Galilee to Jerusalem at Passover, out of sight for three days, the divine necessity of Jesus' going through death to be with his Father, etc. [see esp. Elliott, *ExpTim* 83 (1971–72) 87–89; Laurentin, *Jésus*, 95–109]). This may seem attractive at first sight, but detailed scrutiny shows that Luke has at every point failed to enhance by any literary technique the possibilities offered by the general parallel (vv 41–42 fail to speak of Jesus' going to Jerusalem; in the body of the Gospel Jesus never speaks of going to Jerusalem for Passover; unlike Mark, Luke does not use "three days" in relation to the death and resurrection of Jesus; in Luke 19–24 the temple is referred to both before and after the death-resurrection [19:47; 21:37–38; 24:53]).

The "concentric symmetry" structure proposed by de Jonge (*NTS* 24 [1977–78] 337–39) builds upon the "entry" and "exit" pattern evident in vv 41–42 and 51a. However, it locates the center of the pericope in vv 46b–47, when the dramatic center is clearly v 49, and is finally guilty of a forced division of the material.

V 41 sets the background for the episode. Vv 42–50 defy any structuring that is not just a listing of the steps in the action of the story: on the occasion Jesus stays behind in Jerusalem (vv 42–43); his parents search for him (vv 44–45); they find him in the temple taken up with the things of God and impressing the teachers (vv 46–47); they are shocked at his apparent insubordination (v 48); Jesus is surprised, thinking they would understand that he would be in his Father's house (v 49); this they cannot understand (v 50). V 51a closes off the scene with the family's return to Nazareth. In v 51b we see that here is additional revelation to be pondered by Mary. Finally in v 52 we are told that the growing Jesus, who was still a child in this episode, continued to develop into the fullness of manhood.

Comment

An episode from the in-between years of Jesus' life is a fitting transition to the main Gospel account which will begin in chap. 3. Here Jesus as a preadolescent for the first time takes an active part. And here that unique relatedness to God which marks his adult life comes into clear focus.

41 This sentence, and especially the *κατ' ἔτος*, "year by year," provides for the passing of the years until Jesus was twelve. The language of the verse is quite Lukan (de Jonge, *NTS* 24 [1977–78] 345–46). *γονεῖς*, "parents," is

used for Mary and Joseph as in v 43 and v 27 (see there on the relationship between this usage and the virginal conception). In each place there is a textual variant that avoids identifying Joseph as a parent of Jesus. On the use here of the more Hebraic Ἱερουσαλήμ, "Jerusalem," see at v 22. The idiom ἡ ἑορτὴ τοῦ πάσχα, "the feast of Passover," is not Septuagintal and occurs elsewhere in the NT only in John 13:1 (but cf. Luke 22:1). Passover was one of the three great annual pilgrim feasts that involved traveling to Jerusalem (Exod 23:14–17; Deut 16:16). See further on Passover at 22:1. All Jewish males were obliged to make the trip to Jerusalem (see *m. Hag.* 1:1 for exceptions), but Mary's presence was not strictly necessary. The family trip year by year may echo that of Samuel's parents (1 Sam 1:3, 7, 21; 2:19). A Samuel connection is clear in v 52. Since no special attention is drawn in vv 42–43 to Jesus' presence on the occasion of this Passover trip when he is twelve years old (his presence only becomes definite when we are told that he stayed behind in Jerusalem), it is natural to assume that Jesus accompanied his parents from year to year. *M. Hag.* 1:1 envisages male children being taken to Jerusalem for Passover.

42 At twelve years of age Jesus would in Jewish terms be beginning to make the transition into adult responsibility under the law (some rabbis considered this the age at which vows became binding, parental punishment could become more severe, and fasting could be expected to be sustained for a whole day [*Sipre* Num §22; *b. Ber.* 24a; *b. Yom.* 82a]), but more often the onset of responsibilities is linked with the thirteenth birthday (e.g., *m. Nid.* 5:6; *m. 'Abot* 5:21; *Gen. Rab.* 63:10), and in any case for a male childhood was deemed to continue for some years beyond the twelfth birthday (note in v 43 the use of παῖς, "boy"; cf. de Jonge, *NTS* 24 [1977–78] 319–21). Thus, at twelve Jesus is growing up, but not yet an adult. Luke may not have been unaware that stories were in circulation about the impression created at the age of twelve by various famous men (for Cyrus see Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* 1.2.8; for Samuel see Josephus, *Ant.* 5.348; for Epicurus see *Diog. Laert.* 10.14; for Solomon see 3 Kgdms 2:12; de Jonge, *NTS* 24 [1977–78] 322–23, notes also Daniel, Alexander the Great, Moses, and Cambyeses). Other ages occur in similar stories, but less frequently (cf. Laurentin, *Jésus*, 155).

The participle ἀναβαλόντων, "going up," is probably in the present tense to mark reiteration. This is represented by the "again" of the translation. For κατὰ τὸ ἔθος, "according to the custom," see at 1:9.

43 Passover (with Unleavened Bread) was an eight-day celebration (Lev 23:5–6). Though pilgrims did not necessarily need to stay for the full duration (Str-B, 2:147–48), Mary and Joseph will have done so. The interest focuses on the action of the principal verb of the sentence: the child Jesus remained in Jerusalem. The diminutive form παιδίον, "[little] child," used in vv 17, 27, 40 gives way now as Jesus gets older to παῖς, "child"/"boy"/"servant." V 44 will explain how it was possible for the parents not to know that Jesus had stayed behind.

44 συνοδία, "caravan"/"traveling-party," is not used elsewhere in the NT but is found in Josephus (*War* 2.587; *Ant.* 6.243) and elsewhere. For the festivals, the number of travelers would make possible a Nazareth traveling-party, and this would reduce the demands on the individual of planning and executing

such a trip. The imperfect tense ἀνεζήτουν, “they were looking for,” may suggest that the parents spent the day looking for him. Even if their search can be understood as initially only fitful, quite a large traveling party is indicated. “A day’s journey” (ἡμέρας ὁδόν) would normally be a rough unit for measuring distance (Num 11:31; 1 Kgs 19:4), but here the thought is probably that only after the striking of camp at the end of the first day’s travel could Mary and Joseph be sure that Jesus was not in the traveling-party. Van Iersel (*NouT* 4 [1960] 171) has suggested that v 44 with its novelistic quality may be a Lukan expansion. It does, however, prepare for the “three days” of v 46.

46 μετὰ ἡμέρας τρεῖς, “after three days,” is not used by Luke in connection with Jesus’ resurrection (in 9:22 and 13:33 Luke alters Mark’s use of this phrase [8:31; 10:34]), so no symbolism is intended (against Laurentin, *Jésus*, 101–2; Dupont, *AsSeign* 14 [1961] 42; Elliott, *ExpTim* 83 [1971–72] 87–89). The three days of anxiety prepare for the intensity behind Mary’s rebuke in v 48. In such a story de Jonge (*NTS* 24 [1977–78] 324–25) is misguided to think that only a round figure is intended.

Jesus is depicted as an eager student, learning in the dialogical pattern of the day. He is listening to interchange among the teachers and asking questions. For teaching in the temple precincts see 19:47; 21:37–38; Acts 4:2; 5:25. Jewish teachers (διδάσκαλοι) are not termed such elsewhere in the Gospel (νομικός, γραμματεὺς, νομοδιδάσκαλος [“lawyer,” “scribe,” “teacher of the law”] are used, and the image is quite negative).

47 This verse has a different subject from vv 43–46, 48, which makes for an awkward transition to v 48 where no change of subject is indicated. The verse also moves the accent away from Jesus’ eagerness to learn (v 46) and onto his precocious understanding. It is likely to be a secondary development (cf. van Iersel, *NouT* 4 [1960] 168–70; de Jonge, *NTS* 24 [1977–78] 342–45), perhaps added by Luke in the final stage of editing when vv 25–40 were added (see *Form/Structure/Setting* at 1:5–25), in order to make vv 41–51 take on the additional role of illustrating v 40. Acts 9:21 repeats identically ἐξίσταντο δὲ πάντες οἱ ἀκούοντες, “all who heard were astonished.” “All who heard” occurs eight times in Luke’s writings and not elsewhere in the NT. Luke 20:26 has Luke’s only other use of ἀπόκρισις, “answer,” and there also in connection with the language of amazement. God’s wisdom and grace (v 40) already make an impact in these early words of Jesus (cf. 4:22). If we may judge from the use of the cognate verb ἀποκρίνεσθαι, ἀποκρίσιν (lit., “answers”) need mean no more than “observations [in a context of interaction].”

48 The parents’ amazement has a different cause from that in v 47. The growing apprehension about the boy’s safety and well-being that the three-day separation has produced in the parents stands in sharpest contrast to Jesus’ total preoccupation with other matters. It is a little surprising that the mother should speak (cf. Räisänen, *Mutter Jesu*, 134), but she makes it clear that she speaks for both parents, and at a literary level, only with Mary as speaker can we get the pairing of “your father” (ὁ πατήρ σου) and “my Father” (τοῦ πατρός μου; v 49). Note the prominence given to “your father” by what is, for Greek, the odd word order “your father and I.” Pesch (*BZ* 12 [1968] 245–48) has argued that not only does τί ἐποίησας ἡμῖν οὕτως, “why have you done this to us,” reflect a fixed formula of accusation (cf. Gen 12:18; 20:9;

26:10; 29:25; Exod 14:11; Num 23:11; Judg 15:11) but that also the accusation involved is always one of deception or betrayal. Jesus is accused of having betrayed his parents, that is, of having betrayed the calling that was his as son of Joseph. *ὀδυῖσθαι*, “to cause pain,” is a strong term used elsewhere in the NT only at Luke 16:24–25; Acts 20:38.

49 Jesus’ response is frequently read as a counter-accusation (e.g., Fitzmyer, 443; Pesch, *BZ* 12 [1968] 248). But it is important to note that while in the aftermath of the incident the parents are left with much food for thought (vv 50–51), it is Jesus whose behavior is modified: he goes back with his parents after all and is submissive to them (v 51). Jesus’ question should, then, be seen as reflecting genuine surprise and not reproach.

τί οὕτω (lit., “why that”) is found also at Acts 5:4, 9. *εἶναι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου* (lit., “to be in the [pl.] of my Father”) is a much disputed phrase. Most obvious in the context (Jesus is in the temple and his parents did not know *where* he was) and well supported by linguistic parallels (Job 18:20; Esth 7:9; Josephus, *Ant.* 8.145; 16.302; Laurentin [*Jésus*, 56–68] offers many examples and detailed argumentation for this view) is the translation, “to be in the house of my Father [i.e., the temple].”

Also possible is the translation “to be engaged in the affairs of my Father.” 1 Cor 7:32, 34; 13:11 offer a close syntactical parallel for “the affairs of my Father” part. To parallel the remainder of the idiom assumed for this translation is more difficult. *ἐν τούτοις ἵσθι*, “be engaged in these,” from 1 Tim 4:15 is the closest NT parallel. Field, *Notes*, 52, cites six examples from classical Greek of *εἶναι ἐν* with the sense “to be engaged in.” What looks at first sight to be the closest parallel to the whole phrase taken in this second sense, *ὅλος ἐν τοῖς κυριωτάτοις ἦν τῆς ἡγεμονίας* (lit., “he was wholly in the chief [affairs] of the government”) from Plutarch, *Moralia, de Alexandri Virtute*, Orat. 11, c. 11 (cited by Temple, *CBQ* 1 [1939] 343) falls foul of Laurentin’s dictum (*Jésus*, 54) that *εἶναι ἐν* used morally signifies “to be preoccupied with” and not “to be engaged in.” Nonetheless, this second translation for Jesus’ words is linguistically possible.

A third translation possibility (represented chiefly by Döderlein, *NJDT* [1892] 606–19) takes its point of departure from the use in v 44 of *ἐν* in the phrase *ἐν τοῖς συγγενεῦσιν*, “among the relatives.” *ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου* then becomes “among those who belong to my Father [i.e., among those who occupy themselves with the affairs of God at the temple].” No close linguistic parallels have been offered for the third option. Therefore, since *ἐν* is used predominantly in the episode in a spatial sense (vv 43, 44, 46) and since this third rendering produces a sense that is difficult to integrate with other traditions about Jesus, we should choose between the earlier options.

A further possibility is with de Jonge (*NTS* 24 [1977–78] 330–37) and Weinert (*BTB* 13 [1983] 19–22) to opt for multiple layers of meaning through the use of a deliberately ambivalent expression. De Jonge in particular defends this expedient as a way past certain difficulties (see below) that flow from referring *ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου* unambiguously to the temple.

The choice to be made turns in part on the sense to be given to *δεῖ*, “it is necessary.” Luke frequently uses *δεῖ* in connection with the divine necessity that characterized Jesus’ life (4:43; 9:22; [13:33]; 17:25; 22:37; 24:7, 26, 44), and either in the narrower sense of the necessity of the cross (e.g., Laurentin,

Jésus, 102–3) or in a broader sense (e.g., de Jonge, *NTS* 24 [1977–78] 333), this concern with divine necessity is often claimed for Luke 2:49. A weaker sense, however, will eliminate some of the tangles encountered in the unraveling of the thoughts of this passage (it is difficult to attribute a divine necessity which the parents should have known about to Jesus' presence in the temple at this time [he soon leaves it]; on the other hand the divine necessity for Jesus to be involved in the affairs of God provides little basis for finding him, nor is it carried through in terms of a continuing independence for Jesus from this point on [see v 51]) and will also tip the scales firmly in favor of reading ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου as "in my father's house."

The time-frame here for the present tense δεῖ, "it is necessary," is likely to be, not the moment of Jesus' words, but rather the earlier time (cf. BDF 324) in which Jesus had expected that his parents would have had the awareness: "He must be in his Father's house." Jesus expected that they would realize that if he were not with them (metaphorically in Joseph's house?) he would be in the temple. For Jesus that seemed to follow naturally from the unique relationship with God which in his case superimposed itself upon his membership in a human family (Laurentin, *Jésus*, 38, is right to stress that the story presupposes that Mary and Joseph already have a basis upon which some knowledge of Jesus' unique identity might be expected of them). To his surprise, this was not so obvious to Mary and Joseph.

Though assumed in most of the studies, in light of v 51 it is not likely that Jesus is here pitting over against each other his obligation to God and that to his human family: Jesus' continued submission to his human parents is hardly a fitting sequel to the expression here of a radical subordination of family ties to duty to God. In any case that would be an ethical statement (like that, for example, implied in Luke 18:29–30), where here we are dealing with a Christological statement (cf. vv 50–51, and the strongly Christological focus of the whole infancy gospel). The human parents thought in terms of filial insubordination only because they failed to take adequately into account Jesus' unique identity. Jesus had not betrayed his sonship. In fact he had had no intention of dishonoring either of his sonships. Here, however, in the encounter with his distressed parents, this maturing child has set before him something of the complexity of the relationship between his identity as Son of God and as son in the family of Joseph. His adult handling of this dual identity lies beyond the final growth statement in v 52.

Jesus speaks of God as "my Father" also in 10:22; 22:29; 24:49 (see discussion at 10:21–22). Here in Luke's infancy gospel this expression brings into sharp focus the relational content of the Son of God language of 1:32, 35, which had remained unexploited in the Jewish use of 2 Sam 7:12–16; Ps 2:7 etc., and which is not yet emphasized in those texts. Messianism is here allowed to fade into the background in favor of a concept of one who is uniquely related to God as a son to a father. The two emphases come together in 3:22 (see there).

50 The attribution of such a failure to understand to Mary (and Joseph) has been avoided by referring αὐτοί, "they," to the bystanders (Power, *ITQ* 7 [1912] 262–78) and not to the parents or by suggesting that what the parents had not understood was some earlier communication by Jesus which should

have informed them that he would be in the temple (Thibaut, *Sens*, 17–18, 245–46; Bover, *EstBib* 10 [1951] 205–25; Cortés and Gatti, *Marianum* 32 [1970] 404–18; Delebecque, *Études grecques*, 45–47). While linguistically possible, neither expedient represents a natural reading of the text.

The literary function of the verse is to mark the Christological depth of Jesus' statement, a depth to which Mary and Joseph are not at once able to penetrate (cf. Schürmann, 137).

51 The "exit" in v 51a corresponds to the "entry" in vv 41–42. Jesus' continuing submission to his parents is stressed because of the way in which he had seemed to the parents to have been insubordinate in Jerusalem. On Nazareth see at 1:26. On v 51b see at v 19. The focus on Mary here has been prepared for in the episode by her role in v 48. Echoing as it does the responses to revelation in Gen 37:11 and Dan 7:28, the present statement about Mary orients the reader to the remainder of Luke's story in which the preliminary revelation of the infancy gospel will receive its definitive exposition in Luke's account of what God has accomplished in Jesus. Mary alone bridges in her person the infancy gospel, the ministry of Jesus (8:19–21), and the early life of the postresurrection church (Acts 1:14).

At an earlier stage of editing (see *Form/Structure/Setting* at 1:5–25) vv 51–52 as a conclusion formed a parallel to vv 65–66, 80. But this function has been disturbed by Luke's final sectioning, and 2:19, 39–40 have now the role of paralleling 1:65–66, 80. However, vv 51–52 still conclude both the pericope vv 41–50 and the infancy gospel as a whole.

52 The idiom *προκόπτειν ἡλικία*, "to increase in age/stature," is noted by Schneider (*TDNT* 2:942) from a pagan inscription (W. Dittenberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum* [3rd ed.] 708.18). Here the whole sentence echoes 1 Sam 2:26 (but not LXX; cf. also Prov 3:4), which has, however, no equivalent for *ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ*, "in wisdom." This last has its particular point in relation to the episode immediately preceding (see at v 49). This addition allows for a balancing between the pair "wisdom and stature/age" (*σοφία καὶ ἡλικία*) and the bifurcated "favor with God and man" (*χάριτι παρὰ θεῶ καὶ ἀνθρώποις*).

ἡλικία is well attested in both the sense "age" and the sense "stature" (BAGD, 345). The latter is certain in Luke 19:3; the former may be preferable in 12:25. Here the order of terms favors the latter. *χάρις* means "favor" also at 1:30; Acts 2:47; 7:46.

Traditional theology has stumbled here at what might be taken to undermine the conviction that Jesus was at all times and in all respects utterly without flaw. Luke speaks, rather, out of the conviction that the human maturing process even in perfect form involves not only growth in size but also development in wisdom and in the capacity to execute that which is pleasing both to God and to one's fellows.

Explanation

Already before his birth John had actively anticipated his later role (1:39–56). Now the preadolescent Jesus will unconsciously reflect the unique relatedness to God that is his. The depths implicit in Jesus' identity as Son of God (1:32, 35) are more than his human parents are yet able to fathom, and they

are left puzzled (v 50). Only the unfolding events of the Gospel to follow will bring Mary clarity (cf. Acts 1:14) about the things she ponders now in her heart (v 51). And those events must wait on Jesus' full development to maturity (v 52).

The action of the episode takes place in relation to a family habit of making the annual trip to Jerusalem for Passover, just as had been the habit of Samuel's parents (1 Sam 1:3, 7, 21; 2:19). Passover was one of the three annual pilgrim feasts that involved a trip to Jerusalem (Exod 23:14-17; Deut 16:16). Presumably each year Jesus was taken, but this year something quite different happened. At twelve Jesus would be in terms of the culture of the day beginning to make the transition from childhood to adulthood. In the case of a male child this transition would continue by degrees for several years beyond the twelfth birthday. Girls moved into adulthood more quickly. Quite a number of stories of ancient heroes have them manifesting dramatically at the age of twelve something of their future greatness.

Having seen the festival through its eight days, the parents set off as prearranged with their traveling-party. Such travel-parties or caravans were convenient in that they reduced the demands on the individual for planning and executing such a trip and also provided security. The travel-party would be large and probably chaotic, so that it was not until camp was struck at the end of the first day of traveling that the parents could be sure that Jesus was not somewhere in the travel-party.

While the parents searched, Jesus spent his time at the temple. He was eager to learn and ready to ask questions as he listened to the learned dialogue between the teachers of the law. Those present could not but notice that his understanding was already prodigious, and they were amazed at the acuteness of his observations.

When his parents discovered Jesus there, their amazement was of quite another sort. Apprehension about the child's safety gave way to shock that their child could have treated them so. Mary expressed to Jesus the parents' sense of betrayal: she accused Jesus of having betrayed the calling that was his as son of Joseph.

Jesus was genuinely surprised, and no doubt grieved that his parents had experienced such distress. He had thought that they would have realized that if he was not with them (in Joseph's house, so to speak) he would be in the temple (in the house of God, his Father). For Jesus that seemed to follow naturally from the unique relationship with God which in his case superimposed itself upon his membership in a human family. Jesus had not betrayed his sonship. In fact he had had no intention of dishonoring either of his sonships (v 48: "your father"; v 49: "my Father"). The human parents thought in terms of filial insubordination only because they had failed to reckon adequately with Jesus' unique identity (cf. 1:32, 35). Nevertheless, this unexpected turn of events set before this maturing child something of the complexity of the relationship between his identity as Son of God and as son in the family of Joseph.

The parents could not comprehend all that was implied about the identity of their child in the words of explanation that he spoke to them. But if not immediately, certainly in the days that followed (cf. v 51) they must have

been reassured that Jesus' behavior in Jerusalem had not flowed from an insubordinate spirit. Mary stored it all up and sought to puzzle it all through. As prophecy receives its definitive exposition in fulfillment, so all Mary's experiences in this infancy gospel period will attain their full significance only when the events reaching to Pentecost run their course. Mary's involvement will bridge these early beginnings, the ministry of Jesus (8:19–21), and the early life of the postresurrection church (Act 1:14).

Jesus' unique identity will later be given full expression in his adult ministry. In between, however, there is to be growth in wisdom and in stature and in the capacity to execute that which is pleasing both to God and to man.

Preparation for the Ministry of Jesus (3:1–4:13)

Introduction

The emergence of John the Baptist represents the real beginning of Luke's story. John heralds and prepares for the coming of Jesus. Jesus himself makes a beginning with baptism by John, and is at this point formally introduced by Luke in terms of his legal human ancestry. Identified by the divine voice as Son of God and equipped with the Spirit, Jesus' filial obedience is put to the test, prior to the beginning of his public ministry, in a wilderness encounter with the Devil.

John the Baptist (3:1–6)

Bibliography

Badia, L. F. *The Qumran Baptism and John the Baptist's Baptism*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1980. **Barrett, C. K.** *Holy Spirit*. 25–34. **Beasley-Murray, G. R.** *Baptism in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962. 31–44. **Betz, O.** "Die Proselytentaufe der Qumransekte und die Taufe im Neuen Testament." *RevQ* 1 (1958–59) 213–34. **Böcher, O.** "Johannes der Täufer in der neutestamentlichen Überlieferung." In *Rechtfertigung—Realismus—Universalismus in biblischer Sicht*, FS A. Köberle, ed. G. Müller. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1978. 45–68, esp. 47–52. **Braun, H. von.** "Die Taufertaufe und die qumranischen Waschungen." *ThViat* 9 (1964) 1–4. **Brueggemann, W.** "An Exposition of Luke 3:1–4." *Int* 30 (1976) 404–9. **Creed, J. M.** "Josephus on John the Baptist." *JTS* 23 (1922) 59–60. **Dahl, N. A.** "The Origin of Baptism." In *Interpretationes ad Vetus Testamentum pertinentes Sigmundo Mowinckel septuagenario missae*, ed. N. A. Dahl and A. S. Kapelrud. Oslo: Forlaget Land og Kirke, 1955. 36–42. **Geyser, A. S.** "The Youth of John the Baptist." *NovT* 1 (1956) 70–75. **Gnilka, J.** "Die essenischen Tauchbäder und die Johannestaufe." *RevQ* 3 (1961–62) 185–207. **Grant, R. M.** "The Occasion of Luke III:1–2." *HTR* 23 (1940) 151–54. **Jeremias, J.** "Der Ursprung der Johannestaufe." *ZNW* 28 (1929) 312–20. ———. "Proselytentaufe und Neues Testament." *TZ* 5 (1949) 418–28. **Lohmeyer, E.** *Das Urchristentum I: Johannes des Täufer*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1932. **Michaelis, W.** "Die jüdische Proselytentaufe und die Tauflehre des Neuen Testaments." *Kirchenblatt für die reformierte Schweiz* 105 (1949) 17–20, 34–38. ———. "Zum jüdischen Hintergrund der Johannestaufe." *Judaica* 7 (1951) 81–121. **Robinson, J. A. T.** "The Baptism of John and the Qumran Community." *Twelve New Testament Studies*. 11–27. **Rowley, H. H.** "The Baptism of John and the Qumran Sect." In *New Testament Essays*, FS T. W. Manson, ed. A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: University Press, 1959. 218–29. ———. "Jewish Proselyte Baptism and the Baptism of John." *HUCA* 15 (1940) 313–34. **Sahlin, H.** *Studien zum dritten Kapitel des Lukasevangeliums*. **Schlatter, A. von.** *Johannes der Täufer*, ed. W. Michaelis. Basel: F. Reinhardt, 1956. **Scobie, C.** *John the Baptist: A New Quest of the Historical John*. London: SCM, 1964. **Smith, D.** "Jewish Proselyte Baptism and the Baptism of John." *RestQ* 25 (1982) 13–32. **Sutcliffe, E. F.** "Baptism and Baptismal Rites at Qumran?" *HeyJ* 1 (1960) 179–

88. **Taylor, T. M.** "The Beginnings of Jewish Proselyte Baptism." *NTS* 3 (1955–56) 193–98. **Thyen, H.** "ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΑ ΜΕΤΑΝΟΙΑΣ ΕΙΣ ΑΦΕΣΙΝ ΑΜΑΡΤΙΩΝ." In *The Future of Our Religious Past*, FS R. Bultmann, ed. J. M. Robinson. New York: Harper & Row, 1971. 131–68. **Torrance, T. F.** "Proselyte Baptism." *NTS* 1 (1954–55) 150–54. **Wilkens, W.** "Wassertaufe und Geistesempfang bei Lukas." *TZ* 23 (1967) 1–44.

Translation

¹In the fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberius Caesar, when Pontius Pilate was governing^a Judea, and Herod was tetrarch of Galilee and Philip his brother tetrarch of the region of Iturea and Trachonitis, and Lysanius was tetrarch of Abilene, ²while Annas was high priest, and Caiaphas, the word of God came upon John the son of Zechariah, in the wilderness; ³and he moved into the^b region all around the Jordan preaching a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins, ⁴as it stands written in the book of the words of Isaiah the prophet,

"A voice from someone calling out in the wilderness,
'Prepare the way for the Lord,
make the paths straight for him.'^c

⁵Every valley shall be filled up,
and every mountain and hill shall be made low,
and the crooked places shall become straight
and the rough ways level.

⁶Then^d shall all flesh see the salvation of God.'

Notes

^aD reads here ἐπιτροπεύοντος, "was procurator." See *Comment* below.

^bB A W omit the definite article.

^cA small number of texts here and elsewhere conform readings to the LXX.

^dSee 4:16–30 *Note d*.

Form/Structure/Setting

The sixfold synchronism of vv 1 and 2 marks a beginning for the Gospel account in a way that relegates chaps. 1 and 2 to the role of prehistory (contrast the minimal setting in 1:5). This fresh beginning is confirmed when we note that none of the insights gained by participants in the infancy narratives play any role in the story line from this point forward. Chaps. 1 and 2 orient the reader, but chap. 3 begins the promised account of the "things which have been accomplished in our midst" (1:1 and cf. Acts 10:37; 13:24—contra J. H. Davies, *SE* 6 [=TU 112] [1973] 78–85).

The ministry of John the Baptist belongs to the immediate preparation for Jesus' ministry (cf. 7:29–30) in the same way that Jesus' own baptismal anointing by the Spirit and testing in the wilderness do. The same transcending parallelism marks the relationship between Jesus' ministry and that of the Baptist as has already been evident in the events surrounding their births.

In 3:1–6 the Baptist's ministry is introduced as the preaching of βάπτισμα μετάνοιας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, "a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins," and identified as the fulfillment of Isa 40:3–5. Aspects of his ministry

are developed in more concrete terms in Luke 3:7-18, and a terminus provided by vv 19-20.

Though not as carefully crafted as that of the prologue (1:1-4), a long periodic sentence also marks this new beginning (cf. Fitzmyer, 450). The elaborate synchronism has its immediate analogue in the work of the ancient historians (Thucydides 2.2; Polybius 1.3; Josephus *Ant.* 18.106) but is reminiscent also of OT prophetic introductions (esp. Hos 1:1 and Jer 1:1-3). Luke accurately reconstructs a political configuration quite different from that of the time of composition.

V 3b and the form of the citation in v 4 are identical to the Markan text. The later position of the quotation and the omission of the words from Mal 3:1 are not sufficient to guarantee for Matthew and Luke a common second source here, though the common material in Luke 3:7-9 and Matt 3:7-10 cannot have stood alone.

The form of the text quoted in vv 5 and 6 differs in a number of details from the LXX. Luke, following the MT, has no *πάντα*, "all," before *τὰ σκολιά*, "the crooked." His text reads the plural *αἱ τραχεῖαι*, "the rough ways," where the LXX has the singular. *ὁδοὺς λείας*, "smooth ways," replaces *πεδία*, "level places." These changes would seem to reflect a text form available to Luke (cf. Stendahl, *St. Matthew*, 49 n. 1). The omission of Isa 40:5a, *καὶ ὁφθῆσεται ἡ δόξα Κυρίου*, "and the glory of the Lord will appear," may be of a different character. See *Comment* below.

Luke is probably responsible for extending the quotation on the basis of the universalism and the language of salvation to be found in v 6.

The extensive discussion of John's possible involvement with the Qumran community remains inconclusive. No doubt the Qumran documents provide a particularly revealing window onto one of what may be broadly termed the baptist movements of the first century (see J. Thomas, *Le mouvement Baptiste en Palestine et Syrie* [Gembloux: Duculot, 1935]), and John the Baptist should be located in relation to this broader phenomenon. However, the attempt to identify an initiatory rite at Qumran analogous to John's baptism has not been successful (Gnilka, *RevQ* 3 [1961-62] 185-207). Further, the attempts to locate John's origins at Qumran must either reckon with a significant break with that movement or run the risk of developing a portrait of John that leans more heavily on Qumran than on the evidence concerning John available to us (i.e., the NT and Josephus).

Attempts to understand John's baptizing activity in relation to Jewish proselyte baptism are also unsatisfactory. It still remains unclear whether such proselyte baptism was already an established practice in the time of John, especially when it is borne in mind that clear evidence for the baptism as a definite conversion rite (see the discussion from around A.D. 90 between Rabbi Eliezer ben Hyrkanos and Rabbi Jehoshua ben Hanania as reported in *b. Yebam.* 46a) is later than that for the practice of a purificatory bath in preparation for an initial sacrifice in the temple and participation in the Passover (*m. Ker.* 2:1; *m. Pesah* 8:8; *y. Pesah* 8:36a; *t. Pesah* 7:13 [Zuck. 167]—see esp. Michaelis, *Judaica* 7 [1951] 94-121). In particular, the presence of witnesses, which distinguished proselyte baptism from the regular round of Levitical purification, has no early attestation. A developing sense of gentile Levitical uncleanness

may be traced from the late first century B.C. through the first century A.D. (see Jeremias, *TZ* 5 [1949] 419; *ibid.*, *ZNW* 28 [1929] 313; Michaelis, *Kirchenblatt für die reformierte Schweiz* 105 [1949] 18–19) and is certainly reflected in the NT (Acts 10:28 cf. Gal 2:12 etc.). But the ritual washing away of this uncleanness has no greater claim to illuminate John's baptizing than does the general Jewish practice of Levitical purification, of which it is but a particular example (see already the regulations in Lev 15; and on their practice in the first century, especially in relation to the temple cult, see Dahl, "The Origin of Baptism").

For further discussion of John's baptism see *Comment* at v 3 and also at v 16.

Comment

After the fervent Jewish piety, Spirit-induced prophecy, and angelic messages of chaps. 1 and 2, chap. 3 marks a fresh beginning. The levels of insight achieved by participants in the infancy events will not recur until after the resurrection, when the fact of the cross enables these vistas to take on quite new meaning. The infancy narratives have created a privileged insiders' status for the readers, but now Luke's actual story begins.

1 *ἐν ἔτει*, "in the year," is slightly less polished than the simple *ἐτει* preferred by Josephus (Schlatter, 32). The sixfold synchronism identifies a particular year only in the case of the emperor Tiberius. Tiberius succeeded Augustus in A.D. 14, so that the year A.D. 28–29 is most likely in view. However, the existence of various calendars, lack of knowledge about customs concerning the reckoning of the accession (part-)year, and especially a period of partial coregency with Augustus exclude certainty (see J. Finegan, *Handbook of Biblical Chronology* [Princeton: University Press, 1967] 259–80; H. W. Hoehner, *Chronological Aspects of the Life of Christ* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1977] 29–44). It is wrong to find the world significance of the events to follow in the mention here of the emperor (against Schürmann, 151): in view is his position in the power structure of Palestine. Pilate was prefect of Judea from A.D. 26–36. Judea had reverted to direct Roman rule after the deposition of Herod's son Archelaus in A.D. 6. Luke's term ("ruling") is imprecise but not incorrect (against Conzelmann, *Luke*, 18). The D reading *ἐντροπέοντος*, "being procurator," is more precise but reflects the state of affairs after the Claudian reorganization in around A.D. 46 (for bibliography see Fitzmyer, 456).

Herod Antipas, in accord with the terms of Herod the Great's final will and as confirmed by the emperor Augustus, ruled over Galilee and Perea from 4 B.C. to A.D. 29. Luke mentions only the former territory. Neither in the list of leaders nor in the scope of their territories does Luke seek for completeness. He provides sufficient information to establish the Palestinian ambience of his story. The title "tetrarch" (lit., "ruler of a fourth part") was used in the NT period more generally for petty princes.

Philip was less ambitious than his brothers and received only minor territories. He ruled until his death in A.D. 34. Trachonitis is an area south of Damascus. Iturea is a rather fluid designation (see Schürer [ed. Vermes and Millar], *Jewish People*, 1:561–73). A once considerable kingdom centered in Lebanon was gradually carved up into smaller territories.

The span of Lysanius' rule is not known. An earlier Lysanius ruled Abilene prior to 36 B.C., or at least a territory including the later Abilene. However, it is clear from references in Josephus (*Ant.* 19.275, cf. *War* 2.215) and from an inscription found at Abila (CIG 4521) that cannot be earlier than the reign of Tiberius, that a later Lysanius also ruled Abilene (see Schürer [ed. Vermes and Millar], *Jewish People*, 1:567-69). Abilene was immediately west of Damascus.

The political power structures (and religious to follow in v 2) provide more than remote background for Luke's story (contrast 1:5). John spoke out against Herod Antipas and was to be imprisoned and later executed by this tetrarch. Encounters with Pilate, Herod Antipas, and the high-priestly leaders play key roles in Luke's narrative of Jesus.

2 Luke writes, curiously, ἐν ἡγεμονίᾳ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως ("in the time of the high priest" [singular]) Ἀννα καὶ Καϊάφα ("Annas and Caiaphas" [two names]). The NT reflects a situation in which Annas, an earlier high priest (A.D. 6-15) and father-in-law of the current high priest Caiaphas (A.D. 18-36), retains much of the power and prestige of the high-priestly office (John 18:13, 24; Acts 4:6). It is just possible (following Schürmann, 149, 151) that Luke follows the usage of a group that refused to acknowledge the deposition of Annas, and that we should translate, "in the time of the high priest Annas, and of Caiaphas." Certainly in Acts 4:6 it is Annas and not Caiaphas who is termed high priest. The elimination of Καϊάφα as a correcting gloss (e.g., Wellhausen, 4; Loisy, 135; Sahlin, *Studien*, 8 n. 1) is an unnecessary expedient.

The call to an active prophetic role is carefully dated in Isa 6:1; Jer 1:2; Ezek 1:1-3 and cf. Hag 1:1; Zech 1:1. John had been kept in readiness since his infancy (1:15, 80; cf. Jer 1:5), and now the time was ripe for him to announce the impending fulfillment of God's long-anticipated purposes. Now the process of fulfillment is set in motion. The idiom ῥῆμα θεοῦ γίνεσθαι ἐπὶ, "word of God to come upon," with its use of ἐπὶ, "upon," is paralleled in the LXX only at Jer 1:1, and is yet one more indication of Lukan interest in paralleling the two figures. The dynamic impetus to John is analogous to OT experiences of the Spirit of God coming upon a person (cf. esp. Num 24:2; Judg 3:10; 1 Kgdms 19:23-24). The mention here of Zechariah does not point to the existence of an earlier form of the Gospel without the infancy narratives (against Fitzmyer, 459). Rather, it provides a bridge back to chap. 1 (so Schürmann, 153). The wilderness is a unique location for the call of a prophet (cf. 1:80). The location identifies John as part of a movement of eschatological renewal (see at v 4 below).

3 ἦλθεν, "he came," suggests a change of location, but this should not be seen as a leaving of the wilderness (v 4 and 7:24—against Wink, *John the Baptist*, 4; Schürmann, 155). Rather, John moves in the wilderness to where there is water, and he moves from relative isolation (1:80) to where there are people (Matt 3:5; cf. Gen 13:10 LXX where the same expression πᾶσαν τὴν περίχωρον τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, "all the area surrounding the Jordan," is to be found [the area is claimed by Lot because of its potential for farming]). He seeks contact with people to preach, and proximity to water to baptize. Only Luke labels John's preaching activity as itinerant (Wink, *John the Baptist*, 53), but there are no specific vocabulary links to the itineration of Jesus and Christian evangelists. κηρύσσων, "preaching," and εὐηγγελίζετο, "he evangelized," to follow in v 18 are stronger indications of a "Christianization" of John (note that these two

verbs are precisely those of Luke 4:18–19) and warn against any sharp separation of John and Jesus: not the message, but the state of fulfillment differed. This may not be the whole story (but its substantial truth is confirmed by 7:31–35). However, it is the part of the story that provides the enduring relevance of John's ministry.

The call for *μετάνοια*, "repentance," connects John with the great prophets of Israel. These called the people back from their alienation from and rebellion against God. They called them to refocus their lives on God and on his will, to trust him unreservedly and to turn away from everything unworthy of him (see E. Würthwein, *TDNT* 4:984–86). The classical prophets made their appeal for repentance in relation to historical judgments of God in the political sphere or by means of natural disaster; for John, the urgency of the appeal and the absoluteness of its claim is determined by its eschatological setting. The call for repentance is reiterated in Jesus' ministry (Luke 5:32) and in the early church (Acts 2:38).

John's connection of baptism and repentance lacks any close antecedent. At Qumran admission to the purificatory bath is conditional upon an already established conformity of life to righteousness: admission signifies an adequate level of achievement (see Gnilka, *RevQ* 3 [1961–62] 195). Dahl ("The Origin of Baptism," 39) stresses quite rightly that the need for a moral and spiritual purity was recognized in relation to the ritual cleansings dealt with in OT and rabbinic rules. But as in Qumran, this moral and spiritual rectitude is a precondition for, rather than being established in, the rite (Ps 24:3–4; 26:6; 73:13). Proselyte baptism has no early connection with repentance. In *Adam and Eve* 4–5 standing in water is an ascetic act of penance. Closest is *Sib. Or.* 4.162–69, which exhorts Gentiles in the late first century in view of the coming end of the world to leave their wicked ways, wash their whole bodies in ever-flowing streams, stretch their hands toward heaven, and seek God's forgiveness. The text may bring together the river of life of Zech 13:1; 14:8; Ezek 47, and the metaphorical language about washing oneself found in Isa 16:17; Jer 4:14 in reference to the renunciation of the evil of one's past life. Here, however, a background in pagan cultic washings (see Oepke, *TDNT* 4:295–300, esp. 297) is also possible, and the implication is that turning away from wickedness and observing cultic purity provide a basis for entreating God for forgiveness. In the *Sibylline Oracles* it is uncertain whether an actual rite is envisaged, and even more so whether such a rite, if envisaged, was ever practiced.

The absence of close parallels makes it more difficult to decide whether the water of baptism primarily expresses repentance (as a turning away from evil—Isa 1:16–17; Jer 4:14) or the divine answer to repentance in the cleansing from sin (Ps 51:7–9; Isa 4:2–6; Ezek 36:25–26, 33; 37:23; Jer 38:8; cf. *Jub.* 1.23; Rev 7:14). However, John's active role in dispensing baptism (which the name *βαπτιστής*, "Baptist," already suggests) requires us to favor the second. This option is also supported by the parallel with Christian baptism (see Acts 22:16). The connection between baptism and forgiveness of sins is thus to be understood in relation to the OT imagery of a divine washing. In line with OT prophetic symbolism (e.g., Ezek 4–5), John used the waters of the Jordan to effect the eschatologically promised washing away of sin. His self-deprecating reference to the coming one (Luke 3:16–17) indicates, however, that he was

conscious of being unable to deliver all that such an eschatological cleansing implied.

John's baptism has also been understood as a symbolic submission to the coming judgment. This view is discussed at v 16.

Curiously, repentance and forgiveness of sins are rarely found together in the OT. Such a connection, however, may be found, though not with the same vocabulary, in 2 Kgdms 8:33-34, 48-50; Jer 43:3 (LXX) = 36:3 (MT).

The mode of John's baptism is probably immersion despite recent renewed support for effusion (E. Strommel, "Christliche Taufriten und antike Badesitten," *JAC* 2 [1959] 5-14; J. H. Emminghans, "Die Gruppe der frühchristlichen Dorfbaptisterien," *RQ* 55 [1960] 85-100; Schürmann, 156; I. H. Marshall, "The Meaning of the Verb 'To Baptize,'" *EvQ* 45 [1973] 130-40). It is clear, however, that ancient bathing practices frequently involved effusion, or effusion with partial immersion, and that in the case of John no special emphasis should be placed upon complete immersion. In any case, the baptized person becomes totally wet.

Christian baptism incorporates and transcends John's baptism (note in Acts 2:38 the same juxtaposition of repentance, baptism, forgiveness of sins, and even the receiving of the Spirit). Christian baptism looks back on the achievement of Jesus, is in his name, and bestows the Spirit. John's baptism anticipates the arrival of Jesus and prepares for the baptism of the Spirit. Christian baptism as a distinct phenomenon is post-Easter and is apparently practiced only upon those whose attachment to Jesus arises after Pentecost. The pattern is not at all consistently developed, but does this practice correspond to Luke's tendency to consider that prior to Pentecost the people who are responsive to Jesus are largely those who have already responded to John (see esp. Luke 7:29-30, 31-35; 20:1-8)?

It is not possible to withhold from John's baptism here a genuine offer and experience of forgiveness (as Schürmann, 159-60). But neither is it right to relegate repentance and forgiveness to being merely preparations and conditions for salvation (as Conzelmann, *Luke*, 228-29; followed by Thyen, "ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΑ ΜΕΤΑΝΟΙΑΣ," 131 n. 2). Repentance and forgiveness are essential, indeed central, parts of the salvation Jesus brings (Luke can summarize the Christian proclamation in just these terms [Luke 24:47; Acts 5:31 and cf. Acts 10:43; 13:38], and Jesus' ministry is heavily occupied with these matters [Luke 5:32; 15:7; 5:20-24; 7:47-49; and cf. 10:13; 11:32; 13:3, 5; 15:10]).

Here we are drawn into the complex interaction of the stages of the arrival of the kingdom of God. Each stage depends for its effectiveness on that yet to come (though this effectiveness does not wait for the next stage's arrival) and has its validity only in connection to an openness to and readiness for the next (cf. Acts 19:1-7). So while it is finally in the name and by the authority of Jesus that forgiveness may be dispensed (e.g., Luke 5:17-26; Acts 2:38; 5:31), John offers it ahead of time; while it is finally on reaching his heavenly throne, attained through suffering and death, that Jesus gains full kingly authority and power (Luke 19:12; 22:69; 24:26; Acts 2:30-36), nevertheless, Jesus' ministry already astonishes by the authority of his word (Luke 4:36), and indeed the power of his word to cast out demons demonstrates the presence already of the kingdom of God (11:20); though it is the return of Jesus which will

mark the full exercise of his authority as king in blessing and in judgment (Luke 19:12–27; 22:28–29; Acts 3:21; 10:42; 17:31), already from heaven through his name and the Spirit his rule is experienced in both blessing and judgment (e.g., Acts 2:33; 3:16; 5:1–11; 13:6–12).

Repentance and forgiveness are, nevertheless, not experienced identically at the various stages of this development. In the Baptist's ministry they take on distinctly the quality of readiness for the arrival of the Lord, as is indicated by the citation of Isa 40:3–5 and cf. Luke 3:15–17 and Acts 19:4. He who is prepared by John's baptism is ready to welcome the Lord. It is likely that in Luke 7:44–46 (cf. vv 29–30, 35) we have worked out the difference in the welcome given Jesus by one who has and one who has not received forgiveness through the ministry of John.

For further discussion concerning the nature and significance of John's baptism see below at v 16.

4 The importance of the category of fulfillment is already clear from the infancy narratives. The formula of citation here is unique. However, its component parts may be found in the LXX: in 2 Chr 35:12 we have *ὡς γέγραπται ἐν βιβλίῳ*, "as it stands written in the book"; in Tob 1:1 *βιβλος λόγων*, "book of the words." In connection with prophetic fulfillment there are similar citation formulae in Qumran texts (e.g., 4QFlor 1.12, 15).

A firm biblical (Ezek 20:33–38; Hos 2:14–23) and contemporary (CD 8.12–15; 1QS 9.20) tradition located the beginning of eschatological renewal in the wilderness (see U. W. Mauser, *Christ in the Wilderness: The Wilderness Theme in the Second Gospel and Its Basis in the Biblical Tradition* [Naperville, IL: Allenson, 1963]), sometimes in connection with the text from Isaiah which is quoted here (CD 8.12–15). This tradition is reflected in the composite quotation in Mark 1:2 (see Lane, *Mark*, 45–47), which prefaces Mark's quotation of Isa 40:3 and is reproduced in the same text form in Luke 7:27. John prepares for the kingdom of God in the wilderness. (Rese's suggestion [*Alttestamentliche Motive*, 169] that the voice is the word of God of v 2 finds some support in 1:76, but does not attend to the plural verbs of the quotation, requires reference to a more remote antecedent than the *κηρύσσω* of v 3, and is not the meaning in Luke's source.)

Once again transcending parallelism pertains between John and Jesus. Both are messengers, identified with key figures in texts from Isaiah (cf. 4:18–19).

The imagery is of a coming of the Lord (to Jerusalem; cf. Isa 40:2) by way of the wilderness. Only a perfect road will be fit for him to travel upon. The Baptist context provides a threatening edge to these words not present in their Isaianic context (cf. Isa 40:1–2, 9–11). Preparation has become a responsibility for personal readiness (as in CD 8.12–15), and the coming means both salvation and wrath (Luke 3:7, 9, 17). Despite John's work of preparation, Jerusalem proved unready for its time of visitation (19:41–44; see *Comment* at 19:44).

Luke has in mind the coming of Jesus, rather than directly a coming of God, so prefers the *τὰς τρίβους αὐτοῦ*, "his paths," of the Markan text to the *τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν*, "the paths of our God," of the LXX (following MT, לְלֶחֱנֵי, *l'lohênû*).

6 Luke extends the quotation so as to be able to include v 6. In view of the actual ministry of Jesus, v 6 helps to balance or moderate the rather stern

and threatening tone of vv 7-17: the fulfillment of the purposes of God is supremely in salvation and not in judgment. In light of 2:30 τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ, "the salvation of God," is to be understood in close connection to the person of Jesus, and the achievement realized in his coming and ministry (cf. Acts 28:28 and 31). For Luke the *πᾶσα σὰρξ*, "all flesh," echoes the universalism of 2:32.

Luke omits Isa 40:5a, *καὶ ὁφθήσεται ἡ δόξα Κυρίου*, "and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed." Glory does not characterize the public ministry of Jesus (cf. Luke 9:32) but is the outcome of his suffering (24:26) and will mark his return (21:27).

Explanation

The section 3:1-4:13 provides the immediate preparation for Jesus' public ministry. The synchronism of 3:1-2 marks the true beginning for Luke's narrative after the prehistory of the infancy narratives.

Luke accurately reconstructs, though without concern for completeness, the political configuration of the Palestine of this earlier period. His story has a Palestinian ambience, and the power structures of Palestine have an immediate relevance for his narrative. Although in a quite nonpolitical manner, they are fundamentally challenged by this new thing that begins with John the Baptist.

John's call to an active prophetic role is carefully dated as in Isa 6:1; Jer 1:2; Ezek 1:1-3, while the elaborate synchronism has its immediate analogue in the writings of ancient historians (e.g., Thucydides 2.2; Polybius 1.3). Luke's work belongs in both these worlds. The word of God came upon John as it had upon Jeremiah, according to the LXX text of Jer 1:1, and impelled him to action.

John establishes himself in an itinerant preaching ministry adjacent to the waters of the Jordan. Luke summarizes his ministry as "preaching a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins," which is strikingly similar to early Christian preaching (cf. Luke 24:47; Acts 2:38). Missing are the name of Jesus and the Spirit. Christian baptism incorporates and transcends John's baptism, and it is notably in this light that Luke reports John's ministry. From this perspective, Luke feels no need to address directly the tension between forgiveness already extended by John's baptism and forgiveness made possible through the coming of Jesus (Luke 5:24; 24:47; Acts 5:31; 13:38 etc.). John's baptism is the beginning of the Christian experience. From a salvation-historical point of view, there is a complex interaction of the stages of the arrival of the kingdom of God. Though effective immediately, each stage depends for its effectiveness on that yet to come and has its validity only in connection with an openness to and readiness for the next.

John's ministry is identified as fulfilling the prophecy of Isa 40:3-5, which spoke of a voice announcing the need for a perfect roadway from the wilderness into Jerusalem, along which the Lord is to come and bring salvation. Road building is treated as a metaphor for individual readiness, and the coming Lord is a messianic figure and not God himself (as originally in Isa 40:3). In the Baptist context Isa 40:3-5 has a threatening edge not evident in Isa 40.

In conformity with contemporary Jewish understanding of Isa 40 (see CD 8.12–15), and in line with a broad biblical and Jewish tradition that eschatological renewal would begin in the wilderness, John's ministry is given a wilderness setting.

Luke extends the quotation to v 6, but omits Isa 40:5a; glory does not characterize the public ministry of Jesus, but the presence of salvation does (cf. Luke 2:30).

The Preaching of John (3:7–18)

Bibliography

- Bammel, E.** "The Baptist in Early Christian Tradition." *NTS* 18 (1971–72) 95–128.
- Barnard, L. W.** "Matt. III.11 // Luke III.16." *JTS*, n.s., 8 (1957) 107.
- Best, E.** "Spirit-Baptism." *NovT* 4 (1960) 236–43.
- Brown, R. E.** "Three Quotations from John the Baptist in the Gospel of John." *CBQ* 22 (1960) 292–98.
- Brown, S.** "'Water-Baptism' and 'Spirit-Baptism' in Luke-Acts." *ATR* 59 (1977) 135–51.
- Brownlee, W. H.** "John the Baptist in the New Light of Ancient Scrolls." In *The Scrolls and the New Testament*, ed. K. Stendahl. London: SCM, 1957. 33–53.
- Dunn, J. D. G.** *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*. 8–22. ———. "Spirit-and-Fire Baptism." *NovT* 14 (1972) 81–92.
- Edsman, C.-M.** *Le baptême de feu*. ASNU 9. Leipzig/Uppsala: Lundequistska, 1940.
- Ellis, E. E.** "Present and Future Eschatology in Luke." *NTS* 12 (1965) 27–30.
- Flowers, H. J.** "With the Holy Ghost and Fire." *ExpTim* 64 (1952–53) 155–56.
- Glasson, T. F.** "Water, Wind, and Fire (Luke iii 16) and Orphic Initiation." *NTS* 3 (1956–57) 69–71.
- Grobel, K.** "'He That Cometh after Me.'" *JBL* 60 (1941) 397–401.
- Hamman, A.** "Le baptême par le feu: A propos de livres récents." *RSR* 8 (1951) 285–92.
- Imschoot, P. van.** "Baptême d'eau et baptême d'Esprit Saint." *ETL* 13 (1936) 653–66.
- Kraeling, C. H.** *John the Baptist*. New York: Scribner, 1951.
- Lachs, S. T.** "John the Baptist and His Audience." *Gratz College Annual of Jewish Studies* 4 (1975) 28–32.
- Laufen, R.** *Die Doppelüberlieferung der Logienquelle und des Markusevangeliums*. 93–125, 405–26.
- Lohmeyer, E.** "Von Baum und Frucht: Eine exegetische Studie zu Matth. 3, 10." *ZST* 9 (1931–32) 377–97.
- Manson, T. W.** "John the Baptist." *BJRL* 36 (1953–54) 395–412.
- Martin, F.** "Le baptême dans l'Esprit: Tradition du Nouveau Testament et vie de l'Église." *NRT* 106 (1984) 23–58.
- Nestle, E.** "Otterngzüchte." *ZMJ* 14 (1913) 267–68.
- Patzia, A. G.** "Did John the Baptist Preach a Baptism of Fire and the Holy Spirit?" *EvQ* 40 (1968) 21–27.
- Reicke, B.** "Die Verkündigung des Täufers nach Lukas." In *Jesus in der Verkündigung der Kirche*, ed. A. Fuchs. SNTU A/4. Linz, 1976. 50–61.
- Robinson, J. A. T.** "Elijah, John, and Jesus: An Essay in Detection." *NTS* 4 (1957–58) 263–81.
- Sahlin, J.** "Die Früchte der Umkehr: Die ethische Verkündigung Johannes des Täufers nach Lk 3:10–14." *ST* 1 (1948) 54–68.
- Schwarz, G.** "τὸ δὲ ἄχρον κατακαύσει." *ZNW* 72 (1981) 264–71.
- Seitz, O. J. F.** "What Do These Stones Mean?" *JBL* 79 (1960) 247–54.
- Treu, U.** "Otterngzücht." *ZNW* 50 (1959) 113–22.
- Trilling, W.** "Le message de Jean-Baptiste, Lc 3, 10–18." *AsSeign* 2/7 (1969) 65–74.

(And see also at 3:1–6.)

Translation

⁷He^a would say to the crowds who went out to be baptized by him, "Offspring of vipers! Who warned you to flee from the coming wrath? ⁸Bear, then, fruits^b worthy

of repentance. Do not even begin to say to yourselves, 'We have Abraham as our father.' For I say to you that God is able, out of these stones, to raise up children to Abraham. ⁹Indeed, the ax is already placed against the root of the trees. Every tree, then, that does not bear good fruit^c will be cut out and thrown into the fire."

¹⁰The crowds would ask him, "What, then, shall we do?" ¹¹He would respond, "He who has two tunics, let him share with him who does not have a tunic, and he who has food let him do likewise." ¹²Tax collectors also came to be baptized and they said to him, "Teacher, what should we do?" ¹³He said to them, "Collect no more than is appointed you." ¹⁴Soldiers were also asking him, "We as well, what should we do?" He said to them, "With no one practice extortion or unlawful exaction and be content with your wages."

¹⁵Since the People were in expectancy and all were questioning in their hearts about John: "Could he perhaps be the Christ?" ¹⁶John gave an answer to all, "I baptize you with water, but the one who is mightier than I is coming, of whom I am not worthy to unfasten the strap of the sandals. He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and fire. ¹⁷His winnowing fork is in his hand to clear his threshing-floor and to gather together the wheat into his granary; but the chaff he will burn with inextinguishable fire."

¹⁸Accordingly, he admonished the people in many different ways and evangelized them.

Notes

^a The οὐν which indicates some logical development from the preceding has not been rendered in translation here since the connection is less precise than any English rendering would allow.

^b The plural is a little awkward in English, but has been introduced by Luke to prepare for the multiple fruits of repentance in vv 10-14.

^c Δεσ and the Syriac read the pl. here, which is probably an accommodation to v 8. The omission of καλόν, "good," by P⁴, part of the Old Latin tradition, Irenaeus^{lat} etc. could be original.

Form/Structure/Setting

Where 3:3 describes John's ministry with a formula and vv 4-6 identify it as a fulfillment of Isa 40:3-5, vv 7-18 depict the Baptist's ministry in concrete terms. Vv 7-9 provide an example of the eschatological preaching of John; vv 10-14 illustrate the ethical quality of his message; vv 15-17 attest its messianic orientation (cf. Fitzmyer, 463). These sections are drawn together in the generalizing statement, v 18.

Vv 7-9 give the first clear instance in the Gospel that Luke and Matthew have a common source of tradition beyond Mark. Matt 3:7-10 in the Greek text has sixty (out of sixty-three) words in common, after a different introduction in the respective first half-verses. In vv 16-17 the tradition also preserved in Matt 3:11-12 is followed closely, with some influence from Mark 1:7 in v 16. The material in vv 10-14 is found only in Luke. Vv 15-16a and 18 are Lukan composition. In v 7a, ἐκπορευόμενοις, "going out," is not Lukan composition (against Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 366-67). An influence from Mark 1:5 is possible, but most likely Matthew has altered the original verb here (Matt 3:7), since for him the "going out" has already occurred in v 5. Luke's broad address for John's harsh words here is to be preferred to Matthew's restriction of the

words to the Pharisees and Sadducees, though the word *ὄχλοις*, “crowds,” is probably contributed by Luke. See *Comment* below. Bultmann’s view (*Synoptic Tradition*, 123, 134, and supported in part by Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 369–73), that vv 7–9 represent the later attribution to John of a Christian formulation, fails through lack of specifically Christian content and especially through lack of a believable setting for the harsh address and surprised and skeptical question of v 7 (see *Comment*).

With somewhat greater plausibility, the material in vv 10–14 has frequently been dismissed as a late Hellenistic construct (Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 145; Thyen, “ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΑ ΜΕΤΑΝΟΙΑΣ,” 101) perhaps composed by the evangelist himself (Loisy, 136). But Sahlin (*ST* 1 [1948] 55–59) has shown how well John’s instruction reflects an authentically Jewish ethic with its concern for the commandments of God and works of mercy, and Schürmann (169 and n. 53) has identified a set of non-Lukan word usages in the verses (while acknowledging extensive Lukan reformulation).

In vv 16–17, only the reference to the Holy Spirit has any right to be seriously questioned as properly belonging to the words of John. The issues of origin and meaning are here closely intertwined. In the *Comment* below it will be argued that John’s message requires for intelligible completeness some such reference as that found to the Holy Spirit in our present text.

Comment

Vv 7–22 have been read as a report of a single occasion of preaching and baptism (Schürmann, 162). However, the separate mention of the coming of tax collectors in v 12, the change in v 15 to *λαός*, “People,” after the *ὄχλοι*, “crowds,” of vv 7 and 10, and especially the, on such a view, intrusive verses 18–20, suggest that Luke’s concern is, rather, to characterize a more extensive ministry. John preaches a baptism, but Luke’s interest in him is as a preacher. So John’s baptizing activity never gets to occupy center stage.

7 *ἔλεγεν* (imperfect tense) is here reiterative: “he would say.” Only those not living in “the region all around the Jordan” (v 3) needed to “come out” (*ἐκπορευομένοις*) to see John. His reputation extended further than his preaching. Unlike Matthew and Mark, Luke does not specify the origin of the crowds, but the imagery of the verb (“come out”) depends here upon something like a civilization/wilderness contrast, though there is no indication that this has any significance for Luke. John’s ministry had a major public impact (cf. 7:24–26, 29; 9:19; 20:6; and esp. Josephus, *Ant.* 18.116–19). We might have expected *ἐκπορευομένοις*, “went out,” and *βαπτισθῆναι*, “to be baptized,” to be together, but Sahlin’s excision of *βαπτισθῆναι* (*Studien*, 24) is a drastic expedient, unwarranted in light of Luke’s tendency to dislocate words from their phrases and clauses (cf. Haenchen, *Acts*, 139 n. 3). An emphasis falls on *ἐκπορευομένοις*.

Γεννήματα ἐχιδνῶν, “offspring of vipers,” is harsh and abrupt. The imagery is similar to that in the LXX phrase *ἐκγονα ἀσπίδων*, “offspring of asps” (Isa. 11:8; 14:29; 30:6; cf. 59:5). Poisonous snakes constitute an evil threat to people. In view is the propensity to evil of those who are far away from God. Matthew narrows the address to Pharisees and Sadducees (Matt 3:7). With Luke’s wording, it is tempting to think in terms of a ministry of John initially restricted

to wilderness-dwellers, like those in the Qumran community, who were already alert to the need for renewal in the wilderness. John would be surprised and skeptical, at least at first, about this wider impact of his preaching and inclined to treat the response as of dubious sincerity. (This would suggest that the wider address of Luke's text is original.) This is better than treating flight from the wrath to come as an impossibility (see critique by Sahlin, *Studien*, 30-31, whose own view, however, is vulnerable because of his arbitrary and speculative textual reconstruction), and also than accommodating John to Hellenistic-Jewish Christian polemic against Israel (Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 371-74). Luke's interest, however, will be in the universal need for repentance (Luke 11:29; 13:1-5; cf. 11:13), and for baptismal repentance to be confirmed by subsequent life (cf. Acts 8:13; cf. vv 18-24). The intelligence of John's baptism has not come to these people from the lips of John ("who warned you"), but here they are seeking baptism. ὀργή, "wrath," is not a Lukan word (only here and 21:23). Here it links John with the OT prophetic threat of the day of the Lord as a day of great wrath (Zeph 1:14-15, 18; 2:1-2; cf. Amos 5:18-20; Isa 2:10-21; Mal 3:2-3, 19). John considered this day as about to break. What comes with Jesus is much more complex than John's expectation and shows a graciousness in God's ways not fully anticipated by John.

8 From this rather negative starting point, John proceeds to indicate something of what true repentance will mean for these crowds, if they indeed wish to flee from the coming wrath (οὐν, "then"). In OT usage bearing fruit is a blessing flowing from a relationship with God (2 Kgs 19:30; Ps 1:3; Jer 17:8). Here it is an obligation, rendering visible the change of heart involved in true repentance (cf. Luke 6:43-45). The idiom here ποιήσατε καρπούς (lit., "make fruits") is probably a Hebraism (Black, *Aramaic Approach*, 100-101). Only here (= Matt 3:8) and in Luke 23:41 and Acts 26:30 does the word ἄξιος, "worthy," express fittingness with respect to something already existing. Luke's plural καρπούς, "fruits" (Matthew has the singular), suits the interest of vv 10-14 in particular responses. Baptismal forgiveness is only a shelter for those who live out a readiness for the day of wrath. Neither baptism nor appeal to the merits of Abraham will substitute for the personal need of a right orientation to God and his will. Though often pleonastic (cf. Haenchen, *Acts*, 137 n. 4) ἀρχεσθαι, "to begin," should not be considered so here: "Do not even begin to say. . . ." (Plummer, 89; Schürmann, 165). Matthew's μὴ δόξητε λέγειν, "do not think of saying," is very similar in meaning. Complacency due to Abrahamic descent surfaces clearly in John 8:33-39. For the Jewish sources see Str-B, 1:116-21. Descent from Abraham confers no automatic racial superiority or inalienable birthright. God is not bound to the generational processes in remaining true to his promises, and physical descent does not guarantee one a place in their fulfillment (cf. Exod 32:9-10). The comparison is made with stones because (i) they are a feature of the wilderness landscape; (ii) in their lifelessness and uselessness to man, they dramatically illustrate the range of God's options; and (iii) the Aramaic word for stones (ܐܒܢܝܐ, 'abnayyā') allows a wordplay, since behind the τέκνα, "children," of the text probably stands the Aramaic ܒܢܝܐ, bēnayyā' ("sons"—cf. Dan 6:25 [LXX]).

9 καὶ is here a sentence adverb: "it is even the case that," as in 4:41 and was probably added by Luke. The felling of trees is a prophetic image of

judgment in Isa 6:13; 10:33–34 (cf. v 15); 32:19; Ezek 31:12; Dan 4:14; and cf. Luke 13:6–9. The immediately pressing (ἤδη, “already”) threat of judgment is best captured (with Schürmann, 166) by picturing the blade of the ax as placed against the lowest point of the exposed trunk (i.e., the root) in order rightly to judge the first swing of the felling operation. A single ax at the root of many trees does not make for good visual imagery, but suits the eschatological temper of John’s warning (Rev 14:15–16, 18–19; cf. Schürmann, 166). For the ax as symbol of judgment see esp. Isa 10:15. Similar to the “good fruit” here (and cf. 6:43) is the expectation of cultivated grapes good for wine-making in Isa 5:2 (cf. Jer 2:21; 11:16), but there is no imagery of Israel here (against Sahlin, *Studien*, 34–35; Grundmann, 103; Ellis, 89). Fire is a universal image of judgment, but here merely completes the imagery of disposal of the unwanted trees.

10 True repentance requires fruit, but what exactly is expected? How should life be lived in the last hours before the blade of the ax strikes? Do the normal affairs of life lose their claim? Luke answers these questions with some exemplary fragments of John’s practical ethical instruction. These Luke introduces with a characteristic “What shall we do?” question (10:25; 18:18; Acts 2:37; 16:30; 22:10)—a means used by Luke to underline the need for practical personal response.

11 Despite John’s own detachment from society, he does not stand over against normal life in society. Unlike the classical OT prophets, he does not address the society as such, so there is not here a fundamental questioning of the structures of society, nor the exposure of unjust class behavior, nor a call for community action. However, over against Qumran apocalypticism, there is no call to leave society for a holy remnant, nor to leave behind the normal engagements of life for an exclusive attention to holy matters. Repentance bears its fruit in relationships between individuals in society. This focus on the individual in relationship to others is also characteristic of Jesus, who does, however, also address the society as a whole (Luke 13:6–9, 34–35; 19:41–44, 45–46; 21:5–24).

The accusation that these ethics are bourgeois is terribly misplaced. John calls for a radical generosity in which everything beyond subsistence necessities is vulnerable to the claim of need. Jesus asks for no more. He adds only the clarification that such generosity is not only for those of one’s own group, but shows its true nature especially in being extended to the enemy (Luke 6:35–36). A χιτών is a garment worn next to the skin. It may be worn alone or covered by a ἱμάτιον, “cloak.” The second here represents a change of clothing, held in reserve. John’s call is the prophetic demand for ὤπ, *hesed* (“loving kindness”), writ large (Mic 6:8; Hos 4:1; cf. Tob 4:8, 11), and the rabbinic requirement of acts of charity pressed to its extreme (*Gen. Rab.* 30; *b. Beṣa* 32b; *b. Ber.* 5a—cf. Sahlin, *ST* 1 [1948] 55–58).

12 As for John, acts of mercy and keeping of the commandments are the two major categories for rabbinic ethics. Where, for the rabbis, works of mercy supplement the fundamental duty of keeping the commandments (Schürmann, 168 n. 50), in the new Christian perspective already exemplified by John love of neighbor occupies the fundamental place and helps to clarify the meaning and application of the commandments. Luke does not picture

the tax collectors stepping forward from the crowds. Rather, they also have come, just as the crowds have, and put the same question. The taxes involved are those upon the sale and movement of goods. The system involved the auctioning of the taxing privilege to the highest bidder (the chief tax-collector) who had considerable latitude to guarantee the profitability of the venture for himself. He would employ agents (*τελῶναι*, "tax collectors"), probably on a commission basis. John is called "teacher" as one who instructs in the way of righteousness. Jesus is also frequently addressed as teacher (see at 7:40).

13 There is considerable evidence that the taxing system was shot through with graft and corruption. The Gospel's image of the tax collector is uniformly negative (e.g., Luke 5:30; 7:34; 15:1; 18:13). Various governmental attempts at regulation also indicate the extent of the problems (see O. Michel, *TDNT* 8:88-105; J. R. Donahue, "Tax Collectors and Sinners: An Attempt at Identification," *CBQ* 33 [1971] 39-61). Once again John's call is not to bourgeois respectability. Tax collectors had to work in a social context whose very structures were defined by graft and corruption. The honest tax-collector would face problems akin to those faced today by a businessman seeking to operate without graft in relation to the bureaucracies of certain countries. *πράσσειν*, normally "to do or accomplish," has a technical usage in connection with the collecting of taxes (also at 19:23).

14 These will not be gentile soldiers. They could be Jewish mercenaries, or Jewish men enlisted in the service of Herod Antipas, but it is perhaps best (with Lagrange, 110) to be guided by the association with tax collectors and to think in terms of police assigned to protect tax collectors. These police would then belong in the same corrupt social context as the tax collectors (note that *συκοφαντεῖν* is used in Luke 19:8 in connection with the tax collector Zacchaeus). A comparison with another group is reflected by the *καὶ ἡμεῖς*, "we also." Both verbs (*διασειήσητε* and *συκοφαντήσητε*) involve extortion. The former is the more violent, if a distinction is to be drawn, but they often occur together as synonyms and no clear separation is necessary. It is likely that the difficulty of implementing John's directive was compounded by levels of pay that tended to assume unlawful supplement (H. W. Heidland, *TDNT* 5:592). *ὀψωνίοις* may be wages or provisions. C. C. Caragounis ("ΟΨΩΝΙΟΝ: A Reconsideration of Its Meaning," *NovT* 16 [1974] 35-57) prefers the meaning "provisions," but the decentralization involved in police protection would favor the sense "wages."

15 Luke thinks of an expectancy (*προσδοκῶντος*) stirred by John's preaching of imminent eschatological judgment. Luke is soon to introduce Jesus as one who brings what he heralds (see 4:18-19). Is the same true for John? A sense that the end-time judgment was already (*ἤδη*, 3:9) being unleashed and the eschatological forgiveness (3:3) dispensed by John in his baptism raises the question of John's own role in this eschatological process. *τοῦ λαοῦ*, "the People," here is not merely an alternative means of designating the crowds which streamed out to John. In view is Israel as God's people, the recipients of his promise (see 1:33, 68, 77; 2:10, 32). Nothing in John's ministry attracts thought of a Davidic messiah, but Luke formulates the question this way because of the pattern of transcending parallelism that he uses to relate John and Jesus (see at 3:3 and chaps. 1 and 2 *passim*). For a discussion of messianic expectation

see at 2:11. Luke shows no necessary concern about a contemporary Baptist sect (against Schürmann, 170).

Luke may have substituted v 15 for some previous form of introduction, since the *εἰς μετάνοιαν*, "for repentance," of Matt 3:11 looks like an addition designed to bind together the materials of vv 7–10 and vv 11–12 (note *τῆς μετανόιας*, "of repentance," in v 8 and cf. v 2), which suggests that Matthew has brought these previously separate materials together.

16 Luke establishes the fundamental importance of what is to follow by describing it as an answer given to "all" (*πᾶσιν*), that is, all Israel, not simply all the people present on a particular occasion. Since John preaches the gospel (*εὐηγγελίζετο*, v 18 and cf. 1:77), his message is not complete without reference to the savior (cf. Acts 19:4). John contrasts his own water baptism with the Spirit-and-fire baptism of the one who is coming. Already the media suggest their own contrast, but this is heightened by John's insistence that his own inferiority to the coming baptizer is such that what was too demeaning for a Hebrew slave to do for his master (Str-B, 1:121) was for John in relation to the coming one a privilege quite beyond reach (cf. Luke 7:28). Without v 15 the statement of contrast would only be a pedestal (Schürmann, 172) upon which to place John's description of the role of the coming one (as in Matt 3:11–12). The presence of the question of v 15 focuses attention on the contrast and especially upon the limited significance of John. John locates himself prior to the apocalyptic crisis point: the final stage and true apocalyptic transcendence belong to another.

Luke brings *ὕδατι*, "with water," forward to the emphatic position: "only with water." The clause here comes from the tradition shared with Matthew, but for *ἔρχεται . . . τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ*, "there is coming . . . of his sandals," Luke switches to his Markan source. To this he adds a *δέ*, "and/but," for transition, omits *κύβας*, "having bent down," as fulsome, and omits as well *ὀπίσω μου*, "after me." This last omission is not to avoid any suggestion that Jesus had been a disciple of John (as Grobel, *JBL* 60 [1941] 400; Conzelmann, *Luke*, 24, for whose threefold structuring of the Gospel, the omission, if not taken in this sense, is an embarrassment; and cf. Schürmann, 173 n. 77), nor is it to signal Jesus' presence in the crowd (as Schürmann, 173). Rather, it is a natural omission after the infancy narratives (Schlatter, 477) to avoid any tension with their insistence on the presence already of the savior. With *ὀπίσω μου*, "after me," gone, *ἔρχεται ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου*, "the one mightier than I is coming," must be read closely with v 15 and its suggestion that John might be the Christ. Otherwise, it provides an insipidly weak introduction for the absolute contrast about to be expressed, which because of the *μου*, "than I," cannot be rectified by appeal to the hope for a coming mighty one (2 Thess 1:9; Rev 5:12; Isa 11:2 and *Comment* at Luke 11:22).

It has been maintained that John anticipated a coming of God, and no messianic figure (Thyen, "ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΑ ΜΕΤΑΝΟΙΑΣ," 100), but this is hardly justified since as S. Brown (*ATR* 59 [1977] 136) points out, such an understanding requires an unparalleled anthropomorphism: God's sandals (but cf. Pss 60:8; 108:9).

After *τῶν ὑποδημάτων αὐτοῦ*, "his sandals," Luke switches back to the tradition shared with Matthew. On the basis of Acts 19:1–7, and because no text identifying the messiah as the dispenser of the Spirit can be confidently dated before

the Christian period (but see *T. Levi* 18.26-28; *T. Jud.* 24.2-3), and, in the case of Bultmann, because he sees reflected in the phrase an understanding of Christian (water) baptism as a dispensing of the Spirit (*Synoptic Tradition*, 246-47), the reference to the Spirit here is frequently taken as a Christian gloss (cf. Best, *NovT* 4 [1960] 236, 239). However, Acts 19:1-7 proves too much: the people there had not even heard that there was a Holy Spirit(!) and so their connection to Judaism (and therefore to John) is strangely remote; a Spirit-dispensing messiah is already only a small step from the OT expectation of a Spirit-anointed messiah (Isa 11:2; cf. 42:1 and 61:1) and of an eschatological outpouring of the Spirit (Isa 32:15; 44:3; Ezek 36:27; 37:14; 39:29; Joel 2:28), and may be even a smaller one in light of Qumran speculation about the messiah (see esp. 1QIs^a 52:14-15 and the discussions of Brownlee, "John the Baptist," and Dunn, *NovT* 14 [1972] 81-92); and Bultmann exaggerates the connection between Christian water baptism and the Spirit: in both texts where a reference to baptizing in the Spirit is taken up in Acts, there is no close connection with water baptism (Acts 1:5; 11:16). Further, and more important than any of these considerations, is the effect of this removal of reference to the Spirit on the nature of John's comparison of himself with the coming one: the coming one will be greater only in representing a greater threat by the judgment that he brings. This cannot be satisfactory. John's baptism, while it involves being forced to face up to hard realities and while it provides no cheap alternative to moral authenticity, is fundamentally a gracious activity. And the contrast between the baptisms, while radical with respect to degree, cannot be read as a contrast of opposition (cf. Dunn, *NovT* 14 [1972] 86).

Kraeling (*John the Baptist*, 117-18) is able in part to bypass this line of reasoning by bringing John's baptism within the orbit of judgment as a rite symbolizing submission to judgment: ritual submission releases one by sacramental efficacy from the admittedly deserved judgment of fiery destruction to come. John brings in symbol what the mightier one brings in fiery reality. Certainly a case may be made for the use of the language of baptism in connection with the undergoing of an ordeal: a being overwhelmed (see A. Oepke, *TDNT* 1:530). But this well-established Hellenistic usage is not reflected in the LXX, can at most in the NT be claimed for Luke 12:50 (Mark 10:38-39), and lacks any Semitic antecedent. Since Christian baptism is undoubtedly based on an imagery of cleansing (Acts 22:16; 1 Pet 3:21), we should not understand John's baptism in quite a different way.

What, then, did John anticipate when he announced a coming baptism in Spirit and fire? The main options canvassed have been (i) to identify fire and Spirit and to think of an inflaming, purifying work of the Holy Spirit; (ii) to find here alternative baptisms: fiery destruction for the impenitent, the gift of the Spirit to those who repent; (iii) to view the Spirit not in Christian terms, but as a strong wind of judgment ("wind," "breath," and "spirit" are all possible translations for πνεῦμα/ΠΙΤ, *rûah*; (iv) to treat "and with fire" (καὶ πυρὶ) as a Christian interpretation pointing to the Pentecostal fulfillment. (For these alternatives and their supporters see Dunn, *NovT* 14 [1972] 81-83.) (i) makes a poor connection with v 17; (ii) must be read into the text, which speaks rather of a single baptism ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρὶ, "in Holy Spirit and fire"; (iii) stands in tension with the gracious purpose of John's baptism (as above); the

difficulty with (iv) is that the Pentecost fulfillment does not really have a baptism with fire (Acts 2:3).

Better than any of these suggestions is the view that sees in both Spirit and fire the means of eschatological purgation experienced by the penitent as purification in the refiner's fire and by the godless as destruction by wind and fire (Dunn, *NovT* 14 [1972] 87, followed by Fitzmyer, 474). Jer 4:11–12 (and cf. 13:24) uses the imagery of winnowing to speak of the double possibility in the wind. רוּחַ, *rûah* ("spirit/wind/breath"), is a means of purgative cleansing in Isa 4:4 and a means of judgment in Isa 11:4; 29:6; 30:28; 57:13; Ezek 13:13 and cf. Isa 40:24; Jer 23:19; 30:23. At Qumran also the Spirit is spoken of in connection with images of purgation and refining (1QS 3.7–9; 4.20–21; 1QH 16.12). The double possibility for the fire is present in the imagery of the refiner's fire which destroys the dross, but purifies the precious metals (cf. Isa 1:25; 36:9; Zech 13:9; Mal 3:2–3).

The fulfillment is not necessarily as the expectation. Baptism with the Spirit is claimed for the Pentecostal event and its repetitions (Acts 1:5; 11:16). The Pentecostal Spirit for the most part confers a certain intimacy of relationship with God (Acts 2; 10:46 etc.) and strengthens for a resolute stand and witness for Christ (Acts 1:8; 4:31; Luke 12:12; 24:48–49). However, the Holy Spirit is also witness (Acts 5:32), and Luke will understand this in terms of the tangible presence of the power of God in the church and the individual Christian (Acts 2:6–12 [cf. v 33], 43 [cf. v 47]; 4:13, 16 etc.). The deaths of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:1–11) should be understood in this way (see v 11) and seen as a purging work of the Spirit.

No such direct fulfillment is claimed for the fire baptism. However, Luke 9:54 and 12:49 should be read in this connection: the purging fires are to be seen not in a fire from heaven that removes all opposition and difficulty (9:52–55), but rather in the strife of the final period which sets people in sharp opposition to one another (12:49–53) and in relation to which refinement occurs through painful and costly decisions made and stands taken (14:26–33; 12:8–12). A final eschatological climax is reserved (17:29 and cf. 18:8; 21:25–26, 36).

17 Luke continues to follow his source closely (cf. Matt 3:12). He improves the syntax by using the infinitives *διακαθαῖραι*, "to clean out," and *συναγαγεῖν*, "to gather together," for the future verbs of the Matthew text, and makes a stylistic improvement by transferring αὐτοῦ, "his," from σῖτον, "wheat," to ἀποθήκην, "granary." Luke's tightening of the syntax also adds precision to the imagery. The winnowing which makes it possible to gather up separately the grain and the chaff has already been done. The winnowing-fork is now to be used for shoveling up the grain to be taken off to the granary (Schürmann, 177–78). The interest here is not, however, in a whole harvest process, with the point being made that its terminal phase is about to occur. Rather, the concern is with an immediately impending final separation which is likened to the final phase of the gathering of the fruits of the harvest. The urgency is the same as that of v 9, but here the emphasis is much more positive. Nevertheless, he who gathers the grain will also burn the chaff. It is burnt on the spot; it has no further use. ἀσβέστω, "inextinguishable," underlines the finality and irreversibility of what is to happen. The word protrudes from

the imagery as an allegorical element. Schürmann (178) is probably correct that the image of the eternal fire of punishment shines through that of the inextinguishable fire (cf. Isa 34:10; 66:24; Jdt 16:17; Matt 18:8; 25:41; Mark 9:43, 48; Jude 7; Rev 14:10-11).

18 Luke adds a generalizing statement (cf. 4:14-15, 43). We have been given only a characterization of John's ministry through exemplary fragments. The stern challenge of John's address is indicated by the use of *παρακαλεῖν* (here: "to admonish"); the gospel content, albeit ahead of time, is caught by the use of *εὐαγγελίεσθαι*, "to evangelize/proclaim good news."

Explanation

The Baptist's ministry is now depicted in concrete terms through a series of exemplary fragments.

John's reputation extended far beyond his preaching and crowds would come out (uninvited) to participate in his baptism. John spoke to them severely and questioned the sincerity of this mass movement he had precipitated. Addressing them as offspring of vipers, John is as skeptical of their readiness for repentance as Jeremiah had been before him (Jer 13:23) about an earlier generation of the inhabitants of Judah. When John had spoken of the coming day of wrath these crowds had not been the target of his message!

He will not, however, exclude them from baptism. Rather, he calls them to the fruits that will make visible the change of heart involved in true repentance (cf. Luke 6:43-45). Baptismal forgiveness is only a shelter for those who will live out a readiness for the day of wrath. In a similar way, descent from Abraham confers no automatic racial superiority or inalienable birthright. God is not bound. The need is for decision and change. No false confidence will preserve from the cut of the ax which has already been positioned to strike. There is an urgent need for fruit. The unfruitful trees will be promptly disposed of in the fire.

How, then, is life to be lived in these last moments before the ax strikes? The crowds ask for direction. According to John's answer the fruits of repentance are to be sought not in apocalyptic detachment from the world, nor in an exclusive attention to holy matters, but rather, repentance bears its fruits in relationships between individuals in society. But John's ethics are hardly bourgeois. He calls for a radical generosity in which everything beyond subsistence necessities is vulnerable to the claim of need. John's call is the prophetic demand for "loving kindness" (Mic 6:8; Hos 4:1) writ large and the rabbinic requirement of acts of charity pressed to its extreme.

If John's address to the crowds stresses acts of mercy, then his requirement for tax collectors and soldiers stresses the other major category of rabbinic ethics: keeping the commandments. In a social setting whose very structures are defined by graft and corruption, tax collectors and the soldiers assigned for their protection are to remain scrupulously honest to their own hurt. Their positions must not be used to extract a surcharge on the set rate of taxes. They must not practice extortion.

John's preaching of judgment stirs up eschatological expectancy, which Luke expresses in view of the parallelism he has established between Jesus and John

as a questioning whether John might be the Christ. John's response is a witness to all Israel. He contrasts his own baptism (only with water) with the role of the one who is coming. Whatever claim to distinction John might have, the one who is mightier than he is coming. True apocalyptic transcendence belongs only to this one. John established the degree of difference between the two figures by suggesting that what was beneath the dignity of a Hebrew slave to do for his master was for John in relation to the coming one a privilege beyond all possibility.

This transcendentally exalted one will baptize with Spirit and fire. Both Spirit and fire are in this image means of eschatological purgation experienced by the penitent as purification in the refiner's fire and by the godless as destruction by tempest and fire. The fulfillment is not necessarily as the expectation. Baptism with the Spirit is claimed for the Pentecostal outpouring (Acts 1:5), but the presence of the Spirit is also to be found in every tangible presence of the power of God in the church. The deaths of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:1–11) should be understood as a purging work of the Spirit. The purging fires are to be seen not as fire from heaven that sweeps away all that opposes God's purposes (Luke 9:52–55), but rather in the strife of the final period (12:49–53) which refines the godly. A final eschatological climax is reserved (17:29 and cf. 18:8; 21:25–26, 36).

The coming one is set to separate, as at the end of the threshing and winnowing process, the wheat and the chaff. The focus is on the good fruit of the harvest, gathered in joy into the granary. However, there is also the chaff. Of no further use, it is burned on the spot. John's words go beyond imagery to allegorical application with the word "inextinguishable," and in turn the inextinguishability of this fire points one in all likelihood to the eternal fires of judgment.

The section ends with a generalizing statement which underlines the twin nature of John's ministry as stern admonition and the preaching of good news.

The Imprisonment of John (3:19–20)

Translation

¹⁹But Herod the tetrarch, when he was reprov'd by him concerning Herodias, the wife of his brother, and concerning all the evil things which he did, ²⁰added this also to them all:^a he shut up John in prison.

Notes

^aX² A C L W Θ Ψ etc. avoid the asyndeton by adding καί, "and."

Form/Structure/Setting

These verses are closely tied to the summary generalization of John's ministry by means of a μὲν . . . δέ ("on the one hand . . . on the other hand") construc-

tion. They serve the purpose of rounding off the story of John before the spotlight falls on Jesus. This is a literary technique familiar already at 1:56 and cf. 1:66 and its relationship to vv 67–79 and the chronological anticipation of 4:37–38. S. Giet (“Un procédé littéraire d’exposition: l’anticipation chronologique,” *Revue des études augustinienne*s 2 [1956] 243–49) has demonstrated that chronological anticipation was a common procedure in antiquity. There is no attempt to eliminate John from Jesus’ baptism as a way of marking the sharp separation between the epochs of salvation occupied by the respective figures (as Conzelmann, *Luke*, 21, and many). Already in Mark (1:14) John’s ministry concludes before Jesus’ begins. Luke simply carries this through to a literary separation of the sections of his account devoted to the two figures. For Luke, John is a transitional figure: the infancy narratives and 3:3–6 above have already identified John as a figure of fulfillment; he is so, however, only in a provisional and preliminary manner.

No source beyond Mark 1:14 and 6:17–18 is visible. Luke provides only the most skeletal account of the fact and circumstances of John’s arrest. (That the nature of John’s reproof of Herod is unintelligible on the basis of Luke 3:19 alone is probably to be attributed to oversummarizing rather than to the assumption of reader knowledge.) Luke spares extra words only to emphasize the wickedness of Herod over against the goodness of John (against Schürmann, 184, who sets the contrast between Herod and the people).

Comment

Luke completes the story of John with a brief account of his imprisonment at the hands of Herod Antipas.

19 The activities of the two principals (Herod and John) are set in contrast by a μέν . . . δέ (“on the one hand . . . on the other hand”) construction. Following on from the use of the cognate verb at v 1, Luke replaces Mark’s βασιλεύς, “king” (6:14), with the more accurate τετραάρχης, “tetrarch.” He uses ἐλεγχόμενος, “being reproofed,” for Mark’s colorless ἐλεγεν, “he said.” He simplifies Mark’s awkwardly expressed reason for the arrest, contenting himself with a statement that the reproof was concerning (περί) Herodias, the wife of his brother. (Herodias, the daughter of Antipas’ half-brother Aristobulus, had been married to another half-brother, Herod. Antipas had put away his first wife in order to marry Herodias, in whose affections he had usurped Herod’s place. John’s criticism of Antipas’ marital situation would be based on Lev 18:16 and 21:21.) Luke also broadens the reproof by adding a reference to “all the evil things” that Antipas had done (περί πάντων, “concerning all,” occurs seven times in Luke-Acts). Luke emphasizes the wickedness of Herod over against the goodness of John. John is not the only figure in Luke’s writings whose pointed criticism of evil is his undoing (Luke 4:28; 20:19; Acts 7:54, etc.). Opposition and rejection is by those who do not want to hear the truth.

20 Luke identifies Antipas’ imprisonment of John as yet another in the series of wicked deeds (not the crowning wickedness [cf. Acts 4:27]—against Fitzmyer, 476). The use of προστιθέναι, “to add,” is not a Septuagintalism (against Marshall, 149). The usage is perfectly good Hellenistic Greek (see, e.g., Josephus, *War* 3.379), while the presence of the τοῦτο, “this,” and the absence of

a connecting *καί*, "and," between the verbs separate this usage from the Septuagintal (Judg 11:14 [B reading]; 2 Sam 18:22). *κατακλείειν*, "to shut up," is used in the NT only here and in Acts 26:10.

Explanation

Luke completes his account of John by placing here a brief account of John's imprisonment before he shifts his focus onto Jesus. It is the sparest of accounts except for its underlining of the wickedness of Antipas in contrast to the goodness of John. Antipas is accused specifically of marital irregularity and generally of many wicked deeds. John's pointed criticism of Antipas elicits one more deed of wickedness: the imprisonment of John. According to a pattern to be reiterated (Luke 4:28; 20:19; Acts 7:54, etc.) opposition to Jesus and rejection of his message is by those who do not want to hear the truth.

Jesus: Endowed with the Spirit and Affirmed as Son (3:21–22)

Bibliography

Barrett, C. K. *Holy Spirit*. 34–45. **Beasley-Murray, G. R.** *Baptism in the New Testament*. 45–67 (see at 3:1–6). **Bouman, H.** "The Baptism of Christ with Special Reference to the Gift of the Spirit." *CTM* 28 (1957) 1–14. **Braun, H.** "Entscheidende Motive in den Berichten über die Taufe Jesu von Markus bis Iustin." *ZTK* 50 (1953) 39–43. **Bretscher, P. G.** "Exodus 4:22–23 and the Voice from Heaven." *JBL* 87 (1968) 301–11. **Burkitt, F. C.** "The Baptism of Jesus." *ExpTim* 38 (1926–27) 198–202. **Chevallier, M.-A.** *L'Esprit et le Messie dans le bas-judaïsme et le NT*. 57–67, 71–72. ———. "L'apologie du baptême d'eau à la fin du premier siècle: Introduction secondaire de l'étiologie dans les récits du baptême de Jésus." *NTS* 32 (1986) 528–43. **Collins, R. F.** "Luke 3:21–22, Baptism or Anointing." *TBT* 84 (1976) 821–31. **Davies, W. D.** *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount*. 35–45. **Dennison, C. G.** "How Is Jesus the Son of God? Luke's Baptism Narrative and Christology." *CTJ* 17 (1982) 6–25. **Dömer, M.** *Das Heil Gottes*. 45–49. **Dunn, J. D. G.** *Baptism in the Holy Spirit*. 23–37. **Dupont, J.** "'Filius meus es tu.'" *RSR* 35 (1948) 522–43. **Feuillet, A.** "Le symbolisme de la colombe dans les récits évangéliques du baptême." *RSR* 46 (1958) 524–44. ———. "Le baptême de Jésus." *RB* 71 (1964) 321–52. **Garnet, P.** "The Baptism of Jesus and the Son of Man Idea." *JNST* (1980) 49–65. **Gero, S.** "The Spirit as Dove at the Baptism of Jesus." *NovT* 18 (1976) 17–35. **Gils, F.** *Jésus prophète d'après les évangiles synoptiques*. 49–73. **Hahn, F.** *The Titles of Jesus in Christology*. 337–41. **Hartman, L.** "Taufe, Geist, und Sohnschaft: Traditionsgeschichtliche Erwägungen zu Mk 1, 9–11 par." In *Jesus in der Verkündigung der Kirche*, ed. A. Fuchs. SNTU A/4. Linz, 1976. 89–109. **Jeremias, J.** *New Testament Theology*. 49–56. **Keck, L. E.** "The Spirit and the Dove." *NTS* 17 (1970–71) 41–67. **Kosnetter, J.** *Die Taufe Jesu*. Theologische Studien der österreichisch Leo-Gesellschaft 35. Vienna: Mayer, 1936. **Légasse, S.** "Le baptême de Jésus et le baptême chrétien." *SBFLA* 27 (1977) 51–68. **Légault, A.** "Le baptême de Jésus et la doctrine du Serviteur souffrant." *ScEcll* 13 (1961) 147–66. **Lentzen-Deis, F.-L.** *Die Taufe Jesu nach den Synopti-*

kern: Literarkritische und gattungsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen. Frankfurter theologische Studien 4. Frankfurt am M.: J. Knecht, 1970. ———. "The Gospel between Myth and Historicity—As Demonstrated in the Accounts about the Baptism of Jesus." *TantY* (1980–81) 165–86. **Marshall, I. H.** "Son of God or Servant of Yahweh?" *NTS* 15 (1968–69) 326–36. **Michel, O.,** and **Betz, O.** "Von Gott gezeugt." In *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche*, FS J. Jeremias, ed. W. Eltester. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1960. 3–23. **Plooij, D.** "The Baptism of Jesus." In *Amicitiae Corolla*, FS J. R. Harris. London: University of London, 1933. 239–52. **Potterie, I. de la.** "L'Onction du Christ: Étude de théologie biblique." *NRT* 80 (1958) 225–52. = "The Anointing of Christ." In *Word and Mystery: Biblical Essays on the Person and Mission of Christ*, ed. L. J. O'Donovan. Glen Rock, NY: Newman, 1968. 155–84. **Roulin, P.,** and **Carton, G.** "Le baptême du Christ." *BVC* 25 (1959) 39–48. **Sabbe, M.** "Le baptême de Jésus." In *De Jésus aux évangiles*, ed. I. de la Potterie. BETL 25. Gembloux: Duculot, 1967. 184–211. **Schlier, H.** "Die Verkündigung der Taufe Jesu nach den Evangelien." *Besinnung auf das Neue Testament*. 2nd ed. Freiburg im B.: Herder, 1964. 212–18. **Schreiner, J.** "Geistbegabung in der Gemeinde von Qumran." *BZ* 9 (1965) 161–80. **Seethaler, P.** "Die Taube des heiligen Geistes." *BibLeb* 4 (1963) 115–30. **Stegner, W. R.** "The Baptism of Jesus: A Story Modeled on the Binding of Isaac." *BRev* 1 (1985) 36–46. **Suder, R. N.** "Epiphany Texts and the Akedah." *LTSM* 62 (1982) 3–7. **Turner, C. H.** "Ο ΥΙΟΣ ΜΟΤ Ο ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ." *JTS*, o.s., 27 (1926) 113–29. **Uprichard, R. E. H.** "The Baptism of John." *IBS* 3 (1981) 187–202. **Vögtle, A.** *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien.* Kommentare und Beiträge zum Alten und Neuen Testament. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1971. 314–17, 335–42. **Voss, G.** *Die Christologie der lukanischen Schriften in Grundzügen.* 83–94. **Williams, G. O.** "The Baptism in Luke's Gospel." *JTS*, o.s., 45 (1944) 31–38.

Translation

²¹When all the people had been baptized, and Jesus had been baptized and was praying, it happened that heaven opened ²²and the Holy Spirit came down with a bodily form like that of a dove, upon him, and a voice came from heaven, "You are my beloved Son; in you I have come to delight."^a

Notes

^a There are several variant readings for the words from heaven, the most important of which, *υἱός μου εἰ σὺ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε*, "you are my Son, today I have begotten you," is read by D, much of OL, and is supported by early patristic texts. This reading is discussed under *Comment* below.

Form/Structure/Setting

From this point on Luke's story focuses on Jesus. Where the ministry of John in its entirety prepares for the coming ministry of Jesus, the baptismal identification and endowment with the Spirit along with the period of testing in the wilderness are the divine preparation of Jesus for his ministry.

This pericope is linked to the genealogy and the temptation accounts to follow by the Son of God theme (3:22, 38; 4:3, 9)—to the latter also by the reference to the Spirit (3:22; 4:1, 18). It is tied to the account of John's ministry by reference to baptism (3:3, 7, 12, 16, 21).

No sharp separation of Jesus from John is intended (against Conzelmann, *Luke*, 21; and see discussion above at 3:19–20). John is no more separated

from the baptism of Jesus than he is from the baptism of all the people! Unlike Mark (1:9) and especially Matthew (3:13–15), Luke does not report the baptism of Jesus but rather the opening of heaven which happens after all the baptisms, including that of Jesus.

The episode is reported by Luke in one long and complex sentence which focuses attention on the chain of events expressed by the three parallel infinitive verbs *ἀνεωχθῆναι*, *καταβῆναι*, and *γενέσθαι* (“to be opened,” “to come down,” and “to happen [come]”).

Although the temptation tradition shared by Luke with Matthew (Luke 4:1–13; Matt 4:1–11) probably assumes a prior baptismal declaration as Son, there is no indication that Luke has used any source here beyond Mark (1:9–11).

The historicity of Jesus’ baptism by John cannot be doubted, if only because of the evident perplexity about the event reflected in early Christian tradition (esp. Matt 3:14–15). Neither is there any reason not to trace the beginning of Jesus’ public activity to his encounter with John’s apocalyptic ministry. Against all likely developmental trends the tradition reports Jesus’ extremely high estimation of John (Luke 7:24–28a, 33–35).

An estimation of the historicity of the voice from heaven is finally beyond the scope of critical inquiry. Something set Jesus apart from all the other baptismal penitents! The particular content of that something takes us into the realm of Jesus’ messianic consciousness. The synoptic traditions obviously assume some such consciousness, though there is no particular interest in drawing attention to it as a psychological phenomenon. The perspective is that of Christian affirmation.

A growing willingness may be noted in contemporary scholarship to ground the early church’s Christological affirmations much more thoroughly in pre-resurrection phenomena through a recognition that (i) already in his lifetime Jesus elicited distinctive responses from others (cf. W. Marxsen, *The Beginnings of Christology: A Study in Its Problems*, tr. P. J. Achtemeier [FBBS 22; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1969]); (ii) the nature of Jesus’ challenge (Mark 8:38) contained already an implicit Christology (this point, already noted by Bultmann, became the point of departure for E. Käsemann in the essay [available in ET as “The Problem of the Historical Jesus,” *Essays on New Testament Themes* (London: SCM, 1964) 15–47] that gave the impetus for the new quest of the historical Jesus, which in turn has identified implicit Christology in a number of features of Jesus’ ministry); (iii) unique features in Jesus’ linguistic habits, such as the use of “Abba” in address to God and the introductory double Amen, reflect a consciousness of unique authority and relationship to God (J. Jeremias, *The Prayers of Jesus* [SBT 2/6; London: SCM, 1967] 11–65, 112–15). Of particular importance on the place of the historical Jesus more generally in the early church’s preaching is J. Roloff, *Das Kerygma und der irdische Jesus*, and cf. A. E. Harvey, *Jesus and the Constraints of History* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1982).

However, the differences already in the words from heaven in the canonical gospel tradition show that we are dealing with formulations of Christian faith, the value of which for reconstruction of the historical Jesus can only be maintained in close conjunction with other historical Jesus materials.

Comment

This brief text plays host to a number of difficult questions. Why did Jesus receive John's baptism (a baptism for the forgiveness of sins)? Does Luke report the events from heaven as public events? What is their purpose? Why the dove? What did the voice from heaven say and what does it mean?

21 Luke has almost totally reformulated his Markan source. Only the initial *ἐγένετο*, "it happened," remains. No longer do we have a report of Jesus' baptism. The baptism is stripped of all its details, is subordinated, linked to the baptism of all the people, and set into the past. The report is of what happened while Jesus was praying after his baptism. Luke uses an odd coordination of an *ἐν τῷ* + (aorist) infinitive phrase and an (aorist) genitive absolute (Creed, 57; Sahlin, *Studien*, 61). This enables him by means of a second genitive absolute (present) participle (*προσευχόμενον*, "praying") to establish a clear time separation between the baptisms and the opening of heaven: ". . . had been baptized . . . was praying . . . heaven opened" (cf. Sabbe, "Baptême," 195; BDF 404.2).

Ending as it does with the imprisonment of John, Luke's account of John's ministry could have suggested an aborted ministry. But Luke will not have it so. The successfully completed work of John is looked back upon in terms of the baptism of *all* the people and also of Jesus. John has indeed made ready for the Lord a people prepared (Luke 1:17; 7:29). John's baptism had, however, no power to open heaven and bring down the Spirit (3:16–17). At this point a new beginning is called for. And now, as often in Luke's account, decisive steps are taken in the context of Jesus' prayer (cf. 6:12; 9:18, 28–29; 11:1; 22:41). Attention to Jesus at prayer displaces Mark's "coming up out of the water" (*ἀναβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος*). This is not a paradigm presentation of the Christian's prayer for the Holy Spirit (as Luke 11:13 is—against Sabbe, "Baptême," 207–8; cf. Collins, *TBT* 84 [1976] 828). There is a connection, but it is Christologically determined and not merely exemplary. Christian possession of the Spirit is made possible by Jesus' unique possession of the Spirit both in his ministry (note the juxtaposition of Luke 3:16 and 22) and through resurrection/ascension (Acts 2:33). Jesus' prayer expresses his unique filial relationship to God (Schürmann, 191), and Christian prayer is a secondary participation in that intimacy granted by Jesus (Luke 11:1–2).

For Luke, Jesus' participation in baptism is his participation in the stage of preparation initiated by John and his identification with the imperatives and expectations of John's ministry. Perhaps for Luke the voice from heaven is sufficient to dispel any concern that receiving John's baptism could implicate Jesus in prior sin. The contrast between the exalted role projected by John (3:16–17) and the humble beginning for Jesus in baptism is probably intended (cf. 1:32–35 contrasted with 2:7, and see discussion of "dove" below).

The opening of heaven is an apocalyptic revelation motif (Ezek 1:1; John 1:51; Acts 7:56; 10:11; Rev 19:11; 2 *Apoc. Bar.* 22.1; *T. Levi* 2.6—*T. Levi* 18.6–7 and *T. Jud.* 24.2 are influenced by the Gospel account), as perhaps is the use of *ὡς*, "like," in v 22 which signals a certain inadequacy in the literary description of apocalyptic realities (Saabe, "Baptême," 199; cf. Dan 7:13; Acts 2:2, 3; 4 *Ezra* 13.3). The opening of heaven is not a separately experienced

event but the necessary preliminary for the descent and the voice to follow. Where Mark reports the experience of Jesus, Luke reports in objective terms. His interest is in the reality of the descent of the Spirit and the truth of the divine statement. In the absence of any reported response we should not assume that all the people are aware of what is happening (against Schürmann, 189–90, and most interpreters). The voice speaks words to Jesus alone.

22 Luke remains somewhat closer to Mark's wording in this verse, especially in the second half, and repeats the words from heaven in identical form (but see the textual discussion below). In the OT only in Isa 63:14 LXX does the Holy Spirit come down (*κατέβη πνεῦμα παρὰ Κυρίου, καὶ ὠδήγησεν αὐτούς*, "[the] Spirit came down from the Lord, and led them"; cf. Feuillet, *RB* 71 [1964] 324). A Lukan awareness of an exodus/wilderness typology here may be reflected in his use in Luke 4:1 of *ἡγέτο ἐν τῷ πνεύματι*, "was led about in the Spirit." Luke adds "holy" (*τὸ ἅγιον*) to Mark's use of "the Spirit" (*τὸ πνεῦμα*): for Luke *πνεῦμα* alone is usually an evil spirit (see discussion at Luke 4:33), and is used for the Holy Spirit only when resuming an earlier reference expressly to the Holy Spirit (2:27; 4:1, 14).

The ambiguous *ὡς περιστερᾶν*, "like a dove" (see esp. Keck, *NTS* 17 [1970–71] 63–67), of Mark's account (comes down like a dove, looks like a dove, or even is a dove?) is resolved clearly by Luke in terms of visual form. His use of *εἶδει*, "form," may have been influenced by Mark's *εἶδεν*, "he saw" (so Schürmann, 190 n. 12, and others). Luke introduces *εἶδος*, "form," again in Luke 9:29 where the visible form of Jesus' face is in question. Where the Markan text could be taken as speaking of the Spirit "incarnated" as a dove, Luke stands over against this possibility: both *σωματικῶς*, "bodily," and *εἶδει*, "form," are indicators of the language of appearances; and coming after *εἶδει*, *ὡς* can only be understood as language of approximation, not of identification.

The dovelike visual form of the Holy Spirit is puzzling. The origin of this symbolism is yet to be satisfactorily explained (detailed surveys of the attempts thus far may be found in Lentzen-Deis, *Taufe Jesu*, 170–83, and Keck, *NTS* 17 [1970–71] 41–67). Important for Luke may be the contrast between the harshness of the fiery purging role anticipated for the Spirit by John (Luke 3:16) and the gentleness of the dove, which suits better the temper of Jesus' actual ministry of restoration (cf. Roulin and Carton, *BVC* 25 [1959] 44). Luke clearly understands this coming of the Spirit as an anointing to be equated with that of Isa 61:1 (Luke 4:18; Acts 10:38). The change from Mark's *εἰς αὐτόν*, "[in] to him," to *ἐπ' αὐτόν* anticipates Luke 4:18 (Collins, *TBT* 84 [1976] 824). The role of the Spirit here and the link to Isa 61:1 strengthen the case for connecting the words of the voice from heaven with Isa 42:1. There is nothing to suggest that a paradigm baptism with the Spirit is intended (against Feuillet, *RB* 71 [1964] 349; Schürmann, 191). That is an activity *of* and not *to* the coming one.

Luke prefers the singular form for "heaven" (*οὐρανός*) here and in v 21 to Mark's plurals (cf. Cadbury, *Style*, 190). For the words of the voice from heaven, D, a considerable number of the OL MSS and several early patristic writers have the LXX text of Ps 2:7: *υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε*, "you are my son, today I have begotten you." The *Gospel of the Ebionites* combines both

versions in an account which reflects as well the Matthean baptism narrative (and also the Damascus road experience of Saul). We have here an early and strongly attested variant, accepted by many as the original reading. However, it is not here accepted for the following reasons. (i) The reading is not the best attested and is regional. (ii) If the reading were correct, that would mean that the scribal tradition has harmonized the Lukan text with Mark rather than with Matthew, which is unusual. (iii) That it is a straight quotation from the LXX would make it an easy variant to introduce. (iv) In light of Luke 1:35 and Acts 13:33, neither a re-creative begetting (note Luke's ἐπί, "upon," for Mark's εἰς, "[in]to") nor an adoption would seem to fit Luke's theology at this point, and an enthronement understanding of the text is linked by Luke to the resurrection and can scarcely be duplicated at the baptism.

The voice from heaven is a familiar apocalyptic theme in Revelation (4:1; 10:4, 8; 11:12; 14:13 and cf. Isa 6:4, 8; Ezek 1:25, 28; 4 Ezra 6.13) where it is uniformly involved in giving directives. That is not immediately the case here, though in the larger Lukan structure a directive is obviously implied (cf. Luke 4:18). Even before attending to the words of the voice it is clear that we are dealing with a divine commissioning of Jesus. The place of the Spirit still leaves fairly open the question of the role for which Jesus is commissioned. The Isaianic servant receives the Spirit (Isa 42:1 and cf. 61:1); prophets receive the Spirit (Luke 1:15; 2 Chr 15:1; 20:14; Neh 9:30), as did the judges before them (Judg 3:10; 6:34; etc.); the Davidic messiah receives the Spirit (Isa 11:2; Pss. Sol. 17.37, 42).

The issue of the meaning of the words from heaven is normally approached by means of a discussion of the possible OT texts alluded to in the words. The allusion to Isa 62:1 is almost universally recognized (but see E. Schweizer, *TDNT* 8:368). Most see also an allusion to Ps 2:7, but here there is significant dissent (Jeremias, *Theology*, 53–55; Vögtle, "Selbstbewusstsein Jesu," 632, 660–61; Fitzmyer, 485; and others). Depending upon a Jewish tradition of Isaac as the willing sacrifice, G. Vermes (*Scripture and Tradition*, 233, and cf. 193–227) sees an allusion to Gen 22:2. Bretscher (*JBL* 87 [1968] 301–11) thinks that the description of Israel as God's son in Exod 4:22–23 is in view.

There can be no doubt that in Matthew the voice from heaven and Isa 42:1 are bound together since Matthew's rendering of Isa 42:1 in Matt 12:18 contains the two key words ἀγαπητός, "beloved," and εὐδοκεῖν, "to come to delight in." Though the LXX uses προσδέχεσθαι, "to welcome," εὐδοκεῖν is a better translation equivalent for the רצו, *rāṣāh*, of the MT of Isa 42:1 (it occurs in the LXX mostly as a translation equivalent of רצו and is used by Theodotion in Isa 42:1). The same may not be said for the use of ἀγαπητός for the MT בָּחַר, *bāhîr* ("chosen"—LXX ἐκλεκτός). There is in Isa 41:8 synonymous parallelism between רָצו and אָהַב ("to love"—Aquila reads ἀγαπητός). Bar 3:37 speaks of "Jacob his servant and Israel his beloved," which is the same configuration as Isa 42:1 LXX but with "beloved" (ἡγαπημένος) for "chosen" (ἐκλεκτός). "Beloved" and "chosen" are brought together in the LXX of Isa 44:2 (ἡγαπημένος/ἐξελεξάμην). In Luke 9:35 we find ἐκλελεγμένος, "chosen," for Mark's ἀγαπητός, "beloved." Nevertheless, it is probably necessary to recognize in the ἀγαπητός, "beloved," of Matt 12:18 a secondary influence from the baptismal voice. If the variant reading ἐκλεκτός, "chosen," in John 1:34 is

to be accepted as original (cf. J. Jeremias, *TDNT* 5:689, n. 260) then we may suppose that an earlier use in agreement with Isa 42:1 of ἐκλεκτός in the words from heaven has been displaced by ἀγαπητός, "beloved," in the interests of a fuller Christology, which has in turn affected the rendering of Isa 42:1 at Matt 12:18. Or, perhaps more likely, the ἐκλεκτός of Isa 42:1 was displaced by ἀγαπητός at the moment of combination with Ps 2:7 because of the semantic awkwardness of "my chosen son," and the variant reading in John 1:34 reflects an awareness of the Isa 42:1 origin. (The reading of בְּבִיב, *hābīb* ["dear/beloved"], at *Tg. Ket.* Ps 2:7 should not be appealed to here since the targum text here attenuates divine sonship to a mere comparison ["dear to me as a son to his father"—E. Lohse, *TDNT* 8:362]. A [somewhat remote] Ps 2:7 connection for ἀγαπητός could be argued for on the basis of the use of טוֹב, *hesed* ["steadfast love"], in 2 Sam 7:15.)

The Lukan link to Isa 42:1 is assured by (i) the motif of the Spirit; (ii) the use of εὐδόκησα, "I have come to delight"; (iii) the connection with Isa 61:1 in Luke 4:18; (iv) the use of ἐκλελεγμένος, "chosen," in Luke 9:35 (and cf. ἐκλεκτός, "chosen," at 23:35); and (v) the allusion to Isa 42:6; 49:6 in Luke 1:32.

Ps 2:7 contributes the direct address and the words σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου, "you are my Son." In the Markan text the σύ, "you," is brought forward from its LXX position to stress the contrast between Jesus and all the others who were baptized. The same word order serves Luke to express contrast between Jesus and John (cf. Schürmann, 192–93). The bringing together of messianic and Isaianic servant categories achieved here by the juxtaposition of Isa 42:1 and Ps 2:7 is reflected again in the occurrence together in Luke 23:35 of Χριστός, "Christ," and ἐκλεκτός, "elect" (ἐκλεκτός is never used in the LXX in relation to messianic hope: only in *1 Enoch* is the messiah the elect one and there the messiah takes on other Isaianic servant features as well).

Whether Gen 22:1 has influenced the form of the words from heaven must remain conjectural. τὸν υἱόν μου τὸν ἀγαπητόν, "my beloved son," in Luke 20:13 shows influence from Luke 3:22, but there neither father nor son is intent on sacrifice. Luke shows no discernible interest in Isaac typology. Bretscher's case for an allusion to Exod 4:22–23 is not strong, but it finds some support in the exodus/wilderness typology considered above.

Fitzmyer (485 cf. 206) has rightly objected to the equation of "Son" and "messiah" (against Conzelmann, *Outline*, 76; etc.) though he has himself separated them too categorically. Sonship is an exalted status and relationship to God experienced by the messiah. A pre-Christian messianic use of Ps 2 is clearly evidenced in *Pss. Sol.* 17.23–24 with its clear allusion to Ps 2:9 (cf. Lövestam, *Son and Saviour*, 21–22). 4QFlor reflects the same juxtaposition of 2 Sam 7:11–16 and Ps 2 as is found in *Pss. Sol.* 17, and despite its fragmentary state we may with some confidence claim a messianic application of Ps 2:1. What has been lacking has been a clear messianic use of Ps 2:7, though this verse constitutes the obvious basis for bringing together Ps 2:7 and 2 Sam 7 in 4QFlor and *Pss. Sol.* 17. Though he will not claim it as such, the fragmentary Aramaic Qumran text reported by J. Fitzmyer in "The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament," *NTS* 20 (1973–74) 382–407 (see 391–94) may evidence just such a use. There is certainly an apocalyptic and royal use of the titles בָּרַךְ דִּי אֱלֹהִים, *bārāh dī 'el* ("son of God"), and בֶּרַךְ

בְּרִיךְ, *bar 'elyōn* ("son of the Most High"). In any case, whether the step had been taken or not, Ps 2:7 was ripe for messianic application in at least certain circles of pre-Christian Judaism. Applied to the messiah, it would speak of the exalted status and relationship with God which would be the basis of his messianic rule.

That Jesus is by Luke identified as Son in relation to being messiah is clear from the following. (i) Luke has introduced the Christ category into the context at 3:15, and he clearly uses the title in relation to Davidic messianic hopes (see at 2:11). (ii) Luke draws attention to the etymological connection between "Christ" and "anointed" (Acts 4:26–27), and does this precisely in relation to a text from Ps 2 (Acts 4:25–26). (iii) Luke treats Jesus' experience at the Jordan as an anointing by the Spirit (Luke 4:18; Acts 10:38). (iv) Luke sets Son and Christ in closest relationship (4:41 cf. 22:67, 70; Acts 9:20, 22; and without the title, Luke 1:32–33). At the same time it must be said that royal categories from messianic thought are not allowed to interfere with the consideration of Jesus in the more prophetic categories of the Isaianic servant (Luke 3:22 cf. Isa 42:1; Luke 4:18; Acts 10:38 and cf. Luke 1:17).

For Luke, Jesus' sonship involves more and is more fundamental than anything that can be contained in normal messianic categories. It may be compared with (but also contrasted to) that of Adam (see at 3:38 and 4:1–13) and Israel (see at 4:1–13). It may be traced to a distinct divine involvement in his human conception (1:35) which makes it no surprise that he is able to participate in the resources of the divine power (see at 4:3). As Son, Jesus is uniquely qualified to speak for God (9:35) and to reveal God (10:22). An unparalleled approach of God and his rule is implicated in Jesus' identity as Son (cf. 5:8, 21, 24, 26; 11:20; 17:21, etc.).

ἀγαπητός, "beloved," should probably be allowed the connotation "only": the beloved son in Luke 20:13 is the exclusive heir (v 14); the connotation "only" would respect an origin in the *ἐκλεκτός*, "chosen," of Isa 42:1, and is encouraged by the LXX rendering of the *יָחִיד*, *yahîd* ("only"), by *ἀγαπητός* in about half the texts in which *ἀγαπητός* occurs. It is unlikely that *ὁ ἀγαπητός* should be read independently (i.e., "my Son, the Beloved"—see C. H. Turner, *JTS* 27 [1926] 113–29; G. D. Kilpatrick, "The Order of Some Noun and Adjective Phrases in the NT," *NovT* 5 [1962] 112–13).

In the LXX *εὐδοκεῖν* usually means "to take pleasure, delight, be glad in," but an element of decision or choice is sometimes involved (1 Macc 10:47; Ps 151:5) and can predominate so that the element of pleasure is reduced to something like "to think it good to" (1 Macc 14:41), and in comparisons, "to prefer" (Sir 25:16; see G. Schrenk, *TDNT* 2:738–39, who, however, exaggerates the election element in the use of the word).

An element of decision or choice would seem to be involved in the statement *ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα* (cf. Isa 42:1 Theodotion and Isa 62:4 LXX^B), especially if we are to link it to texts like Luke 1:28, 30; 2:14; 10:21–22; 12:32. We may translate, "in you I have come to delight," though at this point there is not a commendation of achievement, rather a declaration of relationship and perhaps (from Isa 42:1) a declaration of divine approval for the undertaking of a privileged role by Jesus in the purposes of God. As in Isa 62:4 LXX^B the aorist tense is

inceptive. Again from Isa 42:1, there may be a close connection between the descent of the Spirit and this declaration of the divine will.

Explanation

The focus of Luke's account now becomes Jesus. Luke reports not the baptism of Jesus, but rather the opening of heaven that occurred while Jesus was praying after the baptisms. Jesus had participated in the stage of preparation initiated by John, but John's baptism had no power to open heaven and bring down the Spirit (3:16–17). The exalted role projected by John belongs to Jesus, but he arrives in humble obscurity (cf. 1:32–35 contrasted with 2:7) and without presumption prayerfully awaits the will of the Father (cf. 4:1–13; 22:41).

Where Mark reports what follows as an experience of Jesus, Luke reports in objective terms: his interest is in the reality of the descent of the Spirit and the truth of the divine statement. We should not, however, think in terms of a public experience of the events. In a manner familiar from apocalyptic texts heaven opens to release the Spirit from the world above into the world below and to allow the voice of God to be heard. The Spirit and the voice deal with Jesus alone. As he had for Israel in the wilderness at the time of the exodus (Isa 63:14 LXX), the Spirit came down now and led Jesus (cf. Luke 4:1). And as he came down, the Spirit in outward appearance was like a dove—not a form that corresponded to the harshness of the fiery purging role anticipated for the Spirit through the messiah by John (3:16), but one that suits better the temper of Jesus' actual ministry of reconciliation. What happens here to Jesus is his anointing by the Spirit to the ministry of Isa 61:1–2 (Luke 4:18–19). It is not his baptism with the Spirit; that is an activity *of* and not *to* the coming one. This is Jesus' commissioning by God.

The words of commissioning draw together Isa 42:1 and Ps 2:7. Ps 2 was understood as a messianic psalm in Jewish interpretation (*Pss. Sol.* 17.23–24; 4QFlor) and was exploited as such by Christians (Acts 4:25–26; 13:33; Heb 1:5; 5:5). Here the emphasis is on the unique filial relationship to God which is to be the basis for the messianic role. The nature of this filial relationship is developed by Luke in terms that transcend normal messianism and include a distinct divine involvement in his human conception (Luke 1:35), access to the resources of the divine power (see at 4:3), and unique qualification to speak for God (9:35) and to reveal God (10:22). The “beloved Son” is probably to be thought of as an only son (cf. 20:13).

The role of the servant of Isa 42:1 is taken up in the Lukan text by that of the figure of Isa 61:1–2 (Luke 4:18–19) and cf. also Luke 1:32; 9:35 and 23:35. The servant title is only to be found in Acts (3:13, 26; 4:27, 30), but the prophetic Christology that Luke exploits (see at Luke 4:24) is closely related. Jesus is the one upon whom (as in Isa 42:1) God has seen fit to place his Spirit: in deed and word there is, thus, a declaration of divine approval of Jesus as he stands on the threshold of his privileged role in the purposes of God.

The Genealogy of Jesus (3:23–38)

Bibliography

- Abel, E. L.** "The Genealogies of Jesus O XPICTOC." *NTS* 20 (1973–74) 203–10. **Bornhäuser, K.** *Die Geburts- und Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu*. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1930. 5–36. **Burger, C.** *Jesus als Davidsohn: Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970. 116–23. **Byskov, M.** "Verus Deus—verus homo, Luc. 3.23–38." *ST* 26 (1972) 25–32. **Cadbury, H. J.** "Some Lukan Expressions of Time (Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts VII)." *JBL* 82 (1963) 272–78. **Farrer, A. M.** "Note: The Genealogies of Christ." In *Studies in the Gospels*, FS R. H. Lightfoot, ed. D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Blackwell, 1955. 87–88. **Gordon, C. H.** "Paternity at Two Levels." *JBL* 96 (1977) 101. **Hartl, V.** "Zum Stammbaum Jesu nach Lukas." *BZ* 7 (1909) 156–73, 290–302. **Heater, H.** "A Textual Note on Luke 3:33." *JSNT* 28 (1986) 25–29. **Heer, J. M.** *Die Stammbäume Jesu nach Matthäus und Lukas*. BibS(F) 15/1–2. Freiburg im B.: Herder, 1910. **Holzmeister, U.** "Ein Erklärungsversuch der Lk-Genealogie (3,23–38)." *ZKT* 47 (1923) 184–218. ———. "Genealogia S. Lucae (Lc 3,23–38)." *VD* 23 (1943) 9–18. **Hood, R. T.** "The Genealogies of Jesus." In *Early Christian Origins*, FS H. R. Willoughby, ed. A. Wikgren. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1961. 1–15. **Jeremias, J.** *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus*. 290–97. **Johnson, M. D.** *The Purpose of the Biblical Genealogies with Special Reference to the Setting of the Genealogies of Jesus*. SNTSMS 8. Cambridge: CUP, 1969. **Kaplan, C.** "Some New Testament Problems in the Light of the Rabbis and the Pseudepigrapha: The Generation Schemes in Matthew 1:1–17, Luke III:24 ff." *BSac* 87 (1930) 465–71. **Kuhn, G.** "Die Geschlechtsregister Jesu bei Lukas und Matthäus nach ihrer Herkunft untersucht." *ZNW* 22 (1923) 206–28. **Kurz, W. S.** "Luke 3:23–38 and Greco-Roman and Biblical Genealogies." In *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives*, ed. C. H. Talbert. 169–87. **Lambertz, M.** "Die Toledoth im Mt 1,1–17 und Lc 3,23b, ff." In *FS Franz Dornseiff*, ed. H. Kusch. Leipzig: VEB Bibliographisches Institut, 1953. 201–25. **Lee, G. M.** "Luke iii, 23." *ExpTim* 79 (1967–68) 310. **Lerle, E.** "Die Ahnenverzeichnisse Jesu: Versuch einer christologischen Interpretation (Lk 3:23–38)." *ZNW* 72 (1981) 112–17. **Masson, J.** *Jésus fils de David dans les généalogies de Saint Matthieu et de Saint Luc*. Paris: Téqui, 1982. **Nestle, E.** "Zur Genealogie in Lukas 3." *ZNW* 4 (1903) 188–89. ———. "Salomo und Nathan in Mt 1 und Lc 3." *ZNW* 8 (1907) 72. ———. "Sala, Salma, Salmon." *ZNW* 11 (1910) 242–43. **Nolle, L.** "Old Testament Laws of Inheritance and St. Luke's Genealogy of Christ." *Ser* 2 (1947) 38–42. **Ogg, G.** "The Age of Jesus When He Taught." *NTS* 5 (1958–59) 291–98. **Overstreet, R. L.** "Difficulties of New Testament Genealogies." *GTJ* 2 (1981) 303–26. **Ramlot, M.-L.** "Les généalogies bibliques: Un genre littéraire oriental." *BVC* 60 (1964) 53–70. **Rice, G. E.** "Luke 3:22–38 in Codex Bezae: The Messianic King." *AUSS* 17 (1979) 203–8. **Sanders, H. A.** "The Genealogies of Jesus." *JBL* 32 (1913) 184–93. **Seethaler, P.** "Eine kleine Bemerkung zu den Stammbäumen Jesu nach Matthäus und Lukas." *BZ* 16 (1972) 256–57. **Spinetoli, O. da.** "Les généalogies de Jésus et leur signification: Mt 1, 1–25; Lc 3, 23–38." *AsSeign* 9 (1974) 6–19. **Thompson, P. J.** "The Infancy Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke Compared." *SE* 1 [TU 73] (1959) 217–22. **Vogt, P.** *Der Stammbaum Jesu bei Matthäus und Lukas*. BibS(F) 12/2. Freiburg im B.: Herder, 1907. **Willcock, J.** "Cainan (Luke III, 36)." *ExpTim* 30 (1918–19) 86–87. **Wilson, R. R.** *Genealogy and History in the Biblical World*. Yale Near Eastern Research. New Haven: Yale University, 1977. ———. "The Old Testament Genealogies in Recent Research." *JBL* 94 (1975) 168–89.

Translation

²³He, namely Jesus, when he made a beginning, was about thirty years of age, being son, as was reckoned,^a of Joseph, the son of Eli, ²⁴the son of Matthat, the

son of Levi,^b the son of Melchi, the son of Jannai, the son of Joseph,²⁵ the son of Mattathias, the son of Amos, the son of Nahum, the son of Esli, the son of Naggai,²⁶ the son of Maath, the son of Mattathias, the son of Semein, the son of Josech, the son of Joda,²⁷ the son of Joanan, the son of Rhesa, the son of Zerubbabel, the son of Shealtiel, the son of Neri,²⁸ the son of Melchi, the son of Addi, the son of Cosam, the son of Elmadam, the son of Er,²⁹ the son of Jesus, the son of Eliezer, the son of Jorim, the son of Matthat, the son of Levi,³⁰ the son of Simeon, the son of Judah, the son of Joseph, the son of Jonam, the son of Eliakim,³¹ the son of Melea, the son of Menna,^c the son of Mattatha, the son of Nathan, the son of David,³² the son of Jesse, the son of Obed, the son of Boaz, the son of Sala, the son of Nahshon,³³ the son of Amminadab, the son of Admin, the son of Arni,^d the son of Hezron, the son of Perez, the son of Judah,³⁴ the son of Jacob, the son of Isaac, the son of Abraham, the son of Terah, the son of Nahor,³⁵ the son of Serug, the son of Reu, the son of Peleg, the son of Eber, the son of Shelah,³⁶ the son of Cainan, the son of Arphaxad, the son of Shem, the son of Noah, the son of Lamech,³⁷ the son of Methuselah, the son of Enoch, the son of Jared, the son of Mahalaleel, the son of Cainan,³⁸ the son of Enos, the son of Seth, the son of Adam, the son of God.

Notes

^aD reformulates the opening of verse 23 ἦν δὲ Ἰησοῦς ὡς ἔτι ἦν λ' ἀρχόμενος ὡς ἐνομιζέτο εἶναι υἱός, "Jesus was about thirty years old as he began, when [?] he was considered to be son. . . ." It then continues with the (mostly royal) names from Matthew's genealogy from *Joseph* to *David*. This is of a piece with D's use of Ps 2:7 for the baptismal voice from heaven.

Θ relocates ἀρχόμενος, "beginning," after ὥσπερ ἔτι ἦν τριάκοντα, "of about thirty years," thus linking it to the following verb, which it transforms into an infinitive, εἶναι, "to be." Θ also moves υἱός, "son," to before Ἰωσήφ, "Joseph," as do A and many later texts, and intrudes after Ἰωσήφ the Ἰακώβ, "Jacob," of Matthew's genealogy. It is clearly influenced by a text like D.

^bAfricanus, the Latin witness to Irenaeus, and the Latin text c omit *Matthat* and *Levi* from the genealogy.

^cA omits *Menna*.

^dB omits *Amminadab*; A D E G lat conform the text here to Matthew; Θ adds *Aram* from Matthew; the original hand of N has *Adam* for *Amminadab*; and there are yet other variants.

Form/Structure/Setting

The location of the genealogy at this point underlines the impression already created at 3:1–6 that the infancy narratives function as prehistory. The ἀρχόμενος, "beginning," at the start of this pericope and the τοῦ θεοῦ, "[son] of God," at its end are the most helpful clues as to the reason for its present location. Because of the dynamic set in motion by the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus (3:22 cf. 4:1, 18) and his commissioning as Son (3:22 cf. 4:3, 9, 41), Luke identifies this point as the beginning for what is to be accomplished by Jesus. Despite the lack of the full form here in Greek (υἱός τοῦ θεοῦ), it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Adam as son of God (3:38—Ἀδάμ τοῦ θεοῦ) is to be compared with Jesus as Son of God (3:22; 4:3). See further in *Comment* below. Sahlin, *Studien zum dritten Kapitel*, shows the difficulties of any other location for the genealogy.

Unlike Matthew (1:1–17) Luke presents the genealogy of Jesus in reverse order. Most OT genealogies of considerable length do not use this reverse

order. It is, however, found in shorter lists, and also in quite extensive lists in Chronicles, where the concern often seems to be with ancestral qualification for office (e.g., 1 Chr 6:33–38 has a list of twenty-three ancestors).

The present list, if the text-critical decisions made above are correct, consists of seventy-eight names including God. There is no clear structure in the present form, but there appear to be considerable traces of a structuring pattern or patterns which once played a role in the preservation of this list of ancestors. Note especially the following features. Joseph occurs at the beginning and at the end of a set of seven names (Luke 3:23–24) while Mattathias occurs at the beginning and end of the following set (vv 25–26). A second occurrence of the name Jesus (v 29) is midway on the list between Jesus (v 23) and Abraham (v 34), with four-times-seven names before and four-times-seven names after. Reversing the list, starting with Adam, and dividing the genealogy into sets of seven, places the following key figures in the seventh position: Enoch (v 37), Abraham (v 34), David (v 31), Joseph (v 30), Jesus (v 29), Joseph (v 24), Jesus (v 23). It has also been noted (Kuhn, ZNW 22 [1923] 207–8) that starting from the two occurrences of the name Jesus in the list (vv 23, 29), the following names occur in the same relative order in the two sections of the genealogy: Jesus, Eli(ezer) (vv 23, 29), Mat(h)that (vv 24, 29), Levi (vv 24, 29), Joseph (vv 24, 30), Mattath(i)a (vv 25, 31), though no definite structuring significance need be given to this observation.

An interest in blocks of seven is clearly expressed by the Matthean genealogy, which speaks of fourteen (two-times-seven) generations from Abraham to David, from David to the exile, and from the exile to Jesus (Matt 1:17—Luke's source had three-times-seven generations from Abraham to David and from David to the exile). Cf. also Josephus, *Ant.* 2.229; 5.336; Jude 14.

It is not unlikely that Luke utilized a genealogy set out in the usual order, beginning with Adam and divided into eleven sets of seven names. Such a genealogy might have schematically located Jesus at the climax of the eleventh week of the twelve weeks of world history, the twelfth week being the eschaton itself. (Various schematizations occur. 1 *Enoch* 93 has a ten-week schema. 2 *Apoc. Bar.* 53–74 has a twelve-plus-one schema. 4 *Ezra* 14.11 has a twelvefold division [at least in the Latin and Arabic texts] as does *b. Sanh.* 97b.) Such a schema plays no role in the present Lukan text and has been obscured by the reversal of order and the addition of God to the list.

It is frequently suggested that Luke completed the genealogy from Abraham to Adam on the basis of the LXX while the remainder stems ultimately from Semitic sources (e.g., Kuhn, ZNW 22 [1923] 216). The presence of Cainan (v 36) in the genealogy (found in the LXX of Gen 11:12 and 1 Chr 1:18, but not in the MT) and the general agreement with LXX morphology in this part of the genealogy supports an ultimate origin in the LXX, and thus supports a multi-stage development for the genealogy. However, the seven-times-eleven schema suggests a pre-Lukan stage which already included the names from Abraham to Adam.

Jewish interest in genealogies is reflected in their prominence and length in parts of the Old Testament. Jeremiah (*Jerusalem*, 297 and cf. 226) identifies a number of contexts in which it was important in the NT period to be able to trace one's ancestry. In particular, the royal family had the responsibility

of supplying wood for the altar as one of the privileged families. A speculative interest in genealogies is reflected (negatively) in 1 Tim 1:4; Titus 3:9.

Ancient genealogies were used for a complex variety of purposes, not all of which can be reconstructed successfully by historical inquiry from such a distance. Genealogies established individual identity; reflected, established, or legitimated social structures, status, and entitlements to office; functioned as modes of praise or delineations of character or even as basis of exhortation. (See the studies of Hood, "Genealogies of Jesus," 1–8; R. R. Wilson, *Genealogy and History*; and Johnson, *Biblical Genealogies*.) Historical or biographical interest was important at times, but not at all uniformly so. R. de Vaux notes among the Arabs a practice of attaching people to a common ancestor as an expression of a newly created union between groups of people (*Institutions de l'Ancien Testament* [Paris, 1958] 1:18–19). And it is likely that we must appeal to some parallel mechanism to explain, for example, the Levitical genealogy supplied for Samuel (with his ancestors and sons) in 1 Chr 6:27–28, 33–34, where 1 Sam 1:1 makes it quite clear that this family is from the tribe of Ephraim. Indeed this chapter from 1 Chronicles illustrates clearly the difficulty of reading biblical genealogies with a strict historical and biographical interest. Within the bounds of this single chapter we have, as well, Shimei identified alternately as son and as grandson of Gershom (vv 16, 42–43); Jehoram identified as son both of Eliab and of Eliel (whose ancestry is quite distinct—vv 27, 34); and also lacunae such as that between vv 24 and 25 where one is left to presume that a genealogy is continuing. A complex history of societal function is here reflected, a function largely determined by ancestry but also affected by factors to which we no longer have more than speculative access.

The question of the function of the Lukan genealogy is pressed upon us by the existence of the almost entirely different Matthean genealogy (1:1–17). The two genealogies agree in identifying Joseph as (legal) father of Jesus, in including Zerubbabel and Shealtiel in Jesus' ancestry (Matt 1:12; Luke 3:27), and, for the most part, in the list of ancestors from David to Abraham (Matt 1:1–6; Luke 3:31–34—apart from details of spelling the differences are: Luke has "Sala" for Matthew's "Salmon," and "Admin" and "Arni" for Matthew's "Aram"). Elsewhere the list of ancestors provided is entirely different.

Attempts to harmonize the lists go back at least to Africanus (third century) who maintained that Jacob (Matt 1:16), being the uterine brother of Eli (their mother had been married to both Matthan [Matt 1:15] and Melchi [Luke 3:24—Africanus' list lacked Matthat and Levi]), had married this man's childless widow in a levirate marriage (Deut 25:5–10; cf. Ruth 4:1–10) and that Joseph was the first child of this union (as Matthew) but by levirate custom was reckoned as child of Eli (as Luke). The application here of levirate marriage to uterine brothers has been justly criticized (Holzmeister, *ZKT* 47 [1923] 187–93; Nolle, *Scr* 2 [1947] 40; Johnson, *Biblical Genealogies*, 144–45).

Another attempt at harmonization depends upon identifying a contrast in Luke 3:23 between "son, as was thought, of Joseph" (υἱός, ὡς ἐνομίζετο, Ἰωσήφ) and "actually son (i.e., grandson) of Eli" (τοῦ Ἠλὶ). Eli is then taken to be the father of Mary and the genealogy understood as actually that of Mary (Hartl, *BZ* 7 [1909] 290–302). Although ὡς ἐνομίζετο does raise problems (see *Comment* below) this solution must finally be judged to be an artificial harmonization.

The most attractive of the harmonizing solutions is that proposed by Holzmeister (*ZKT* 47 [1923] 184–218) and cf. Nolle (*Scr* 2 [1947] 38–42). Holzmeister argues that Mary was an heiress (i.e., had no brothers) whose father Eli, in line with a biblical tradition concerned with the maintenance of the family line in cases where there was no male heir (Ezra 2:61 = Neh 7:63; Num 32:41 cf. 1 Chr 2:21–22, 34–35; Num 27:3–8), on the marriage of his daughter to Joseph, adopted Joseph as his own son. Matthew gives Joseph's ancestry by birth, Luke that by adoption.

(Each of the harmonizing solutions offers some parallel suggestion to account for the fact that there are two fathers also for Shealtiel.)

It may be, however, that the theological perspective is more important here than the historical. Matthew is inclined to see the life of the nation as reiterated in Jesus (2:15, 18; this is probably also the perspective for the Matthean temptation narrative: 4:1–11). It is natural for him to connect Jesus with all the reigning kings of Judah (1:6–11). Luke, less positive generally about the history of Israel (Acts 7:7–53; 28:25–27), is no doubt impressed by the sense of final termination in Jeremiah's words about Jechoniah, the last of the reigning kings of the line of Solomon (Jer 22:24–30). Already in Solomon's day the high-priesthood had been transferred from one line of Aaron's descendants to another (1 Kgs 2:27). Where the potential for the fulfillment of the Davidic promise along the Solomonic line had petered out, God would be free to carry forward the Davidic promise through another of David's descendants. Scripture is aware already of some role for the house of Nathan (Zech 12:12). So, it is no surprise that the messiah's ancestry is now traced through David's son Nathan and completely bypasses the line of the kings of Judah.

Comment

The meaning of the Lukan genealogy is determined by (i) the significance of its location; (ii) the identification of the beginning (*ἀρχόμενοι*) referred to in v 23; (iii) the nature of the interest in tracing Jesus' ancestry through Nathan (v 31); and (iv) the reason for extending the genealogy to Adam and finally to God (v 38). Significant comment has already been provided above on several of these matters.

Unlike the other pericopes in this section (3:1–4:13), this pericope is not concerned to report an event. Rather, at the point where the descent of the Spirit and commissioning as Son provide the immediate starting point for the account of Jesus' accomplishment of his mission, Luke inserts a formal introduction of Jesus in terms of his genealogy.

23 The *καὶ αὐτὸς* . . . *Ἰησοῦς* (lit., "and he . . . Jesus") is odd. Except for an unlikely variant reading at Luke 20:42, the pleonastic use of *αὐτὸς* after *καὶ* is never elsewhere linked by Luke to an expressed subject (cf. W. Michaelis, "Das unbetonte *καὶ αὐτὸς* bei Lukas," *ST* 4 [1950] 86–93; Fitzmyer, 120–21). It is perhaps best to treat the *αὐτὸς* as indicating change of subject from God in the previous verse, to which *Ἰησοῦς* has then been added for greater precision: "And he, namely Jesus" (cf. BDF 277 [3]).

ἦν, "was," can be connected variously to *ἀρχόμενος*, "beginning," *ὥσει ἐτῶν τριάκοντα*, "of about thirty years," and *τοῦ Ἠλὶ*, "[son] of Eli." The first produces a poor sense and awkward syntax. The third is motivated by harmonistic con-

cerns (see above in *Form/Structure/Setting*), creates an unnaturally long gap between verb and predicate, and leaves *ὥσεί ἐτῶν τριάκοντα*, "of about thirty years," unconnected to the sentence.

The divine commissioning after Jesus' baptism is that which causes Jesus to make a beginning (*ἀρχόμενος*)—thus the present location. If we are to understand the beginning of his ministry, then this does not actually commence until after the temptation experience in the wilderness. But there is already in the temptation narrative (4:1, 3, 9) a beginning of action in terms of his role as Son empowered by the Spirit. He is, of course, not beginning to be Son of God (cf. 1:35).

Luke uses the language of approximation for Jesus' age. The most that can be suggested is that such an age denotes an adequate measure of maturity (cf. Num 4:3). Since we do not know at what stage of John's ministry Jesus was baptized and began his own independent career, and because the information itself here is imprecise, no firm birth year can be established for Jesus by the juxtaposition of v 23 here and 3:1.

ὥς ἐνομίζετο, "as was reckoned," raises the question of what kind of reckoning was involved. If we link *ἦν* with *τοῦ Ἠλὶ* (see above) then the reckoning is the mistake of the uninformed who judge from the place of Jesus in Joseph's family when actually Jesus' descent is to be reckoned through Mary, or is only to be directly linked to God. For Johnson (*Biblical Genealogies*, 230) the reckoning casts its doubt over all the details of the genealogy to follow—Luke is not sure that it is historically accurate! But surely our points of departure for understanding Luke here are (i) the birth without human father anticipated in 1:34–35; but also (ii) the seriousness with which Luke takes the genealogy—continuing it as he does all the way to God at the creation. The reckoning will be that of legal standing (cf. Schürmann, 199): Jesus has the status of son and heir in the family of Joseph and thus a place in his genealogy (cf. 2:41, 48).

If Joseph is son of Eli only as wife of the heiress Mary (see *Form/Structure/Setting* above), then we have here a tradition conflicting with that in the *Protevangelium of James*, which has Joachim (*Ἰωακὴμ*) as father of Mary. Nolle (*Scr* 2 [1947] 41) claims an equivalence for the two names, arguing that *Ἠλὶ* (Eli) is short for *Ἠλιακὴμ* (Eliakim) which in 4 Kgdms 23:34 and 2 Chr 36:4 is an equivalent for *Ἰωαχὴμ*. It is doubtful whether such a shortening is possible, but in any case the *Protevangelium of James* tradition is an isolated tradition with almost no support in the early centuries of Christian tradition (Vogt, *Der Stammbaum Jesu*, 102–7). *y. Sanh.* 23c and *y. Hag.* 77d speak of a Mary the daughter of Eli, who could be Mary the mother of Jesus.

24–27 The names Matthat to Rhesa are names of otherwise unknown figures. It has frequently been suggested (see, e.g., Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 296) that *Ῥησά* (Rhesa) is actually a transliteration of the Aramaic word for prince, *רֶשָׁא*, *rēšāʾ*, and that Joanan (*Ἰωάναν*) is the son of Zerubbabel referred to in 1 Chr 3:19 as Hananiah (*Ἀνανία*). This is certainly possible, since no son of Zerubbabel named Rhesa is otherwise known and Zerubbabel was a successor to Sheshbazzar who is termed *prince* in Ezra 1:8. The further corrections suggested by Kuhn (*ZNW* 22 [1923] 211–12) on the basis of Semitic reconstruction are unsupported speculations.

With Zerubbabel we reach a definitely known figure, who was a governor

of Judea in the Persian restoration and who had a part in the rebuilding of the temple (Ezra 3:2; Hag 1:1; Zech 4:6–10, etc.). Zerubbabel is listed as son of Shealtiel in Hag 1:1; Ezra 3:2; Neh 12:1 etc. 1 Chr 3:19, by contrast, lists Zerubbabel as son of Pediah, Shealtiel's brother. Levirate marriage has been appealed to as a basis for harmonization here (Plummer, 104; Marshall, 163). 1 Chr 3:17 (and cf. v 10) has Shealtiel as son of Jeconiah in the line of the Solomonic kings of Judah, with which Matt 1:12 agrees. Luke has Shealtiel as son of the unknown Neri. Since neither Shealtiel nor Zerubbabel is elsewhere in the OT connected with the royal line through Solomon, it may be that the line in 1 Chronicles is determined at this point by function rather than by ancestry (cf. Samuel in 1 Chr 6:27). Alternately, adoption or levirate marriage may again be a possible explanation.

28–31 Melchi to Mattatha are once again unknown figures. The patriarchal names here (Levi, Simeon, Judah, Joseph) are not otherwise known to have been used as personal names in preexilic times (Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 296; but cf. 1 Chr 25:2).

Nathan is the third son of David, born in Jerusalem (2 Sam 5:14; 1 Chr 3:5; 14:4). Johnson (*Biblical Genealogies*, 241–46) and others point to Jewish and Christian confusion between Nathan son of David and Nathan the prophet. Despite Luke's interest in a prophetic Christology (see at Luke 4:18–19), an early origin for this confusion cannot be attested, and since Luke remains committed also to a royal Davidic Christology (1:32–33), it seems best to think in terms of an alternative to the Solomonic royal line which expired with Coniah (that is Jeconiah; Jer 22:24–30). See further above in *Form/Structure/Setting*.

31–34 The names from David to Abraham, except in details of spelling, agree with the Matthean list, except that Luke has Admin and Arni (v 33) where Matthew has Aram. Except for Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, the names may be found conveniently at 1 Chr 2:1–15. The MT has אֲרָם, "Aram," for Matthew's Aram, for which Luke's equivalent is Arni. Kuhn (ZNW 22 [1923] 217 n. 3) has shown that a Hebrew אֲרָנִי (= Matthew's *Aram*) stands behind the B text of 1 Chr 2:9 (LXX). Luke's Ἀρνὶ, "Arni," is closest to the Ἀρραν, "Arran," of Ruth 4:19 (LXX), but probably (with Kuhn, 217) is to be traced to a reading of the Hebrew אֲרָם, "[H]aram," as אֲרָנִי, "[H]arni." This may argue for a Hebrew original for this section of the genealogy. However, a Greek corruption of ἈΡΑΜ, "Aram," for ἈΡΝΙ, "Arni," is also possible.

There is nothing in MT or LXX corresponding to Luke's Admin (Ἀδμίν). It is normally taken as an abbreviation or a corruption of Amminadab (Ἀμινάδαβ) which either in the transmission history of the Gospel or earlier has accidentally been included along with the longer (the correct) form.

34–38 Where Matthew's genealogy concluded with Abraham, Luke's carries us right back to the creation. The names may be taken from Gen 11:10–26 (cf. 5:1–32) or 1 Chr 1:1–26. The presence of the name Cainan (Καϊνάν), not found in the MT, suggests that the LXX text is here being followed. There is also general agreement with LXX morphology throughout this section (Kuhn, ZNW 22 [1923] 216).

Luke's intention is not merely to take the genealogy back to Adam, the first man (against Ramlot, *BVC* 60 [1964] 66). Certainly it is important to

Luke that Jesus be fully part of the human family (Acts 17:31) into which he is reckoned as child of Mary and Joseph. Also important to Luke is Jesus' Davidic descent (Luke 1:27, 32, etc.). But ultimately the striking thing about the genealogy is its termination in God, and this is where we should look for Luke's chief concern, especially in light of the Son of God emphasis of the surrounding pericopes (3:22; 4:3, 9). A genealogy that reaches back to God is not known in the OT or Pseudepigrapha or Qumran, and has not been reported for any of the rabbinic sources, nor is Adam spoken of in any of these sources as son of God. Nevertheless, the point is not that Jesus is son of God at his baptism in the Greek sense that he springs from a distinguished set of ancestors whose original forefather was a biological son of God (as Hood, "Genealogies of Jesus," 14–15). The infancy narratives will hardly allow this (esp. 1:35), nor will the universality of Acts 17:28b–29.

It is only the Alexandrian Jew, Philo, who comes close to Luke here. In *On the Virtues*, 204–5, Philo says of Adam τοῦ δὲ πατὴρ [μὲν] θνητὸς οὐδεὶς, ὁ δὲ αἰδῖος θεός, "his father was no mortal, but the eternal God," and speaks of Adam's failure to follow "in the steps of the virtues τοῦ γεννήσαντος (of the one who begot [him])." While Philo views Adam's situation as unique (see *On the Virtues*, 203) Luke affirms some kind of universal human status as offspring of God (γένος; Acts 17:28b–29) which can be traced back to Adam (v 26). But they agree on the failure of Adam's sonship. This we will see in the discussion below of the temptation narrative (4:1–13) which clearly invites comparison between the testing of God's son Adam and the testing of God's Son Jesus (Philo here speaks of "when the opposites were set before [Adam] to choose or to avoid"). Luke sees the universal sonship as also flawed (see the context of Acts 17:28b–29).

Luke would have us see that Jesus takes his place in the human family and thus in its (since Adam's disobedience) flawed sonship; however, in his own person, in virtue of his unique origin (Luke 1:35) but also as worked out in his active obedience (4:1–13), he marks a new beginning to sonship and sets it on an entirely new footing. In this human situation Jesus is the one who is *really* the Son of God (cf. Fitzmyer, 504).

Explanation

Luke inserts the genealogy at this point because this is where Jesus' role as Son of God empowered by the Spirit begins. This is the Jesus whose accomplishments (1:1) Luke wishes to report. So it is here that he formally introduces Jesus in terms of his genealogy.

Luke takes over an existing genealogy, reverses the normal order of presentation, and adds God to the end of the list: Adam is son of God. Traces remain in the genealogy of internal structuring devices (mostly sets of sevens) but these do not concern Luke.

The genealogy is quite different from Matthew's, agreeing in the section between Joseph and David only in the names Zerubbabel and Shealtiel. The most credible harmonization is based on Jewish customs in the case of the marriage of heiresses: it may well be that Mary had no brothers and that, therefore, on her marriage to Joseph, her husband was adopted by Mary's

father, whose genealogy is thus reflected in the Lukan text (cf. Ezra 2:61; Num 32:41 cf. 1 Chr 2:21-22, etc.).

The theological perspective may, however, be more important here than the historical. Matthew sees the life of the nation as reiterated in Jesus (2:15, 18, etc.) and links Jesus to all the reigning kings of Judah (1:6-11). Luke focuses on the failures of the history of Israel (Acts 7:7-53) and sees the end of the Solomonic line in Jer 22:24-30. The Davidic promise must be carried forward through another of David's sons, and of these only the house of Nathan has any ongoing place in Scripture (Zech 12:12).

Jesus was not by birth a son of Joseph (Luke 1:35); nevertheless, his proper genealogy is that of Joseph. In Jewish law Jesus has the status of son and heir in the family of Joseph and that is where he fits into the broader human family (cf. 2:41, 48).

Most of the names in the list are of otherwise unknown figures. Rhesa may actually transliterate the Aramaic word for *prince* and have originally been a title for Zerubbabel (cf. "Sheshbazzar" the prince in Ezra 1:8).

Harmonization with Matthew again becomes an issue with the father of Shealtiel (Matthew has Jechoniah; Luke has the otherwise unknown Neri). Levirate marriage (that is, the marriage of a childless widow to her dead husband's brother), adoption, and functional rather than biological connection at this point in Matthew's genealogy (cf. 1 Chr 3:17) are all possible explanations.

From David to Abraham there is a close agreement between the genealogies in Matthew and Luke, except for Luke's inclusion in v 33 of Admin, normally taken as a corruption or shortening of Amminadab which has crept into the genealogy along with the fuller or more accurate form.

Luke, unlike Matthew, continues the genealogy on from Abraham to Adam and then God. Here Luke closely follows the Greek OT, except for the final listing of God which is quite distinctive. By extending the genealogy in this way, Luke makes his most important point in this section. Adam as son of God comes after the baptismal address of Jesus as Son of God (Luke 3:22) and before the tempter's beguiling suggestions to Jesus as Son of God (4:1-13, and esp. vv 3, 9). Thus both contrast and continuity is established between Adam as son of God and Jesus as Son of God. Jesus takes his place in the human family and its (since Adam's disobedience) flawed sonship; but in his own person in virtue of his unique origin (1:35), and also as worked out in his active obedience (4:1-13), he makes a new beginning of sonship and sets sonship on an entirely new footing.

Temptations of the Son in the Wilderness (4:1-13)

Bibliography

Achtemeier, P. J. "It's the Little Things That Count (Mark 14:17-21; Luke 4:1-13; Matthew 18:10-14)." *BA* 46 (1983) 30-31. Argyle, A. W. "The Accounts of the Tempta-

- tions of Jesus in Relation to the Q Hypothesis." *ExpTim* 64 (1952-53) 382. **Barrett, C. K.** *Holy Spirit*. 46-53. **Brown, S.** *Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke*. 6-19. **Charlier, C.** "Les tentations de Jésus au désert." *BVC* 5 (1954) 85-92. **Doble, P.** "The Temptations." *ExpTim* 72 (1960-61) 91-93. **Dupont, J.** *Les tentations du Jésus au désert*. StudNeot 4. Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1968. ———. "L'arrière-fond biblique du récit des tentations de Jésus." *NTS* 3 (1957) 287-304. ———. "Les tentations de Jésus dans le récit de Luc (Luc, 4, 1-13)." *ScEccl* 14 (1962) 7-29. ———. "L'origine du récit des tentations de Jésus au désert." *RB* 73 (1966) 30-76. **Duquoc, C.** "La tentation du Christ." *LumVie* 53 (1961) 21-41. **Edgar, S. L.** "Respect for Context in Quotations from the Old Testament." *NTS* 9 (1962-63) 55-62, esp. 59-60. **Fascher, E.** *Jesus und der Satan: Eine Studie zur Auslegung der Versuchungsgeschichte*. Hallische Monographien 11. Halle: Max Niemayer, 1949. **Feuillet, A.** "Le récit lucanien de la tentation (Lc 4, 1-13)." *Bib* 40 (1959) 613-31. ———. "Die Versuchungen Jesu." *Internationale Katholische Zeitschrift Communio* 8 (1979) 226-37. **Fridrichsen, A.** *The Problem of Miracle in Primitive Christianity*. Tr. R. A. Harrisville and J. S. Hanson. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972. 121-28. **Gerhardsson, B.** *The Testing of God's Son (Matt 4:1-11 & Par.): An Analysis of an Early Christian Midrash*. Chaps. 1-4. ConB, NT 2/1. Lund: Gleerup, 1966. **Glendenning, F. J.** "The Devil and the Temptations of Our Lord according to St. Luke." *Theology* 52 (1949) 102-5. **Graham, E.** "The Temptation in the Wilderness." *CQR* 162 (1961) 17-32. **Gueuret, A.** *La mise en discours: Recherches sémiotiques à propos de l'Évangile de Luc*. Thèses. Paris: Cerf, 1987. **Hoffmann, P.** "Die Versuchungsgeschichte in der Logienquelle: Zur Auseinandersetzung der Judenchristen mit dem politischen Messianismus." *BZ* 13 (1969) 207-23. **Holst, R.** "The Temptation of Jesus." *ExpTim* 82 (1971) 343-44. **Hyldahl, N.** "Die Versuchung auf der Zinne des Tempels (Matth 4, 5-7/Luk 4, 9-12)." *ST* 15 (1961) 113-27. **Iersel, B. M. F. van.** "Der Sohn" in den synoptischen Jesusworten: Christusbezeichnung der Gemeinde oder Selbstbezeichnung Jesu? NovTSup 3. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill, 1964. 165-71. **Jeremias, J.** "Die 'Zinne' des Tempels (Mt. 4, 5; Lk. 4, 9)." *ZDPV* 59 (1936) 195-208. **Johnson, S. L.** "The Temptation of Christ." *BSac* 123 (1966) 342-52. **Kelly, H. A.** "The Devil in the Desert." *CBQ* 26 (1964) 190-220. **Ketter, P.** *Die Versuchung Jesu nach dem Berichte der Synoptiker*. NTAbh 6/3. Munster: Aschendorff, 1918. **Kirk, J. A.** "The Messianic Role of Jesus and the Temptation Narrative: A Contemporary Perspective." *EvQ* 44 (1972) 11-29, 91-102. **Kruse, H.** "Das Reich Satans." *Bib* 58 (1977) 29-61, esp. 44-50. **Kurichianil, J.** "The Temptations of Christ, Their Meaning." *Biblehashyam* 1 (1975) 106-25. **Lafon, G.** "La genèse de l'homme: Lecture de Luc 4, 1-13." *Christus* 22 (1975) 443-55. **Lohmeyer, E.** "Die Versuchung Jesu." *ZST* 14 (1937) 619-50. **Mahnke, H.** *Die Versuchungsgeschichte im Rahmen der synoptischen Evangelien: Ein Beitrag zur frühen Christologie*. BET 9. Frankfurt am M./Bern/Las Vegas: Lang, 1978. **Meyer, A.** "Die evangelischen Berichte über die Versuchung Christi." *Festgabe H. Blümner*. Zürich: Buchdr. Berichthaus, 1914. 434-68. **Morgenthaler, R.** "Roma-Sedes Satanae (Röm 13, 1 ff im Lichte von Luk 4, 5-8)." *TZ* 12 (1956) 289-304. **Neugebauer, F.** *Jesu Versuchung: Wegentscheidung am Anfang*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1986. **Panier, L.** *Récit et commentaires de la tentation de Jésus au désert: Approche sémiotique du discours interprétatif*. Paris: Cerf, 1984. **Percy, E.** *Die Botschaft Jesu*. 13-18. **Pokorný, P.** "The Temptation Stories and Their Intention." *NTS* 20 (1973-74) 115-27. **Powell, W.** "The Temptation." *ExpTim* 72 (1960-61) 248. **Querdray, G.** "La tentation de Jésus au désert: Prélude de la Passion." *Esprit et vie* 90 (1980) 184-89. **Riesenfeld, H.** "Le caractère messianique de la tentation au désert." *La venue du Messie*. RechBib 6. Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1962. 51-63. **Rigaux, B.** *Témoignage de l'évangile de Luc*. 17-30. **Robinson, J. A. T.** "The Temptations." *Twelve New Testament Studies*. 53-60. **Sabbe, M.** "De tentatione Jesu in deserto." *Collationes brugenses* 50 (1954) 459-66. **Scheuller, A.** "And the Desert Shall Be Made Like Eden." *BiTod* 25 (1987) 104-8. **Schnackenburg, R.** "Der Sinn der Versuchung Jesu bei den Synoptikern." *TQ* 132 (1952) 297-326.

Schulz, S. Q. *Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten*. 177-90. **Seidelin, P.** "Zur Christologie der Versuchungsgeschichte bei Matthäus und Lukas." *Deutsche Theologie* 6 (1939) 127-39. **Smyth-Florentin, F.** "Jésus, le Fils du Père, vainqueur de Satan: Mt 4,1-11; Mc 1, 12-15; Lc 4, 1-13." *AsSeign* 14 (1973) 56-75. **Stegner, W. R.** "Wilderness and Testing in the Scrolls and in Matthew 4:1-11." *BR* 12 (1967) 18-27. **Stonehouse, N. B.** *The Witness of Luke to Christ*. 34-40. **Strauss, D. F.** *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined*. 252-63. **Swanston, H.** "The Lukan Temptation Narrative." *JTS*, n.s., 17 (1966) 71. **Taylor, A. B.** "Decision in the Desert: The Temptation of Jesus in the Light of Deuteronomy." *Int* 14 (1960) 300-309. **Thompson, G. H. P.** "Called-Proved-Obedient: A Study in the Baptism and Temptation Narratives of Matthew and Luke." *JTS*, n.s., 11 (1960) 1-12. **Voss, G.** *Die Christologie der lukanischen Schriften in Grundzügen*. 95-97. **Wilkens, W.** "Die Versuchungsgeschichte Luk. 4, 1-13 und die Komposition des Evangeliums." *TZ* 30 (1974) 262-72.

Translation

¹Jesus, full of the^a Holy Spirit, departed from the Jordan and was led about in^b the Spirit in the wilderness ²for forty days, being tempted by the Devil. He ate nothing in those days and when they were completed he was hungry. ³The Devil said to him, "If you are the Son of God, tell this stone to become bread." ⁴But Jesus answered him, "It stands written, 'Man shall not live by bread alone.'"^c

⁵Then^d he took Jesus^e up and showed him all the kingdoms of the world in a moment of time. ⁶The Devil said to him, "I will give to you all this authority and the glory of these kingdoms,^f because it has been given over to me and to whomever I wish I give it. ⁷You, then—if you worship before me, it will all be yours." ⁸But Jesus answered him, "It stands written, 'You shall worship the Lord your God and him only shall you serve.'"

⁹He brought Jesus^e into Jerusalem and set him on the pinnacle of the temple, and said to him, "If you are the Son of God, cast yourself down from here. ¹⁰For it stands written, 'To his angels he will give command concerning you, to protect you,' ¹¹and 'They will raise you up upon their hands, lest you strike your foot against a stone.'"¹²But Jesus responded to him, "It has been said, 'You shall not put the Lord your God to the test.'"

¹³Having completed every kind of temptation, the Devil departed from him until an opportune time.

Notes

^aThere is no definite article here in the Greek text.

^bOr "by means of."

^cA number of Greek texts add in various forms the additional phrase found in Matthew at this point.

^dSee Note d at 4:16-30.

^eGreek has only "him."

^fGreek has "their glory."

Form/Structure/Setting

The temptation narrative is firmly linked with the baptism account (v 1: πνεύματος ἁγίου, "Holy Spirit"; ὑπέστρεψεν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, "departed from the

Jordan"; v 3: υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, "Son of God"). The accounts of the baptismal identification and endowment with the Spirit and of this initial testing represent for Luke the divine preparation of Jesus for his ministry.

Despite the supernatural setting, the narrative shows some formal similarities to accounts of rabbinic debate (van Iersel, *Der Sohn*, 166; Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 253–57). For the synoptic tradition, this pericope is remarkable in that the responses of Jesus are entirely made up of scriptural citations (but cf. the relation to biblical texts of the words of the voice in 3:22 and 9:35). Jesus' dialogue with demons (see at 4:31–37) provides the closest formal analogy to this exchange with the Devil; while not directly reported, the discussion with Moses and Elijah (9:30–32) offers a more remote parallel, as do the interactions with angels (see at 1:5–20).

Luke clearly shares a common source with Matthew, and except for a few words, entirely replaces the Markan temptation narrative with an account based on this second source. Matthew and Luke order differently the second and third temptations. Some scholars claim originality for Luke's order (Schürmann, 218; and see list in Feuillet, *Bib* 40 [1959] 613–14), but most rightly recognize the priority of the Matthean order which allows the first two closely related temptations to be juxtaposed, and sets the quotations from Deuteronomy in simple reverse order (cf. Fitzmyer, 507–8).

Such an event obviously has no witnesses. So the unique personal appearance made by the Devil, the restriction of Jesus' words to scriptural quotation, the elaborate use of Scripture in quotation and allusion, difficulties of harmonization with the Johannine chronology (van Iersel, *Der Sohn*, 168), as well as judgments concerning the intention of the narrative, have led the majority of scholars to doubt the place of such an event in the life of Jesus. It is popular to identify the account as an elaborate midrash (Gerhardsson, *Testing*, passim; van Iersel, *Der Sohn*, 170). Much depends on how the text is understood. However, the difficulties are decisive only in relation to a narrow literalism. As we have it, the account is primarily concerned with identifying what constituted Satanic temptation for Jesus, affirming the fact of Jesus' steadfastness and reflecting on the significance of his success. The precise nature of the event is of secondary importance.

A temptation theme can certainly be traced back to Jesus (Mark 12:15) who connected temptation with Satan (Mark 8:33 and cf. van Iersel, *Der Sohn*, 167). As well, the stand of Jesus in the temptation narrative accords with the general character of his life and ministry. So there seems to be no particular reason for doubting that in some form or other the opening of Jesus' ministry was marked by such Satanic attack, probably in the context of a period of seclusion in the wilderness (Dupont, *RB* 73 [1966] 30–76). On the basis of the Matthean ending, Feuillet suggests (*Internationale Katholische Zeitschrift Communio* 8 [1979] 236) that Jesus reported such an experience to his disciples in the context of the rebuke of Peter (Mark 8:33). The OT citations of the account conform to the LXX (Stendahl, *St. Matthew*, 88–89; Holz, *Alttestamentlichen Zitate*, 61–64) but since the MT would serve as well, this need not point to a Greek-speaking origin.

In the NT there is little speculative interest in demonic world. Luke uses *Σατανᾶς*, "Satan," and *ὁ διάβολος*, "the Devil," interchangeably. When temptation,

sin, and spiritual darkness are in view, the direct action of Satan is normally envisaged (Luke 8:12; 22:3, 31; Acts 5:5; 26:18 and cf. 13:10). Demons are responsible for possession with resulting personality distortion and debilitating conditions (see references at 4:31-37). The ultimate origin of this demonic destruction is, however, located in the malevolence of Satan (Luke 13:16; Acts 10:38), who is head of an integrated hierarchy of evil (Luke 11:18 and cf. 10:18). Though Satan's opposition to God's purposes is unqualified, he operates only in the realm permitted to him by God (Luke 4:1-2; 22:31 and 53). There is here a close family relationship to rabbinic and Qumran views (see Kruse, *Bib* 58 [1977] 29-37; Foerster, *TDNT* 2:75-79; 7:152-56).

Comment

It has proved difficult to reach any kind of scholarly consensus about the main thrust of the temptation narrative. Is Jesus tempted to prove himself by signs (Dupont, *NTS* 3 [1957] 303)? Does the narrative defend Jesus against accusations of black magic and collusion with the Devil (S. Eitrem, "Die Versuchung Christi," *Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 24 [1923-24])? Is Jesus presented as the true Israel (Robinson, "Temptations," 54-60), faithful to God in the wilderness where Israel of old had failed? Or should we go back to the garden of Eden and see in Jesus a new Adam meeting the tempter at the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (Feuillet, *Bib* 40 [1959] 627-28)? Do we have an inner-church dispute in which Christians preoccupied with miracles are shown to have been seduced by the Devil (Fridrichsen, *Problem of Miracle*, 121-28)?

The individual temptations have also been subject to widely divergent interpretations.

1 The temptations are clearly an aftermath to the baptismal identification and anointing (see above). πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου, "full of [the] Holy Spirit," anticipates the successful outcome of the encounter. Barnabas (Acts 11:24) and Stephen (6:5, 8; 7:55) were also empowered by being "full of the Holy Spirit." On the Holy Spirit see further at 1:35 and 4:14. ὑπέστρεψεν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, "departed from the Jordan," signifies the basis for this episode in the baptismal experience (cf. 4:14). Luke's ἤγετο . . . ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ, "he was led about . . . in the wilderness," avoids the difficulty created by the impression in the Matthean and Markan texts that Jesus here enters the wilderness (after being with the Baptist in the wilderness!). Luke prefers ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, "in the Spirit," to Matthew's ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος, "by the Spirit." (ἐν + dative can be equivalent to ὑπὸ + accusative but not after a passive verb: ἐν here could be "by means of" but not "by" [contra Fitzmyer, 513].) Jesus is not subject to the Spirit (Conzelmann, *Luke*, 28), but only to God (ἤγετο "was led about": a divine passive). Jesus is supernaturally led about in the wilderness (ἤγετο . . . ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ) just as God led Israel about in the wilderness (Deut 8:2, ἤγαγε . . . ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ; MT has here "these forty years").

2 For the correspondence between forty days and forty years see Num 14:34 and Ezek 4:6. πειραζόμενος, "being tempted," probably reflects the Markan account. Luke follows Mark in making the temptations coextensive with the forty days. In the exodus wanderings, testing is a divine prerogative (e.g., Deut 8:2). Here too it is in the divine intention (ἤγετο). The double attribution

corresponds to the double sense of the *πειράζ*—root: “test” or “tempt.” Developing Jewish theology attributed to Satan what had earlier been univocally ascribed to God (Exod 4:24–26 cf. *Jub.* 48.2–3; 2 Sam 24:1 cf. 1 Chr 21:1; Gen 22:1 cf. *Jub.* 17.15–18; cf. Gerhardsson, *Testing*, 38–40). Jesus’ fidelity is proved (tested) by the temptations of the Devil. Luke avoids the religious language for fasting (*νηστεία*; *νηστεύειν*). Only here and after the Last Supper (Luke 22:16) does Jesus refrain from food. Elsewhere Luke regularly characterizes him as eating and drinking (7:34, etc.).

ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις, “in those days,” is Lukan (2:1; 5:35; 9:36; 21:23; Acts 2:18; 7:41; 9:37) and is generally connected with the motif of fulfillment (esp. Acts 2:18 quoting Joel 3:2). *συντελεσθεισών*, “having been completed,” is probably Lukan (Luke 4:13; Acts 21:27). *ἐπείνασεν*, “he was hungry,” perhaps echoes the use of *רָעָב* (*rā‘ēb*; “to hunger”) in Deut 8:3 (LXX has *ἐλμαγχόνησεν*). It prepares for the first temptation.

3 Throughout the episode Luke consistently uses *ὁ διάβολος*, “the Devil.” Matthew has *ὁ πειράζων*, “the tempter,” and *Σατανᾶς*, “Satan,” as well. The relationship between the extensive period of temptation and these final temptations is not well specified. Perhaps there is crescendo (*ἐπείνασεν*, “he was hungry”). Luke frequently has a generalizing statement accompanying accounts of particular events (4:14–15, 44, etc.; Acts 2:43–47, etc.). Satan does not arrive at this point (contra Matt 4:3) since he has already been present tempting. *υἱὸς . . . τοῦ θεοῦ*, “Son of God,” takes up 3:22, *ὁ υἱὸς μου* “my Son,” and relates also to the genealogy which concludes (at 3:38) with [*υἱὸς*] *τοῦ θεοῦ*, “son of God.” Something of the complexity of Luke’s use of the “Son” terminology has been seen at 3:22. For Luke it is essentially a relational term: the Son is privileged to share the family honor and resources, and lives in filial submission to his Father. That Jesus as Son of God has power to make stones bread is doubted neither by the Devil nor by Jesus himself. This sonship involved participation in the powers of the Father to a degree not anticipated for the sonship of Adam (but cf. Pokorný, *NTS* 20 [1973–74] 120–21; Cullmann, *Christology*, 144–52; Jervell, *Imago Dei*, 100–107, for the glorification of Adam in Judaism), nor for the sonship of Israel (Exod 4:22–23; Jer 31:9; Hos 11:1), nor perhaps even for the sonship of the messiah (see texts and discussion at 3:22). The Devil suggests that Sonship is a privilege to be exploited. Jesus is tempted to order his own affairs and provide for his own needs, rather than being nourished in filial dependence on God. The single “loaf” and “stone” of Luke’s account is a more appropriate response to hunger than Matthew’s “loaves” and “stones.”

4 Jesus’ reply is from the LXX text of Deut 8:36 (which follows the MT closely). Matthew has a longer quotation. The Lukan focus is on the negative: attention should not be on bread alone. When the Israelites were hungry in the wilderness and pined for the bread of Egypt (Exod 16:3), God provided manna to nourish them (Deut 8:3). There is no need to leave off attending to God to seek for oneself. Rather, one should seek God’s kingdom (Luke 12:31). The desire for bread should not determine the Son’s use of the possibilities and privileges that are his.

5 Luke reverses the order of the second and third temptations. Of the many suggestions concerning the reason for the changed order only that of a Jerusalem climax is at all persuasive (see below). In Luke the high vantage point is signaled by the verb *ἀναγαγών*, “taken up,” but a mountain is not

mentioned. The impressiveness of the display is heightened with *ἐν στιγμή χρόνου*, "in a moment of time." The spectacle is achieved by supernatural insight bestowed by Satan (cf. Schürmann, 210) which uncovers the extensiveness of his influence (v 6: *τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἅπασαν*, "all this authority"). Luke prefers *οἰκουμένης*, "inhabited world," to *κόσμου* "world" (cf. 2:1; 21:26; Acts 11:28, etc.). He relocates the final phrase *καὶ τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν*, "and their glory," into v 6.

6 The Devil's speech is introduced as in v 3. Where in Matthew it is the kingdoms which are offered, in Luke it is "all this authority [i.e., which you see now that I exercise] and their glory." *καὶ τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν*, brought from v 5, lacks a proper antecedent for *αὐτῶν*, "their," in its new position. Luke's form has also a supporting statement *ὅτι* ("because") [the glory of the kingdoms] *ἐμοὶ παραδέδοται καὶ ἧ ἐὰν θέλω δίδωμι αὐτήν* ("has been given to me and I give it to whomever I will"), i.e., Satan claims to see to the disposition of glory in the world.

The reality of this influence of Satan is not to be doubted (contra Doble, *ExpTim* 72 [1960-61] 92). His influence is co-extensive with the influence of evil in the fabric of human affairs. Perhaps we should think particularly of the hunger after power and glory (*ἐξουσίαν, δόξαν*) to which Jesus' way was such an antithesis (22:24-29: v 25, *οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν κυριεύουσιν*, "the kings of the nations lord it over"; v 27, *ὁ διακονῶν*, "the one who serves"; v 28, *πειρασμοῖς*, "temptations"; v 29, *βασιλείαν*, "kingdom").

Satan's role in this situation does not relate specifically to Satan worship (though note the way Judaism identified idolatry and demon worship [Gerhards-son, *Testing*, 65]). It is likely, therefore, that the worship of Satan to which Jesus is enticed is the temptation to pursue his task in the ways of the world (cf. Feuillet, *Internationale Katholische Zeitschrift Communio* 8 [1979] 230), to gain glory for himself in this world by compromise with the forces that control it (Robinson, "Temptations," 57), and to become indebted to Satan in the manner that every successful man of the world is. Despite Morgenthaler (*TZ* 12 [1956] 289-304; and cf. Pokorný, *NTS* 20 [1973-74] 126) no direct contrast between Christ and the Roman emperor is intended, but the connection he finds (p. 300) with Luke 22 (esp. vv 24-30) alerts us to the orientation to the cross already implicit in this second temptation.

Since Jesus is destined for messianic glory (24:26 and 9:26, 31, 32), this temptation is experienced by him in a uniquely messianic context (and cf. Ps 2:8 and Dan 7:14 LXX). But the temptation itself is a universal human temptation.

7 The sentence in v 6 has already become long. So the condition is now expressed in a separate sentence which briefly reiterates the offer. The redundant *πεσῶν*, "having fallen down," of Matthew's account is omitted and a fulsome *ἐνώπιον*, "before," added.

8 The *ὑπάγε Σατανᾶ*, "be gone Satan," of the Matthean account would be inappropriate with the new order. The quotation is from Deut 6:13 and is close to the A text of the LXX. In the Lukan form the *προσκυνήσεις*, "you shall worship," has been drawn to the beginning by the previous *προσκυνήσης*, "you will worship." The *μόνῳ*, "alone," of the LXX is a deduction from Deut 6:14. Each one of the temptations is answered in terms of right human piety. The stands taken by Jesus are those proper to every man.

9 Luke's ἤγαγεν, "brought," is better than Matthew's παραλαμβάνει, "takes along with." Luke introduces the name of the city (Matt: τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν, "the holy city") as he later introduces Nazareth into the rejection pericope (4:16). He adds ἐντεῦθεν, "from here," to make it clear that the request is not to throw himself at Satan's feet. The identity of τὸ περύγιον τοῦ ἱεροῦ (lit., "the winglet of the temple") remains a puzzle. Nothing comparable occurs in the OT, other early Jewish sources or in any of the rabbinic literature (Hyldahl, *ST* 15 [1961] 115). Only Hegesippus, in his account of the martyrdom of James, speaks of such a place (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 2.23.11). The later *Testament of Solomon* (22.8) uses the expression περύγιον τοῦ ναοῦ, "winglet of the shrine." However, both these texts (especially the latter, which is probably a Christian text [cf. Charlesworth, *Pseudepigrapha* 1:943]) may be suspected of dependence on the Gospel accounts. Certainly a very high point is meant, such as the "royal colonnade" which Josephus (*Ant.* 15.412) tells us overlooked a deep ravine from a giddy height. The word περύγιον may have been chosen to connect with the use of πτέρυγας, "wings," in the LXX of Ps 90[91]:4 (Gerhardsson, *Testing*, 59).

As with each of the other temptations we have here a private transaction between Jesus and the Devil. It is wrong, therefore, to create a crowd of observers to help explain the temptation, as is regularly done. The central motif of this temptation is the facing of death in Jerusalem. This temptation occupies the climactic third position because just such a facing of death in Jerusalem represents the climax of Jesus' ministry (Luke 9:51; 13:32–33). We should read the temptation in relation to the clear Lukan recognition of a divine timetable for Jesus' life that culminates in the Jerusalem passion (24:26 and cf. 2:35). Jesus is here encouraged by the Devil to provoke a life-threatening situation in Jerusalem in order to demand from God, on the basis of his privileged status as Son of God, release from vulnerability to threat upon his life. Jesus is to force the issue of divine protection.

10–11 The Devil supports his proposal with appeal to the promises in Ps 90[91] of protection to the godly man. The LXX text of vv 11 and 12 is reproduced without the final phrase of v 11 (ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς σου, "in all your ways") and identified as separate extracts by the connective καὶ ὅτι, "and that." According to the Devil's theory there should be no martyrs. But the divine purpose for Jesus, as for certain others, is that they should be preserved through death, not from death (Luke 21:16 with vv 18–19; 22:39–46 contrasted with the Petrine denials vv 54–62). "Vanquished by Scripture . . . in the first two temptations, the Devil now quotes it to his own purpose" (Fitzmyer, 517). In light of the passion narrative, Jesus' rejection of this temptation expresses his readiness in obedience to God to give up his life (cf. Gerhardsson, *Testing*, 61).

12 Each quotation thus far in the episode has been introduced by γέγραπται, "it stands written" (vv 4, 8, 10). As if the Devil's use has contaminated this form, now Jesus says εἰρηται, "it has been said" (a form not found elsewhere in the NT). He quotes from Deut 6:16. At Massah the people confronted God (Moses) about the preservation of their lives (Exod 17:3). But the faithful man does not seek to dictate to God how he must express his covenant loyalty and fulfill his promises. That would be to put God to the test and a failure to believe that God will do well by his son.

In the final analysis Jesus is tempted neither as second Adam, nor as true Israel, but as Son. There is a touch of Adamic typology and considerable exodus typology, but that is because the experiences of Adam and Israel are paradigmatic cases of the testing of God's Son. Jesus' temptations are not uniquely messianic, though it is clear that his sonship is of a uniquely exalted kind. His temptations are superlative instances of every person's temptations. The narrative presents moral challenge as well as Christological affirmation.

13 Luke has formulated his own ending for the temptation encounter. *συντελεῖν*, "to complete," is repeated from v 2. For *ἄχρι καιροῦ*, "until [an opportune] time," cf. Luke 1:20; 8:13; 21:24; and esp. Acts 13:11. *ἀφιστάναι*, "to depart," is found ten times in Luke's writings and not elsewhere in the Gospel tradition. *πάντα πειρασμόν* is here every kind of temptation (BAGD, 631). Temptations characterize Jesus' whole ministry (Luke 22:28), but the opportune time that Luke here particularly anticipates is the passion period with its heightened activity of Satan (22:3, 31, 53) and for Jesus the imminent prospect of drinking the cup of suffering (22:39-46, esp. 42).

Explanation

At his baptism (3:21-22) Jesus is identified as Son by the voice from heaven and anointed by the Spirit to empower his coming ministry (4:18). Now—before his ministry begins—his filial obedience is tested in the wilderness, separated from all human provision and support. Strengthened by the Spirit he faces the Satanic seductions. Echoes of the testing of God's son Adam (3:38) in the garden and of God's son Israel in the wilderness permeate the account. But it is with a greater Son that we here deal. Luke reports three temptations at the climax of the forty-day encounter with the Devil.

When Jesus is hungry the Devil suggests that such hunger does not befit his dignity as Son, that sonship should be treated as a privilege to be exploited. Jesus should see to his own needs. He has the power to make stone into bread; he should not neglect his opportunities. Jesus replies with words from Deut 8:36. The Israelites had pined for the bread of Egypt (Exod 16:3), but the attention of an obedient son should be on the kingdom (Luke 12:31), not on bread. God will provide, as he had with the manna. The desire for bread should not determine the Son's use of the possibilities and privileges that are his.

The Devil takes Jesus up and treats him to a dazzling display of his extensive influence in the kingdoms of the world: the Devil is a power broker who sees to the disposition of glory in the world. His influence is co-extensive with the influence of evil in the fabric of human affairs, and he works through every form of the desire for self-aggrandizement. The Devil entices Jesus to come over to his way: to gain glory for himself in this world by compromise with the demonic forces that control it. But Jesus has been appointed a kingdom as one who serves (22:24-29). He seeks not for himself but only for his God. He will worship God alone and not the idols of the nations (Deut 6:13).

The third place of temptation is at the temple in Jerusalem, the central place of the divine presence and protection (1 Kgs 9:3; 2 Chr 7:16; Ps 61:4-5; etc.). Here the Son of God is to insist upon the protection of God by throwing

himself down from a great height. We must read this temptation in relation to the Lukan recognition of a divine timetable for Jesus' life (Luke 9:51; 13:32–33) which leads to a facing of death in Jerusalem. Jesus is tempted to force the issue of divine protection, to demand in this provocative way the divine protection of the godly man promised in Ps 91. By the Devil's logic there should be no martyrs. But the divine purpose for Jesus, as for certain others, is that they should be preserved through death, not from death (Luke 21:16 with vv 18–19; 22:39–46 contrasted with the Petrine denials vv 54–62). Jesus will not put God to the test (Deut 6:16). He will believe that the faithful God will do well by his Son.

The Devil has tried every kind of temptation, but he will be back. Jesus' whole ministry is marked by temptations (trials; Luke 22:28), but particularly the passion period will be a time of special onslaught by Satan (22:3, 31, 53, 39–46) as Jesus' ultimate act of obedience (22:42) draws near.

Preaching in the Synagogues of the Jews

(4:14–44)

Introduction

This section introduces Jesus' public ministry with a focus on teaching in the synagogues. Jesus is presented as a charismatic itinerant whose expanding ministry is stopped neither by the murderous rage of the Nazareth synagogue (vv 29–30), nor by the attempt by the crowds of Capernaum to gain exclusive possession of him (vv 42–43). The Nazareth and Capernaum ministries are offered as exemplifying a ministry that begins in Galilee (v 14) and expands throughout Palestine (v 44).

Return to Galilee (4:14–15)

Bibliography

Delobel, J. “La Rédaction de Lc., IV, 14–16a et le ‘Bericht vom Anfang.’” In *L'Évangile de Luc*, ed. F. Neirynck. 203–23. **Freire, C. E.** “Jesús profeta, libertador del hombre: Vision lucana de su ministerio terrestre.” *EE* 51 (1976) 463–95. **Prevallet, E. M.** “The Rejection at Nazareth: Luke 4:14–30.” *Scr* 20 (1968) 5–9. **Reicke, B.** “Jesus in Nazareth—Lk 4, 14–30.” In *Das Wort und die Wörter*, FS G. Friedrich, ed. H. Balz and S. Schulz. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1973. 47–55. **Schürmann, H.** “Der ‘Bericht vom Anfang’: Ein Rekonstruktionsversuch auf Grund von Lk. 4, 14–16.” *SE* 2 [= TU 87] (1964) 242–58.

Translation

¹⁴*Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee, and a report about him spread through the whole countryside.* ¹⁵*He was teaching^a in their synagogues, being glorified by all.*

Notes

^aThe force of the imperfect ἐδίδασκεν should be retained in translation, since it makes clear that the synagogue ministry is the basis of the report, rather than itself arising subsequent to the spread of Jesus' reputation.

Form/Structure/Setting

While appearing in Luke's text at the point corresponding to Mark 1:14–15, Luke 4:15–15 is not properly to be regarded as a free redaction of these verses (Schürmann, “Bericht,” 243–44). Luke has made use of Mark 1:14, 28 and 39 to produce a generalizing summary. This use in a generalizing statement of material which is included at 4:37 and 44 is not unlike the echoing of Acts

2:19 in v 43, in the generalizing summary vv 43–47. Cf. also the relationship between Acts 8:4 and 11:19 (Harnack, *Acts*, 138).

According to Schürmann ("Bericht," esp. 243, and *Lukasevangelium*, 223), Luke 4:14–15 reflects a source containing a variant of the tradition behind Mark 1:14–15, 21–28, 32–39 (6:1–6). This source represents the second half of a "report of the beginning" available to Matthew and Luke, the first half of which, while more detailed, runs parallel to Mark 1:1–13 and is reflected in Luke 3:3–17 (21–22); 4:1–13. Luke makes use of this report to construct this pericope, with 4:14a, 14b, 15 (16) representing the report's parallel verses to Mark 1:14, 28, 39, (6:1). Schramm considered the argumentative base of Schürmann's case to be too narrow (*Markus-Stoff*, 90 n. 1). More recently Delobel ("Lc., IV, 14–16a") has been able to offer plausible alternative explanations for most of the features of the text in which Schürmann finds reflected the use of such a source. Luke's use of synonyms for purely stylistic purposes (Cadbury, "Lucan Style," 88–97) makes the identification of additional sources here precariously speculative.

In v 14a (cf. Mark 1:14) Luke naturally omits Mark's reference to John's arrest, since he has already dealt with it in 3:20. The change from ἦλθεν, "came," to ὑπέστρεψεν, "returned," reflects Lukan preference (Delobel, "Lc., IV, 14–16a," 210 n. 26), as well as linking v 14 with 4:1 and ultimately with the baptismal account (Schürmann, 222). ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος, "in the power of the Spirit," strengthens the same link, as well as connecting to the Capernaum exorcism in vv 31–37 where Luke has added δύναμις, "power," in v 36. The juxtaposition of δύναμις, "power," and πνεῦμα, "Spirit," is Lukan (1:17; Acts 1:8; 10:38). The omission of κηρύσσων τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ θεοῦ, "preaching the gospel of God," is adequately accounted for by the sample preaching to come in Nazareth and also by Luke's studious avoidance in the Gospel of the word εὐαγγέλιον, "gospel."

In v 14b (cf. Mark 1:28) the omission of εὐθύς, "immediately," the addition of περὶ, "concerning," the replacement of the tautologous πανταχοῦ εἰς ὅλην, "everywhere throughout all," by the more Lukan καθ' ὅλης, "through the whole," are all changes we might expect from Luke (Delobel, "Lc., IV, 14–16a," 212). τῆς Γαλιλαίας, "of Galilee," is omitted as repetitious after v 14a.

In v 15 (cf. Mark 1:39) ἦλθεν κηρύσσων, "came preaching," which would not follow well on v 14b, is replaced by ἐδίδασκεν, "taught"—probably inspired by Mark 1:21. εἰς ὅλην τὴν Γαλιλαίαν, "throughout all Galilee," would be pleonastic after v 14. καὶ τὰ δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλων, "and casting out demons," may be omitted in light of the mighty works implicit in the use of δύναμις in v 14. καὶ αὐτός, "and he," is typically Lukan (Hawkins, *Horae*, 18—Matt 4; Mark 5; Luke 41; Acts 8). The use of δοξάζεσθαι, "to glorify," is distinctive here. The generalization with πάντες, "all," is Lukan (Luke 1:63, 66; 2:18, 20, 47; 4:22, 28, 26, 37, etc.).

F. Schleiermacher considered vv 14–15 as the concluding section of a narrative of the beginnings of the public life of Jesus (*Über die Schriften des Lukas: Ein kritischer Versuch* [Berlin, 1817] 1:50). However, he has not been followed except by J. Wellhausen (7–8). Schürmann (221) seeks to do justice to the links these verses have with earlier material by labeling vv 14–15 "eine überleitende . . . Einleitung" (a transitional introduction). Most other interpreters

treat these verses as an introduction to the Galilean section of Jesus' ministry (Delobel, "Lc., IV, 14–16a," 207).

The links of v 14a to earlier materials have been noted above. We should further note Luke's frequent use of *ὑποστρέφειν*, "to return," to conclude an episode or section (1:56; 2:20; 7:10; 9:10; 24:[33], 52). The links of vv 14b and 15 are all to following material (see above). Thus, v 14a is transitional in serving to conclude the earlier section and to open this introductory piece.

As an introduction, vv 14–15 have been variously taken to relate to vv 16–30 (Bundy, *Jesus*, 67; cf. Grundmann, 98), vv 16–43 (Schürmann, 221), or 4:16–9:50 (Conzelmann, *Luke*, 30). To terminate the pericope at v 30 seems indefensible when vv 31 and 37 in the very next incident have such strong links with vv 14–15. To extend the section to 9:50 overlooks the transition from Galilee to Judea achieved at 4:44. We should also note that the major emphasis on teaching in the synagogue to be found in the Gospel is located in the section 4:14–44. (Teaching in the synagogue is mentioned again at 6:6 and 13:10, but there without the same focused concern on the teaching activity of Jesus as such, or on the response evoked by it.) V 44 has no forward reference (see discussion below), allowing vv 15 and 44 to form an *inclusio* (a bracketing device which identifies the enclosed material as a literary unit), with the latter marking the boundary of the section of text commented on by vv 14–15 and at the same time further generalizing the significance of the included incident (cf. Freire, *EE* 51 [1976] 468–69, 471–73). The links between vv 43 and 18 (see discussion on v 43 below) further strengthen the sense of *inclusio*, as does the nicely contrasting balance between the ministries in Nazareth and Capernaum: impressed in both cases (vv 22, 36), the one group would have lynched Jesus (v 29), while the other wished to gain exclusive possession of him (v 42).

Comment

14a Luke has not explicitly mentioned Jesus' departure from Galilee. The use of *ὑπέστρεψεν*, "returned," here (cf. 19:12 and Dömer, *Heil Gottes*, 62) refers rather to his coming from the baptism (and the temptations). These have a foundational role for the ministry in the power of the Spirit now to be exercised.

Luke expresses the role of the Spirit with Jesus variously by *καταβῆναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον . . . ἐπ' αὐτόν*, "the Holy Spirit came down on him" (3:22); *πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου*, "full of the Holy Spirit" (4:1); *ἐν τῷ πνεύματι*, "in the Spirit" (4:1); *ἐν τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ πνεύματος*, "in the power of the Spirit" (4:14); *πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ*, "the Spirit of the Lord is upon me" (4:18); *τῷ πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ*, "in the Holy Spirit" (10:21); and cf. *δύναμις Κυρίου ἦν εἰς τὸ ἰᾶσθαι αὐτόν*, "the power of the Lord was with him to heal" (5:17). The meanings are not identical but each identifies Jesus as a pneumatic figure: not ruled by the Spirit but operating in the sphere of the Spirit and with the power of the Spirit at his disposal (Schürmann, 222). On the Holy Spirit in Luke's writings see further at 1:35.

Luke's use of *δύναμις*, "power," here implies mighty works (cf. 4:36; 5:17; 9:1; and Acts 10:38). The *φήμη*, "report," of v 14b and the *ὅσα . . . γενόμενα*, "what . . . happened," of v 23b have their basis in the deeds of Jesus implicit in this use of *δύναμις* (Schürmann, "Bericht," 248).

14b “This was not done in a corner” (Acts 26:26) is a notice that could be written across much of the Lukan account. Luke is concerned to “document” the extensive public impact of Jesus (cf. J. Nolland, “Impressed Unbelievers as Witnesses to Christ (Luke 4:22a),” *JBL* 98 [1979] 219–29, esp. 226–27).

There is a certain infelicity in the use of ἐξῆλθεν . . . τῆς περιχώρου, “went out . . . the countryside,” without a precise location in view. However, this should not be resolved as Delobel suggests (“Lc., IV, 14–16a,” 213 n. 35): “and in each place, where Jesus presents himself, his renown spreads across all that region.” Rather Luke thinks of the region as the whole of Galilee, as the source history of the verse suggests (see above). The retention of ἐξῆλθεν is merely an oversight.

In περὶ αὐτοῦ, “concerning him,” the περὶ could be taken to pick up and repeat the περὶ from περιχώρου. This would give the pleonasm, “the surrounding countryside round about him.” However, Luke does not use περὶ with this sense. Further, 7:17 also has περὶ αὐτοῦ well separated from the noun which it qualifies and meaning “concerning him.”

15. Rengstorf (67) thinks that with ἐδίδασκεν (“he taught”; cf. Mark 1:39, κηρύσσων, “preaching”) Luke has predominantly scriptural exposition in mind. While it is true that Jesus comments on a text of Scripture in the Nazareth synagogue teaching to follow, and that the risen Christ expounds Scripture (24:27, 45)—but not in the synagogue—and further, that Paul’s synagogue ministry involved scriptural exposition (Acts 17:2–3, 11), nevertheless, such accounts as we have of Jesus’ synagogue ministry lay no special stress on biblical exposition, nor do Luke’s other uses of διδάσκειν, “to teach,” encourage this judgment (cf. Volkel, *ZNW* 64 [1973] 224–25 and n. 14).

αὐτῶν, “their,” lacks a true antecedent. However, it is merely repeated from Mark 1:39 and should not be read as an expression of Luke’s (and his reader’s) distance from Jewry (contra Marshall, 177, et al.). The sense is “the synagogues of the Galileans,” or just possibly “the synagogues of those who had heard report of his fame.”

In the sense required here δοξάζεσθαι, “to be glorified,” is applied to Jesus nowhere else in the NT. It is regularly God who is glorified. Despite this we should not think in terms of divine prerogative being conferred on Jesus (Delobel, “Lc., IV, 14–16a,” 216 n. 39). Rather, the use of δοξάζεσθαι is only a stylistic variation for the μαρτυρεῖν, θαυμάζειν, ἐκπλήσσεσθαι, θάμβος γενέσθαι, θάμβος περιέχειν, ἔκστασις λαμβάνειν, ἐξίσταναι by means of which Luke elsewhere expresses the very visible impact of the ministry of Jesus.

Explanation

V 14a introduces Jesus’ public ministry in Galilee as bursting on the scene as a culmination of his baptismal anointing with the Spirit (3:21–22; cf. 4:18 and Acts 10:38) and his Spirit-empowered (4:1), faithful obedience to God throughout the onslaught of the Devil’s attack in the wilderness (4:1–13). Jesus comes as an impressive pneumatic figure operating in the sphere of the Spirit and with the power of the Spirit at his disposal.

Vv 14–15 serve as a generalizing introduction to the accounts of concrete ministry in Nazareth and Capernaum: Jesus has this kind of ministry throughout

Galilee. (V 44 later generalizes further to all Judea and also serves to mark the boundary of the section commented on by vv 14–15.) The ministry involved is characterized as one of mighty works and synagogue teaching, both in the power of the Spirit.

As part of his presentation of the credentials of Christianity, Luke lays stress on the wide public access to a knowledge of the words and deeds of Jesus (many attracted to hear and see Jesus: 5:15; 6:17; etc.; from many places: 5:17; 6:17; 8:4; reports spread far and wide: 4:14, 37; etc.) and the extensive positive impact of his presence (astonishment: 4:15, 22; etc.; favorable attitude: 7:29; 9:43; etc.)—the latter receiving a distinct and surprising development in the Nazareth rejection scene to follow.

Preaching in Nazareth (4:16–30)

Bibliography

- Albertz, R.** "Die 'Antrittspredigt' Jesu im Lukasevangelium auf ihrem alttestamentlichen Hintergrund." *ZNW* 74 (1983) 182–206. **Anderson, H.** "Broadening Horizons: The Rejection at Nazareth Pericope of Luke 4:16–30 in Light of Recent Critical Trends." *Int* 18 (1964) 259–75. **Baarlank, H.** "Ein gnädiges Jahr des Herrn—und Tage der Vergeltung." *ZNW* 73 (1982) 204–20. **Bajard, J.** "La structure de la péricope de Nazareth en Lc., IV, 16–30: Propositions pour une lecture plus cohérente." *ETL* 45 (1969) 165–71. **Belser, J. E.** "Zu Lukas 4, 23." *TQ* 89 (1907) 365–73. **Billerbeck, P.** "Ein Synagogengottesdienst in Jesu Tagen." *ZNW* 55 (1964) 143–61. **Bishop, E. F. F.** "Three and a Half Years." *ExpTim* 61 (1949–50) 126–27. **Bonus, A.** "Widow or Gentile?" *ExpTim* 14 (1902–3) 430. **Bratcher, R. G.** "The Mission of the Servant of the Lord." *FM* 2 (1984) 65–71. **Brawley, R. L.** *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation*. 6–27. **Brun, L.** "Der Besuch Jesu in Nazareth nach Lukas." In *Serta Rudbergiana*. SO Suppletum 4, ed. H. Holst and H. Mørland. Oslo: 1931. 7–17. **Büchele, A.** *Der Tod Jesu*. 118–24. **Busse, U.** *Das Nazareth-Manifest*. **Cave, C. H.** "The Sermon at Nazareth and the Beatitudes in the Light of the Synagogue Lectionary." *SE* 33 [TU 88] (1964) 231–35. **Chevallier, M.-A.** *L'Esprit et le Messie*. 74–77. **Chilton, B.** "Announcement in Nazara: An Analysis of Luke 4:16–21." In *Gospel Perspectives: Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels*, vol. 2, ed. R. T. France and D. Wenham. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981. 147–72. ———. *God in Strength*. 123–77. **Combrink, H. J. B.** "The Structure and Significance of Luke 4:16–30." *Neot* 7 (1973) 27–47. **Crockett, L. C.** "The Old Testament in the Gospel of Luke, with Emphasis on the Interpretation of Isaiah 61:1–2." 2 vols. Providence, RI: Ph.D. diss., Brown University, 1966. ———. "Luke iv. 16–30 and the Jewish Lectionary Cycle: A Word of Caution." *JJS* 17 (1966) 13–46. ———. "Luke 4:25–27 and Jewish-Gentile Relations in Luke-Acts." *JBL* 88 (1969) 177–83. **Dahunsi, E. J.** "The Significance of the Account of the Nazareth Episode in the Gospel of Luke." Louisville, KY: Diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1957. **Dömer, M.** *Das Heil Gottes*. 49–62. **Elias, J. W.** "The Furious Climax in Nazareth (Luke 4:28–30)." In *The New Way of Jesus*, ed. W. Klassen. Newton, KS: Faith and Life, 1980. 87–99. **Eltester, W.** "Israel im lukanischen Werk." In *Jesus in Nazareth*, ed. W. Eltester. 131–45. **Finkel, A.** "Jesus' Sermon at Nazareth (Luk. 4, 16–30)." In *Abraham unser Vater: Juden und Christen im Gespräch über die Bibel*, FS O. Michel, ed. O. Betz, M. Hengel, and P. Schmidt.

- Leiden: Brill, 1963. 106–15. **Freire, C. E.** "Jesús profeta, libertador del hombre: Vision lucana de su ministerio terrestre." *EE* 51 (1976) 463–95, esp. 488–92. **George, A.** "La prédication inaugurale de Jésus dans la Synagogue de Nazareth, Luc 4, 16–30." *BVC* 59 (1964) 17–29. **Gils, F.** *Jésus prophète d'après les évangiles synoptiques*. 9–20. **Goguel, M.** "Le rejet de Jésus à Nazareth." *ZNW* 12 (1911) 321–24. **Guiling, A.** *The Fourth Gospel and Jewish Worship: A Study of the Relation of St. John's Gospel to the Ancient Jewish Lectionary System*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1960. **Haenchen, E.** "Historie und Verkündigung bei Markus und Lukas." In *Das Lukas-Evangelium*, ed. G. Braumann. 287–316. **Hill, D.** "The Rejection of Jesus at Nazareth (Luke iv 16–30)." *NovT* 13 (1971) 161–80. **Holzmeister, U.** "Das 'angenehme Jahr des Herrn' (Is 61,2=Lk 4, 19) und die Einjahrtheorie." *ZKT* 53 (1929) 272–82. **Jeremias, J.** *Jesus' Promise to the Nations*. 44–46. **Kealy, S. P.** "A Jubilee Spirituality." *DL* 33 (1983) 584–92. **Kirk, A.** "La Conciencia Messianica de Jesús en el Sermón de Nazaret: Lc 4, 16ss." *RevistB* 33 (1971) 127–37. **Klein, W. W.** "The Sermon at Nazareth (Luke 4:14–22)." In *Christian Freedom*, ed. W. and G. C. Grounds. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1986. 153–72. **Kodell, J.** "Luke's Gospel in a Nutshell (Lk 4:16–30)." *BTB* 13 (1983) 16–18. **Koet, B.-J.** "Today This Scripture Has Been Fulfilled in Your Ears." *Bijdragen* 47 (1986) 368–94. **Maillot, A.** "Réparer les coeurs brisés: Réunifier les vies en miettes." *La Revue Réformée* 27 (1976) 97–103. **Mangatt, G.** "'The Acceptable Year of the Lord' (Lk. 4:16–30)." *Biblehashyam* 9 (1983) 179–86. **Masson, C.** "Jésus à Nazareth." In *Vers les sources d'eau vive*. Publication de la Faculté de théologie, Université de Lausanne 2. Lausanne: Libraire Payot, 1961. 38–69. **Menezes, F.** "The Mission of Jesus according to Lk 4:16–30." *Biblehashyam* 6 (1980) 249–64. **Michl, J.** "Der Geist des Herrn ruht auf mir (Lk 4,18): Jesus, Träger und Spender des heiligen Geistes nach Lukas." *BK* 21 (1966) 42–45. **Miesner, D. R.** "The Circumferential Speeches of Luke-Acts: Patterns and Purpose." *SBL 1978 Seminar Papers*, vol. 2, ed. P. J. Achtemeier. Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1978. 223–57. **Miller, M.** "The Function of Isa. 61:1–2 in 11Q Melchizedek." *JBL* 88 (1969) 467–69. **Miller, P. D.** "Luke 4:16–21." *Int* 29 (1975) 417–21. **Nestle, E.** "Luc 4, 18.19." *ZNW* 2 (1901) 153–57. **Nolland, J.** "Luke's Readers." 4–89. ———. "Classical and Rabbinic Parallels to 'Physician, Heal Yourself' (Lk. IV.2)." *NovT* 21 (1979) 193–209. ———. "Impressed Unbelievers as Witnesses to Christ (Luke 4.22a)." *JBL* 98 (1979) 219–29. ———. "Words of Grace (Luke 4.22)." *Bib* 65 (1984) 44–60. **Noorda, S. J.** "Cure Yourself, Doctor' (Luke 4.23): Classical Parallels to an Alleged Saying of Jesus." In *Logia*, ed. J. Delobel. 459–67. **O'Fearghail, F.** "Rejection in Nazareth: Lk 4:22." *ZNW* 75 (1984) 60–72. **Perrot, C.** "Luc 4, 16–30 et la lecture biblique de l'ancienne synagogue." *RevScRel* 47 (1973) 324–40. **Potterie, I. de la.** "L'onction du Christ." *NRT* 80 (1958) 225–52. **Preuschen, E.** "Das wort vom verachteten Propheten." *ZNW* 17 (1916) 33–48. **Prevallet, E. M.** "The Rejection at Nazareth: Luke 4:14–30." *Scr* 20 (1968) 5–9. **Reid, D. P.** "Jesus' Return to Nazareth." *BiTod* 23 (1985) 39–43. **Rese, M.** *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas*. 143–54. **Rice, E. P.** "Fulfilled in Your Ears." *ExpTim* 29 (1917–18) 45–46. **Rice, G. E.** "Luke 4:31–44: Release for the Captives." *AUSS* 20 (1982) 23–28. **Rodriguez, G. P.** "L'Évangile (Lc 4, 16–22): Jésus à la synagogue de Nazareth." *AsSeign* 38 (1967) 26–39. **Rogers, M.** "Luke 4:16–30—A Call for a Jubilee Year?" *RTR* 40 (1981) 72–82. **Samain, E.** "Le discours-programme de Jésus à la synagogue de Nazareth—Lc 4, 16–30." *Foi et vie* 70/5 (1971) 25–43; *Cahiers bibliques* 10. ———. "Le discours-programme de Nazareth—Lc 4, 16–21." *AsSeign* 20 (1973) 17–27. ———. "Aucun prophète n'est bien reçu dans sa patrie—Lc 4, 21–30." *AsSeign* 35 (1973) 63–72. **Sanders, J. A.** "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4." In *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults*, FS M. Smith, vol. 1, ed. J. Neusner. Leiden: Brill, 1975. 75–106. **Schmeichel, W.** "Christian Prophecy in Lukan Thought: Luke 4:16–30 as a Point of Departure." In *SBL 1976 Seminar Papers*, ed. G. MacRae. Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1976. 293–304. **Schmidt, K. L.** *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*.

38-43. **Schürmann, H.** "Zur Traditionsgeschichte der Nazareth-Perikope Lk 4, 16-30." In *Mélanges bibliques*, FS B. Rigaux, ed. A. Descamps and A. de Halleux. Gembloux: Duculot, 1970. 187-205. **Seccombe, D. P.** *Possessions and the Poor in Luke-Acts*. 44-69. **Sherlock, W.** "The Visit of Christ to Nazareth: A Study in the Synoptic Gospels, Matt. xiii 54-58; Mark vi 16; Luke iv 16-30." *JTS*, o.s., 11 (1909-10) 552-57. **Sloan, R. B.** *The Favorable Year of the Lord: A Study of Jubiliary Theology in the Gospel of Luke*. Austin, TX: Schola, 1977. **Stevens, B. A.** "Jesus as the Divine Warrior." *ExpTim* 94 (1983) 326-29. **Stonehouse, N. B.** *The Witness of Luke to Christ*. 68-92. **Strobel, A.** "Die Ausrufung des Jubeljahrs in der Nazarethpredigt Jesu: Zur apokalyptischen Tradition Lc 4, 16-30." In *Jesus in Nazareth*, ed. W. Eltester. 38-50. ———. "Das apokalyptische Terminproblem in der sogen. Antrittspredigt (Lk 4, 16-30)." *TLZ* 92 (1967) 251-54. **Stuhlmacher, P.** *Das paulinische Evangelium*. 1:225-34. **Sturch, R. L.** "The 'ΠΑΤΡΙΣ' of Jesus." *JTS*, n.s., 28 (1977) 94-96. **Tannehill, R. C.** "The Mission of Jesus according to Luke iv 16-30." In *Jesus in Nazareth*, ed. W. Eltester. 51-75. **Temple, P. J.** "The Rejection in Nazareth." *CBQ* 17 (1955) 229-42. **Thiering, B.** "The Three and a Half Years of Elijah." *NovT* 23 (1981) 41-55. **Tiede, D. L.** "Proclaiming the Righteous Reign of Jesus: Luke 4 and the Justice of God." *WW* 7 (1987) 83-90. **Trocme, A.** *Jesus and the Nonviolent Revolution*. Tr. M. H. Shank and M. E. Miller. Scottdale, PA: Herald Press, 1973. 27-40. **Trudinger, L. P.** "Subtle Symbols of Sacramentalism? A Note on Luke 4:25-27." *RTR* 31 (1972) 95-96. **Tuckett, C. M.** "Luke 4,16-30, Isaiah and Q." In *Logia*, ed. J. Delobel. 343-54. **Violet, B.** "Zum rechten Verständnis der Nazareth-Perikope Lc 4, 16-30." *ZNW* 37 (1938) 251-71. **Yoder, J. H.** *The Politics of Jesus*. 34-40, 60-77.

See also the *Bibliography* for 4:14-15.

Translation

¹⁶He came to Nazareth where he had been brought up and, following his custom, on the sabbath day he went into the synagogue and stood up to read. ¹⁷The scroll of the prophet Isaiah was handed to him and he unrolled the scroll and found the place where it stood written,

¹⁸The Spirit of the Lord is upon me
because he anointed me.

To evangelize the poor he has sent me,^a
to proclaim to the captives liberty and to the blind recovery of sight,
to send the oppressed away in liberty,

¹⁹to proclaim the year acceptable to the Lord.

²⁰He rolled up the scroll, handed it to the attendant and sat down: the eyes of all in the synagogue were fixed on him. ²¹Then^b he set about telling them: "Today, this scripture has been fulfilled in your ears." ²²They were all bearing witness to him, in that^c they were marveling at the words of grace coming from his mouth. Then^d they said, "Isn't this fellow Joseph's son?" ²³He said to them, "No doubt you will quote this proverb to me: 'Physician, heal yourself; what we have heard happened in Capernaum, do also here in your native place.'" ²⁴He said in response, "Amen, I say to you, no prophet is acceptable in his native place. ²⁵But in truth, I tell you, many widows were, in the days of Elijah, in Israel, when the heavens were shut up for three years and six months, as a great famine gripped the land; ²⁶and Elijah was sent to none of them, only to Zarephath in the territory of Sidon, to a widow

woman. ²⁷Again,^e many lepers were in Israel in the time of Elisha the prophet, and none of them was cleansed, only Naaman, the Syrian.” ²⁸When they heard this, all in the synagogue were filled with wrath. ²⁹They rose up, hustled him out of the city and took him to a cliff of the hill on which their city was built so that they might cast him down. ³⁰But he passed through their midst and went on his way.

Notes

^aThere has been some modern defense of the majority text's addition of *ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τὴν καρδίαν*, “to heal the broken-hearted” (Isa 61:1), on the basis of contextual appropriateness (Schürmann, 229) and rhythm (Reicke, “Jesus in Nazareth,” 48–49). No adequate reason has, however, been offered for the omission.

^bCf. Robertson, *Grammar*, 1184.

^cFor a full discussion of the translation of *καί* here as “in that” see Nolland, *JBL* 98 (1979) 228–29, and cf. 1 Cor 8:12; 3 Kgdms 13:21–22; BDF 442(9), 471; BAGD, 393.

^d*καί*, “and,” marks sequence with slight separation in a way that suggests “then” as an appropriate translation (cf. 10:9; 23:42 and 43).

^eSuch a translation for *καί*, “and,” is not recognized in the grammars. However, it best expresses the nature of the coordination present here.

Form/Structure/Setting

Structure

Luke omits Mark 1:15 and instead characterizes Jesus' preaching ministry by means of his account of Jesus' activity in Nazareth and Capernaum. For the connection and parallel between Luke 4:16–30 and vv 31–37 compare v 16 (*καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς Ναζαρά*, “and he came to Nazareth”) and v 31 (*καὶ κατήλθεν εἰς Καφαρναούμ*, “and he came down to Capernaum”); v 16 (*Ναζαρά*, “Nazareth”) and v 34 (*Ναζαρηνέ*, “of Nazareth”); v 16 (*ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων*, “on the day of the sabbath”) and v 31 (*ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν*, “on the sabbath”); note also the probable allusion in v 34 to the widow of Zarephath's words to Elisha from 1 Kgs 17:18 (Benoit and Boismard, *Synopse*, 95, II.1.b); and consider the way Luke 4:14–15 functions as introduction for both vv 16–30 and vv 31–39 (see above), and how vv 43–44 build out from a combination of the Nazareth and Capernaum materials. (Cf. Freire, *EE* 51 [1976] 486–88.) Freire's pattern of proclamation in Nazareth and realization in Capernaum (468) is too precise but points in the right direction.

The Nazareth scene has been brought forward by Luke from its Markan position (6:1–6), and is used to encapsulate major features of the ministry of Jesus. Schürmann (“Nazareth-Perikope,” 201–3, cf. “Bericht”) has argued that Luke was aided in this relocation by the position of the Nazareth account (after the Capernaum account) in a source representing a “report of the beginning.” The basis for identifying such a source is criticized above (see at vv 14–15).

The quotation in vv 18–19 is framed by a chiasm formed by the verbs *ἀνέστη*, *ἐπεδόθη*, *ἀνείξας* (“stood up,” “was handed,” “unrolled”—vv 16–17) and *πύξας*, *ἀποδούς*, *ἐκάθισεν* (“rolled up,” “handed,” “sat down”—v 20). The quotation itself is structured by the thrice-repeated “me” (*ἐμέ*, *με*, *με*) and by the resolution of “to evangelize the poor” into parallel infinitive clauses.

The juxtaposition of ἀπεστάλην, “I was sent,” and εὐαγγελισασθαι, “to preach good news,” in v 43 suggests that εὐαγγελισασθαι πτωχοῖς, “evangelize the poor,” should be linked with ἀπέσταλκέν με, “he has sent me,” rather than with ἐχρίσέν με, “he anointed me.” Loisy (156) has argued for the same structuring on the basis of rhythm; Nestle, ZNW 2 (1901) 153–57 finds textual evidence; Morgenthauer, *Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis*, 84, points to this thrice-repeated pronoun.

Sources

There can be little doubt that Luke had access to an additional account of Jesus’ ministry in Nazareth. The mention of Capernaum in v 23b is inexplicable on the basis of free Lukan construction. (Conzelmann [*Luke*, 32–33; following Wellhausen, 10] finds a real future in the ἐρεῖτε, “you will say,” of v 23 and understands the verse as prophetic. This is very artificial and has not been followed. Eltester [“Israel,” 143–45] explains v 23b in terms of Luke having originally inserted his Nazareth account in the Markan position and then later having transferred it in a modified form to its present location, in the wake of the hardening of lines between Christians and Jews. Eltester is forced to such an expedient by having adopted an understanding of the Nazareth account according to which Israel appears in a different light here than is the case in the remainder of Luke-Acts. The problem lies with his understanding of the pericope.) Therefore, Luke must have found v 23b in a source. However, v 23b is too contingent to have survived in the tradition apart from an account of Jesus’ ministry in Nazareth.

The nature and extent of such an account is much more problematical. Estimates as to its extent range from the skepticism of Haenchen (“Historie,” 303; *Weg*, 217), who sees no proof of any additional source beyond Mark, to the optimism of Schürmann (“Nazareth-Perikope”), for whom such a source is represented in every verse. For representative lists of suggested source reconstructions see Schürmann, “Nazareth-Perikope,” 195, and Marshall, 179.

Attempts to identify Semitic features in the account are of uncertain validity because of the Septuagintalizing style of Luke. (For an attempt to identify an Aramaic written source see Violet, ZNW 37 [1938] 251–71; and cf. Wellhausen, 10.) On the other hand, the presence of Lukan vocabulary and style is not incompatible with extensive source material, given Luke’s strong propensity to reexpression of his sources (Schürmann, *Untersuchungen*, 194 n. 4; Kümmel, *Introduction*, 138; Cadbury, *Style*, passim).

It seems unlikely that Luke is mainly dependent on a simple unified account. The difficulties in the thought sequence, especially v 22 to v 23, v 23 to v 24, and v 24 to vv 25–27, strongly suggest that various traditions have been welded together here. However, this same observation does suggest a considerable use of source materials as opposed to free composition. Free composition would produce an account with a more obvious unity than Luke has here achieved.

The Aramaic name form Ναζαρά (Nazareth) in v 16 reflects a traditional source. Luke elsewhere used the form Ναζαρέθ. In the same verse τεθραμμένος, “brought up,” is probably not a spontaneous Lukan choice of words (Schürmann, “Nazareth-Perikope,” 196; Black, *Aramaic Approach*, 254). The same is true of the use of βιβλίον, “book,” in vv 17 and 20 since Luke elsewhere consistently uses βίβλος.

The Isaianic text quoted in vv 18–19 is clearly Septuagintal. (i) It agrees with the LXX against the Hebrew in reading *Κυρίου*, “Lord,” instead of *יהוה*, *ādōnāy* YHWH (“Lord Yahweh”), and *τυφλοῖς*, “blind,” instead of *עיוורים*, *āsûrîm* (“those bound”—see J. A. Sanders, “Isaiah 61,” 80–82). (ii) The wording follows LXX apart from *κηρύξαι*, “to proclaim,” in v 19 for LXX *καλέσαι* and the infinitive *ἀποστέλλαι*, “to send,” in v 18 in place of the LXX imperative form *ἀποστείλε*. The first departure from LXX could be MT influence since MT has *קָרָא*, *qārā*, both here and for the earlier *קָרָא* in v 18 (France, *Jesus*, 243), but it is more likely that Luke substitutes a synonym which is more suited for expressing the preaching of the gospel and which is ready to hand earlier in the quotation. The second is required to fit the fragment from Isa 58:6, of which it is part, into the syntax of Isa 61:1–2. (iii) The inserted phrase from Isa 58:6, *ἀποστέλλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφ᾽εσεί*, “to send the oppressed away in liberty,” seems to be linked to Isa 61:1 by the catchword *ἀφ᾽εσεί*, “liberty.” But in the Hebrew two different words are used.

The other main features of the text as quoted are the omission from Isa 61:1 of the line *ιάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τῇ καρδίᾳ*, “to heal the broken-hearted,” and the omission of the continuing words of Isa 61:2, *καὶ ἡμέραν ἀνταποδόσεως*, “and a day of vengeance.” For these omissions see *Comment* section below.

The LXX text form and the evident redactional activity in no way preclude an actual reading of Isa 61 in the Nazareth synagogue. It has been objected that we have here a messianic self-affirmation that would not fit what we know of the historical Jesus (e.g., Loisy, 156). However, this objection is not telling. (i) The text can be naturally understood as referring to the eschatological prophet and not the messiah (see below), and a self-consciousness as eschatological prophet is widely attributed to the historical Jesus (Bultmann, *Theology* 1:4–11). (ii) Despite all reserve, self-reference by Jesus is much more deeply embedded in the earliest synoptic tradition than is sometimes recognized (B. E. Gärtner, “The Person of Jesus and the Kingdom of God,” *TToday*, 27 [1970] 32–43, and see even Bultmann, *Theology* 1:7). (iii) This use of Isa 61 fits neatly with the use of the Isaianic collage in Luke 7:22 in response to the Baptist’s inquiry (cf. Eltester, “Israel,” 137; Dunn, *Jesus*, 54–62), the authenticity of which is not generally disputed (Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 128). (iv) The use of Isa 61:1 in the Qumran document 11QMelch provides an interesting Palestinian background for the use here in Luke 4. (See Y. Yadin, “A Note on Melchizedek and Qumran,” *IEJ* 15 [1965] 152–54; M. de Jonge and A. S. van der Woude, “11QMelchizedek and the New Testament,” *NTS* 12 [1965–66] 301–2; J. A. Fitzmyer, *Semitic Background*, 250, 265–66; A. Strobel, “Ausrufung des Jubeljahrs,” 48–49; Hill, *NovT* 13 [1971] 179.)

Vv 28–30 have lain under the heaviest suspicion of being free Lukan composition (Tannehill, “Mission,” 61; Masson, “Jésus à Nazareth,” 60). (i) The language and style are thoroughly Lukan (Tannehill, 61). (ii) There is a certain tension between these verses and the Markan account. (But see Marshall, 180, and Brun’s conjecture [“Besuch Jesu,” 15] that an attempt to murder Jesus at some other location has been transferred to Nazareth.) (iii) The reference to *ἕως ὀφρύος τοῦ ὄρους ἐφ’ οὗ ἡ πόλις ὠκοδόμητο αὐτῶν* (normal translation: “to the brow of the hill on which their city was built”) has proved difficult to

square with the geography of Nazareth (Schmidt, *Rahmen*, 42–43; Grundmann, 123; Tannehill, “Mission,” 61). However, Reicke (“Jesus in Nazareth,” 51) insists on the absence from ὄψρος of the definite article and justifies a translation: “to a cliff of the hill on which their city was built.” In this case suitable cliffs are not difficult to locate (Grundmann, 123). Reicke’s translation fits well with an understanding of the intended act as a preliminary to stoning. (See below in *Comment.*)

Vv 25–27 are widely recognized as a pre-Lukan unit (Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 32); both LXX text influence (Tannehill, “Mission,” 60) and early Aramaic tradition (Jeremias, *Jesus’ Promise*, 51) have been claimed. The “three and a half years” of v 25 (contrast the “three years” of 1 Kgs 18:1) almost certainly reflect a tradition in which “three and a half” is symbolic of persecution and distress (Jas 5:7; Dan 7:25; 12:7; Rev 11:2–3; 12:6, 14; 13:5; Josephus, *War* 1.32). Since this symbolism seems to play no role in Luke’s presentation (contra Loisy, 162–63; Thiering, *NovT* 23 [1981] 51–55), its use should be attributed to an earlier stage of the tradition (cf. Fitzmyer, 537–38).

Historical Context

Luke’s Nazareth synagogue scene contains the earliest extant report of a synagogue service (Marshall, 181). With due allowance for Luke’s evident intent to keep Jesus center-stage (Haenchen, “Historie,” 294), the account reflects an accurate knowledge of first-century synagogue practice (Billerbeck, *ZNW* 55 [1964] 143–161; Schürer [ed. Vermes, Millar, and Black], *Jewish People* 2:447–63), though there is not enough detail to justify Rengstorff’s confident judgment (67) that a knowledge of specifically Palestinian synagogue customs can be inferred.

The major elements of the synagogue service were the recitation of the *Shema* (Deut 6:4–9; 11:13–21; Num 15:37–41), the praying of the *Tephillah* by one of the congregation, a reading from the Torah (probably shared by several people), a reading from the Prophets (both readings accompanied by Aramaic paraphrase), a sermon based on the readings and a final priestly blessing (if a priest was present). Tasks were allocated to congregation members by the ἀρχισυνάγωγος / תַּנְשֵׁימָא שַׂר, ῥῶς *hakēneset* (“ruler of the synagogue”), who supervised the arrangements for worship and the business of the synagogue as a whole.

It seems unlikely that Jesus should be regarded as reading here from Isa 61 in relation to a fixed lectionary cycle. While it is possible that a relatively fixed three-year cycle of Torah readings had become customary, there is no real evidence for fixed prophetic lections. (See Guilding, *Jewish Worship*; L. Morris, *Jewish Lectionaries*; Crockett, *JJS* 17 [1966] 13–46; Heinemann, “The Triennial Lectionary Cycle,” *JJS* 19 [1968] 41–68; Perrot, *RevScRel* 47 [1973] 324–40; Goulder, *Midrash*.)

There is some uncertainty about what is meant to represent the sermon in Nazareth. Finkel (“Jesus’ Sermon,” 106–15) has speculated that we have the text of Jesus’ address in the Sermon on the Mount, especially in the Beatitudes (cf. Cave, “Sermon at Nazareth,” 231–35). Sanders (“Isaiah 61,” 92) locates the sermon in the midrash on Elijah and Elisha in vv 25–27. However, the traditional view that v 21 represents the sermon (*in nuce*) finds support in the

posture of Jesus (cf. Matt 23:2; 26:55; Str-B, 1:997; 4/1:185), in the expectation of the people in v 20, and in the event and response pattern present in vv 21 and 22.

Some influence from the diatribe may be in evidence in v 23 where Jesus brings to expression the unspoken thoughts of his hearers (Eltester, "Israel," 141) but the correspondence is less than perfect and, as will be suggested below, Luke's concern here is Christological rather than literary.

It is likely that the use of ἀμήν, "amen," before a verb of saying is a speech characteristic unique to the historical Jesus (for the literature and an overview of the discussion see Fitzmyer, 536–37).

Comment

Luke 4:16–30 is widely regarded as a programmatic text for Luke's whole enterprise and has therefore been the subject of intense study. Much of the study of this pericope has been preoccupied with the issue of the inner coherence in the story, with attempts on the one hand to explain the lack of coherence in terms of the combination of sources and, sometimes, redaction (e.g., Loisy, 159–60; Asting, *Verkündigung*, 595–96; Leaney, 50–54; Lohfink, *Sammlung*, 44–46) and with arguments on the other hand that there is in fact an essential unity of development within the narrative (see esp. Violet, *ZNW* 37 [1938] 251–71; Jeremias, *Jesus' Promise*, 44–46; Bajard, *ETL* 45 [1969] 165–71; Hill, *NovT* 13 [1971] 161–80; Combrink, *Neot* 7 [1973] 27–47; Nolland, "Luke's Readers," 4–85).

A first focus of interest in the study of this pericope has been the quotation from Isa 61, where attention has been given to the Christology involved and to the nature of the program of liberation implied.

Major issues involved in understanding the remainder of the account include (i) the nature of the initial response to Jesus (v 22); (ii) what is implied by the identification of Jesus as "son of Joseph" (v 22b); (iii) the motivation for Jesus' remarks in vv 23–24; (iv) the nature of the demand that the Nazareth congregation has in mind in v 23; (v) the purpose of v 24 as response to or justification of v 23; (vi) the role of vv 25–27 and their reference (if any) to the Gentile mission; (vii) the basis for the fury of v 28; (viii) the significance to be attributed to Jesus' safe delivery in v 30; (ix) the contribution of the pericope to a clarification of Luke's understanding of Jesus' rejection by the Jews.

16 οὗ ἦν τετραμμένος, "where he was brought up," serves here to link with the infancy narrative, esp. 2:39–40, 51–52, and to prepare for vv 22–23. Nazareth, already known to the reader, does not need to be introduced here as "a city of Galilee" as does Capernaum in v 31 (cf. 1:26).

κατὰ τὸ εἶωθός αὐτοῦ, "as was his custom," is a reference back to v 15. It refers to Jesus' synagogue teaching habits (Loisy, 155; Chilton, "Announcement in Nazara," 152–53; cf. Busse, *Nazareth-Manifest*, 31 and 56)—not to his earlier practice in Nazareth, nor generally to his practice of attending synagogue—and makes the Nazareth scene into a concrete exemplification of Jesus' Galilean synagogue teaching ministry.

The account of the synagogue service is foreshortened to eliminate everything

that would keep Jesus from center-stage and that would detract from a sense of his total command of the situation (Haenchen, "Historie," 294).

17 In the absence of fixed prophetic lections it is not clear how the particular choice of readings was regulated by the ruler of the synagogue, but here a sense of the initiative of Jesus dominates the account. Qumran scrolls of Isaiah indicate that in NT times one scroll could contain the whole text of Isaiah. ἀναπτύξας ("unrolled"; cf. v 20: πτύξας, "rolled up") is the appropriate expression for handling a parchment scroll.

18 πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me," continues the thread that runs back through 4:14 and 4:1 to 3:22 where the Spirit came down ἐπ' αὐτόν, "upon him." From Acts 10:38 we learn that Luke reads ἐχρίσεν με as "God anointed me with the Holy Spirit": the Spirit is upon Jesus by reason of the anointing that occurred at his baptism (against Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive*, 148). Luke gives confusing signals about whether the anointing is to be understood as prophetic (de la Potterie, *NRT* 80 [1958] 231–33; Hahn, *Titles*, 381–82; Stuhlmacher, *Das paulinische Evangelium* 2:142–46, 225–30; Freire, *EE* 51 [1976] 473–79 and cf. Gils, *Jésus prophète*, 12–20) or messianic (Schnider, *Prophet*, 165; Tannehill, "Mission," 69, and cf. Dömer, *Heil Gottes*, 61, who is, however, quite wrong in denying a Jewish content to Luke's use of "Christ").

The natural sense in the Isaianic context is prophetic. The Targum makes this explicit: "The spirit of prophecy from before the Lord Elohim is upon me" (Stenning, *Isaiah*, 202). A prophetic anointing finds support from the Qumran documents. "Anointed" seems to be used collectively of the prophets in CD 2.12, 61. 1QM 11.7 speaks of a (past) figure in the community as "God's anointed," while 1QH 18.14 applies Isa 61:1 to probably the same figure. 11QMelch applies Isa 61:1 to an eschatological figure (line 6) who is called the "anointed of the Spirit" (line 18). A prophetic identity for Jesus is of importance to Luke in this pericope and elsewhere (see on v 24 below).

On the other hand Luke does juxtapose Χριστοῦ ("Christ" = "anointed") and ἐχρίσας ("you anointed") in Acts 4:26–27 (despite de la Potterie, *NRT* 80 [1958] 240–47), and in the baptism account "son" (3:22) seems to have some messianic content (see discussion above at 3:21–22).

It is likely, given Luke's tendency to use Christological titles somewhat promiscuously (Conzelmann, *Luke*, 170–74; Wilckens, *Missionsreden*, 156; Schürmann, 249), that Luke thinks in both prophetic and messianic terms (cf. Tiede, *Prophecy and History*, 46), though in the immediate pericope the prophetic thought is predominant. In any case, the stress is on Jesus as anointed by the Spirit (van Unnik, *NTS* 8 [1961–62] 113–16).

The figure in Isa 61 brings and does not merely herald salvation. This is already true in the Isaianic context (Isa 40:9; 41:27; 52:7; cf. 51:16; Friedrich, *TDNT* 2:707–10) and is carried on in the tradition of Palestinian Judaism (pp. 714–17) and strengthened in Luke 4 by the insertion from Isa 58:6. The time of salvation comes with the announcement.

"To evangelize the poor" in 4:18 should be read as an encompassing designation of Jesus' whole ministry which is then expanded upon in the remainder of the verse (Bammel, *TDNT* 6:906). Such an analysis finds confirmation from a comparison of 4:43 with v 18.

The extent to which one should spiritualize the references here to the poor, the captives, the blind, and the oppressed is a vexing question. The captives and the oppressed are not mentioned again and no specific ministry to them is recorded. A connection with exorcism is, however, near at hand. (Note the immediately following exorcism in Capernaum and see 13:16 and Acts 10:38. Cf. Busse, *Wunder*, 64–65.) Elsewhere in Luke the blind are the physically blind (14:13) and Jesus heals them (7:21, 22; 18:35). However, in parabolic contexts there may be a secondary, nonliteral meaning (6:39; 14:13, 21; and cf. Acts 26:18 where “to open their eyes” refers to spiritual sight). The poor are frequently mentioned, clearly literally in 14:13, 21; 16:20, 22; 18:22; 19:8; 21:3, but also in 6:20 and 7:22 where a literal reference can be disputed.

The evident connection between 4:18 and 7:22 with its quite literal application in v 21 should keep us from rejecting literal reference entirely. The line *ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συνετριμμένους τῇ καρδίᾳ*, “to heal the broken-hearted,” with its nonliteral reference to healing, is the line Luke preferred to omit (cf. Freire, *EE* 51 [1976] 475; Busse, *Nazareth-Manifest*, 35—against Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive*, 145, and cf. Schweizer, *TDNT* 6:407–9; Luke does not omit the line to avoid connecting healings and the Spirit).

It is widely agreed that the language of Jubilee release (Lev 25 and cf. Deut 15:2) is being picked up in Isa 61:1–2. This impression is strengthened by the additional reference to *ἀφῆσις*, “liberty, release, Jubilee,” in the line inserted from Isa 58:6. Yoder (*Politics*, 34–40, 64–77) following Trocmé (*Revolution*, 27–40) claims that Jesus is demanding an implementation of Jubilee requirements, while Strobel (“Ausrufung des Jubeljahrs,” 38–50, and cf. *TLZ* 92 [1967] 251–54) has argued for that year being in fact a Jubilee year (A.D. 26/27) with heightened eschatological expectations due to the link with the 490-years prophecy of Dan 9:24.

However, there is a definite Jewish tradition of using the language of Jubilee to image salvation. (In addition to Isa 61:1–2, see 11QM^{elch} which makes use of Isa 61:1–2 in a clearly Jubilee manner [Miller, *JBL* 88 (1969) 467–69]; *Pss. Sol.* 11; *Shemoneh ‘Esreh* 10. In Isa 61, vv 1 and 2 are clearly no call to implement Jubilee legislation!) And if this is the case, then it is not finally an analysis of the language of Isa 61:1–2, but rather the perceived nature of men’s bondage in the Lukan frame that must determine the force of the words as used here (cf. Busse, *Nazareth-Manifest*, 34; *ibid.*, *Wunder*, 428–34, 438–39, 480–84).

The Lukan Jesus is no social reformer and does not address himself in any fundamental way to the political structure of his world, but he is deeply concerned with the literal, physical needs of men (Acts 10:38), as with their directly spiritual needs.

The presence of the Jubilee (*ἀφῆσις*) imagery tells against the simple equation of Luke’s use of *ἀφῆσις*, “liberty,” here with his use elsewhere of *ἀφῆσις* for “forgiveness of sins” (twice concerning John the Baptist, 1:77; 3:3; and once with reference to the post-Pentecost mission, 24:27—against Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive*, 146 and 151). Sight for the blind (7:21, 22; 18:35) and good news for the poor (7:22 and cf. 6:20) are the elements that Luke clearly takes up. See further discussion at 6:20–26; 7:21–22.

19 *δεκτόν*, “acceptable,” is to be understood in relation to the divine will

and purpose, here a divine will to salvation (Grundmann, *TDNT* 2:59, and against Violet, *ZNW* 37 [1938] 264; Bajard, *ETL*, 45 [1969] 168–69; and Combrink, *Neot* 7 [1973] 38, who are all determined by the sense of the Hebrew text).

The termination of the quotation immediately before the mention in Isa 61:2 of the “day of vengeance” (*ἡμέραν ἀνταποδόσεως*) accords with Luke’s two-stage eschatology for Jesus—salvation now, judgment in the future (Ellis, *NTS* 12 [1965–66] 27–41)—but should not be understood as the basis for the hostile reaction to Jesus (as Jeremias, *Jesus’ Promise*, 45).

20 *ἐκάθισεν*, “he sat down,” is here the posture of a teacher (Matt 23:2; 26:55; Str-B, 1:997; 4/1:185; Schneider, *TDNT* 3:443).

Previous reputation (vv 14–15 and 23b) and the chosen text justify the riveted attention, which in turn points to the validity of the perception of v 22a (cf. Stephen in Acts 6:15).

21 *ἤρξατο*, “he began,” provides a sense of duration for the sermon (cf. 13:25; 23:2 and the imperfect tenses of v 22; no theology of a beginning is implied; cf. Hunkin, *JTS* 25 [1924] 394; Chilton, “Announcement in Nazara,” 159–60, and contra Schürmann, 231, and George, *ETL* 43 [1967] 106). The main content of the sermon is summarized as: “Today, this scripture has been fulfilled in your ears.” The “today” of salvation is inaugurated in the ministry of Jesus (Fuchs, *TDNT* 7:269–75) but not terminated by its close (Acts 13:32 cf. v 33; contra Conzelmann, *Luke*, 30–31). The fulfillment is literally “in your ears” because it consists in the words from Isaiah being spoken by the one for whom they were prophetically destined. We should not find an emphasis on a Nazareth beginning to Jesus’ public ministry (against Samain, *AsSeign* 20 [1973] 18, 26 n. 19; Schürmann, 232). The role of the Nazareth episode (coupled with the Capernaum experience) is much more typical.

22 As his sermon continued the people “all bore witness to him in that they marveled at his words.” *μαρτυρεῖν*, “to bear witness,” implies that something is to be established by the testimony borne (Nolland, *JBL* 98 [1979] 220–21; Strathmann, *TDNT* 4:496; contra BAGD, 493). A self-conscious witness by the people of Nazareth that (i) Jesus’ claim to fulfill Isa 61 is correct; (ii) Jesus’ known character supports his credibility; or (iii) the “report” of v 14 which has also reached Nazareth is correct are all problematical (Nolland, *JBL* 98 [1979] 221–22). A more hopeful approach involves recognizing that it is Luke who considers that the people’s response as witnesses is equivalent to a giving of evidence. Compare the examples of “impartial” witness by opponents of Christianity in Acts (esp. 4:13–16; 6:15). The impact of Jesus’ words bears its own witness to the truth of his claims. For Luke *θαυμάζειν*, “to marvel,” always refers to something less than or not yet as developed as a proper belief in Jesus (cf. Bertram, *TDNT* 3:22–42 and esp. 37–40). The people are impressed, not surprised (contra Schürmann, 235; Voss, *Christologie*, 156, etc.).

What impresses the people are “words of grace” (*λόγοις τῆς χάριτος*): not winsome words (e.g., Zahn, 239; Creed, 67; Eltester, “Israel,” 138 n. 131) or words about God’s mercy or grace (e.g., Violet, *ZNW* 37 [1938] 263–68; Jeremias, *Jesus’ Promise*, 44–45; Schürmann, 274 n. 92; Tannehill, “Mission,” 72) but words endued with the power of God’s grace. Luke uses *χάρις*, “grace,” as a quasi-substantial power, especially as resident in or on people (2:40; Acts

4:33; 6:8; 7:10) but also where the grace is not immediately linked to a charismatic figure (Acts 14:26; 15:40; 18:27 and esp. 20:32—see Nolland, “Luke’s Readers,” 60–84; Samain, *AsSeign* 20 [1973] 27; Dupont, *Discours de Milet*, 104–5; and cf. Gils, *Jésus prophète* 12–20; Cambe, *RB* 70 [1963] 200). χάρις is the divine influence which is present in the words and which gives the words their quite tangible impact. The people were impressed not *that* the words were “words of grace” but *because* they were “words of grace.” (Cf. 4:36 where Luke changes Mark’s “what is this” to “what is this word,” where the tangible effects of the “word” are pointed to.)

The connection “fulfilled in your ears” (v 21) by “proceeding out of his mouth” is attractive but uncertain. τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ is a Septuagintalism. In LXX usage a certain dignity, solemnity, or sense of occasion is added by the presence of this idiom (e.g., Isa 55:11; Ps 88 [89]:34; Deut 23:23 [24]; 1 Kgdms 1:23; Ps 44 [45]:3).

The force of “Isn’t this fellow Joseph’s son?” cannot be clearly determined, but the parallel words in Mark 6:3 are evidently critical, and the flow in Luke’s narrative requires that these words express an objection to Jesus’ claims. They are using the question to evade the message (Tiede, *Prophecy and History*, 37–38). A suggestion of illegitimacy (cf. John 8:41) or a contempt based on familiarity and/or humble origins is possible. The reader knows that Jesus’ humble origins are more appearance than reality (Luke 3:22, 23 and cf. 1:31–35). Burn (“Besuch Jesu,” 9) speculates that “son of Joseph” had attained “the status of a typical expression of Jewish unbelief.”

23 ἐπεῖτε, “you will say,” represents no prophetic future (against Wellhausen, 10; Conzelmann, *Luke*, 35; Tannehill, “Mission,” 54–55; Voss, *Christologie*, 157). Here it means “you are on the point of saying.” In this pericope Luke first introduces his readers to Jesus’ uncanny awareness of what goes on in people’s minds (5:22; 6:8; 7:40; 9:47; 11:17; cf. 20:23—Brun, “Besuch Jesu,” 11).

παράβολήν, “parable,” is used here for a proverb involving a comparison. It may, but need not be, Septuagintal. The proverb here is a traditional saying with a number of surviving parallels in classical and rabbinic literature (Nolland, *NovT* 21 [1979] 193–209).

σεαυτόν, “yourself” (singular), is frequently referred to Jesus’ hometown (e.g., Zahn, 240; Creed, 687; Lagrange, 142; Schürmann, 236–37) but this is quite unnatural, and fits ill with Jesus’ sense of rejection which is clearly present in v 24. σεαυτόν should be referred to Jesus individually. Though in form a request, the proverb is best understood as functioning as a retort, almost an insult (cf. the role of similar proverbs in *Gen. Rab.* 23:4 and Plutarch, *Moralia* [*How to Tell a Flatterer*] 32.71F). There is a parallel response to Jesus’ claim to have a saving role in 23:35, ἄλλους ἔσωσεν, σωσάτω ἑαυτόν, “he saved others, let him save himself,” a verse which plays off Jesus’ claim to be able to save others against his own sorry state. Jesus comes forward as the eschatological healer (4:18, 19, 21), but for one who offers the glories of the day of salvation he seems himself to have participated surprisingly little in its benefits (cf. 2:7; 9:58); his state does not match his claim. The force is, “Who do you think you are to offer to us what you do not have for yourself?” Cf. the Devil’s suggestion in Luke 4:3.

ὅσα ἠκούσαμεν γενόμενα, “what we have heard happened,” expresses skepticism (cf. 1 Cor 11:18; Morris, 107) about the claimed deeds in Capernaum. The request is not for an implementation in Nazareth of the ministry announced in vv 18–19 (against Schürmann, 236–37). Rather, it is a cynical demand for a display of dazzling miracles to dispel the impression that only Joseph’s son is here. ἐν τῇ πατρίδι σου, “in your homeland/hometown,” both underlines the skepticism of the request (ἐν τῇ πατρίδι σου = “where we can see it”) and prepares for the theme of the rejection of the prophet in his πατρίς to be clearly enunciated in v 24.

24 With εἶπεν δέ, “he said,” Jesus is reintroduced as though there were a change of speaker, since he has in v 23 been voicing the people’s sentiment. V 24 is thus a response to v 23 (against Reicke, “Jesus in Nazareth,” 50). The proverb is a comment on his rejection in Nazareth which interprets that rejection (it is not a prophecy of the rejection of vv 28–29—contra Busse, *Nazareth-Manifest*, 50). Where the Markan form (6:4) suggests that a prophet finds acceptance except at home, Luke’s form focuses exclusively on rejection: it is the lot of the prophet to be rejected by those to whom he is sent. A prophetic identity for Jesus is of considerable importance for Luke (e.g., 7:16, 39; 13:33; 24:19; Acts 3:22–23; 7:37), as is the viewpoint that the Israelites throughout their history have characteristically rejected the prophets sent to them (6:23; 11:47, 49–50; 13:33–34; 20:9–19; Acts 7:52; 28:25). Here the two are brought together. Jesus is unabashed by his poor reception: he points out that he is being treated to a standard prophet’s fate (Schürmann, “Nazareth-Perikope,” 190, and cf. Schnider, *Prophet*, 166–67, and Voss, *Christologie*, 158, who understands v 24 as saying, “You show that you want a mere healer and not a prophet”).

The rejection in Nazareth is a “dress-rehearsal” for the passion, and sets up theological categories which prepare the reader for Jesus’ prophetic destiny in Jerusalem (cf. J. A. Sanders, “Isaiah 61,” 104). Thus, the pericope constitutes an important element in Luke’s apologetic concern to show that Jewish rejection does not discredit Jesus. ἐν τῇ πατρίδι αὐτοῦ, “in his homeland/hometown,” acquires emphasis from its terminal position (contrast Mark 6:4), and the use of the ambiguous πατρίς sets up a principle in Jesus’ πατρίς = Nazareth which carries over to his πατρίς = Jerusalem as the capital city and heart of his homeland (cf. 13:33). δεκτός elsewhere means “acceptable to God” (4:19; Acts 10:35; 2 Cor 6:2; Phil 4:18 and LXX) but is used here for human acceptance to achieve an ironical link with v 19 (via the cognate δέχεσθαι, “to receive”; there is probably also a link to 9:5, 48, 53; 10:8, 10). The presence here of ἀμήν, “amen,” the only Hebrew word retained by Luke, signals the presence of teaching considered to be of special importance by Luke (O’Neill, *JTS*, n.s., 10 [1959] 1–9).

25–27 These verses are frequently understood to be picking up on the prophetic identity of Jesus in v 24. So they are said (i) to give examples of rejection of prophets (Lagrange, 144; Geldenhuys, 168); (ii) to show that the consequence of rejecting a prophet is that others will get the benefit of his ministry (Ellis, 98; Rengstorff, 68; and cf. Schlatter, *Markus und Lukas*, 204); or (iii) to make the point that, treated like a prophet in one respect, i.e., rejection, Jesus will behave like a prophet in another respect, i.e., benefiting

outsiders by his ministry (Plummer, 127). Alternatively, the verses are seen as a follow-up on the request for miracles. In that case they make the point that (i) miracles cannot be demanded of Jesus any more than they could be of Elijah and Elisha (Zahn, 242; Schürmann, 238–39; Masson, “Jésus à Nazareth,” 57; Schmid, 113–14) or (ii) outsiders are to get the benefit of Jesus’ ministry just as it was outsiders who benefited from the presence of Elijah and Elisha (Hill, *NovT* 13 [1971] 169; Creed, 66, and cf. Schürmann, 238–39). Both (i) and (ii) are frequently set in the context of the freedom of the divine sovereignty.

The connection by means of prophetic identity seems the more likely. The way that the repeated *ἐν τῇ πατρίδι*, “in [your] homeland/hometown,” is taken up in the *ἐν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ*, “in Israel,” of v 25 and 27 shows that we are dealing in each case with a prophet in his *πατρίς*, “homeland/hometown.” However, rejection is hardly prominent in these verses nor in their OT sources (1 Kgs 17 and 18; 2 Kgs 5—Loisy, *Synoptiques* 1:846), nor is there a stress on what outsiders received (two people aided is hardly an impressive achievement): the emphasis falls rather on the many needy widows and lepers in Israel who remained without help, despite the fact that there was a prophet in Israel (2 Kgs 5:8).

The point will, then, be that unbelief has created a situation where possibilities are not realized and benefits do not flow, a situation parallel to the occasions when the prophetic ministry of Elijah and that of Elisha (prophets raised up in Israel and for Israel) brought no blessing to Israel.

Without any emphasis, there is a mention of other potential beneficiaries. The ministries of Elijah and Elisha were not narrowly nationalistic. And in the wider Lukan context (cf. Busse, *Nazareth-Manifest*, 62) this adumbrates the universalism which is to be the basis of the Gentile mission (see already Luke 2:32; 3:6). However, in the immediate context the point is that the people of Nazareth are to be the losers. For a discussion of Luke’s treatment of the relationship between Jesus and Elijah see at Luke 7:11–17.

28 Jesus’ words are treated as having been highly provocative. The response scene here is evocative of Luke’s account of Stephen’s death (Acts 7:54–60; George, *BVC* 59 [1964] 25). Both Stephen and Jesus accuse their hearers of rejecting God’s prophets (Acts 7:52; Luke 4:24) and identify them as outsiders to what God is presently doing (Acts 7:51; Luke 4:25–27).

29 While the act envisaged is not a formal execution but lynch law (Marshall, 190), it is likely that the intention was to follow the procedure for stoning (Rengstorf, 68; J. Blinzer, “The Jewish Punishment of Stoning in the New Testament Period,” in *The Trial of Jesus* [FS C. F. D. Moule, ed. E. Bammel; SBT 2nd series 13; London: SCM, 1970] 147–61; b. *Sanh* 6 and cf. John 8:59 and Acts 7:54–60) which involved first casting the victim down from an elevated position which served as a vantage point for throwing or dropping the stones used in the execution.

30 The nature of the deliverance is not specified. Schürmann (240) sees it as a fulfillment of 4:10–11. It could be an anticipation of the resurrection to complete the parallel with the Jerusalem passion. Most likely, we have a rather Johannine indication that Jesus’ hour had not yet come (John 7:30; 8:59; 10:31, 39; 11:8–9; 13:30 and cf. Luke 22:3 and 53; Reicke, “Jesus in

Nazareth,” 51). Similarly, we perhaps should find in Luke’s use of *ἐπορεύετο*, “he went on his way,” a reference to the divine pattern laid out for the life of Jesus and finding its goal in Jerusalem (4:42; 7:6, 11; 9:51, 52, 53, 56, 57; 13:33; 17:11; 22:22—Tannehill, “Mission,” 62; Masson, “Jésus à Nazareth,” 63).

Explanation

The Nazareth ministry is presented as a concrete example of preaching in the synagogues of Galilee (v 15 and cf. v 16: “as was his custom”). The synagogue scene is recounted entirely with reference to Jesus’ role, and a sense of his initiative dominates the narrative. Jesus is presented as reader of the synagogue lesson from the Prophets (vv 16–20; the text is an edited version of Isa 61:1–2a LXX supplemented from Isa 58:6) and as preacher for the day (vv 20–21). The burden of his message is that the prophetic text now finds its fulfillment in him.

Luke clearly uses the text to express Jesus’ identity and to define his role. The Spirit is upon Jesus by reason of his baptismal (3:22 cf. Acts 10:38) anointing. (In the immediate pericope, prophetic anointing is primarily in view, but Luke thinks of messianic anointing as well; Luke 3:22 and Acts 4:26–27.) His anointing signals appointment and empowering to be the Isaianic figure who heralds and brings salvation. The salvation in view is represented with Jubilee imagery, but is no call for an implementation of Jubilee legislation. Jubilee release is not spiritualized into forgiveness of sins, but neither can it be resolved into a program of social reform. It encompasses spiritual restoration, moral transformation, rescue from demonic oppression, and release from illness and disability.

As a charismatic figure Jesus speaks words endued with the power of God’s grace (v 22). This grace guarantees the words a dramatic impact. Jesus’ listeners testify to their experience of the presence of the Spirit (grace) in Jesus’ words, and so to Jesus, by their involuntary amazement and thus head the ranks of impressed unbelievers whom Luke brings forward as witnesses for the claims of Christian faith—see esp. Acts 4:13–16; 6:15. However, they are determined not to be drawn in, so at once they find grounds for objection: “Isn’t this fellow Joseph’s son?” At this point (v 23) Jesus takes matters out of their hands. The Lukan Jesus exhibits an uncanny awareness of what goes on in people’s minds (Luke 5:22; 6:8; 7:40; 9:47; 11:17; cf. 20:23). Here, he plucks the words from his respondents’ mouths by announcing to them what they were about to say. By means of a traditional proverb they intended to play off Jesus’ claim to offer the glories of salvation against his own modest state (cf. 23:35). They would suggest that Jesus look to his own needs! The reports of deeds in Capernaum are viewed with skepticism. Only mighty deeds before their very eyes will dispel their impression that only Joseph’s son is here. Jesus meets proverb with proverb (v 24). He responds as one who has been clearly rejected and interprets his rejection as a prophet’s fate: it is the lot of the prophet to be rejected by those to whom he is sent (cf. 6:23; 11:47, 48–50; 13:33–34; 20:9–19; Acts 7:52; 28:25). Rejection in Nazareth prepares for and justifies rejection in Jerusalem: Jewish rejection does not discredit Jesus.

The conversation moves a stage further with the introduction of scenes from the ministry of the prophets Elijah and Elisha (vv 25–27). Here were instances of prophetic ministry from which the Israelites had not benefited: the many needy widows and lepers in Israel remained without help. So too the people of Nazareth will not benefit since they have chosen by their unbelief to be outsiders to what God is presently doing (cf. Acts 7:51).

In the wider Lukan context, the blessed Gentiles adumbrate the universalism which is to be the basis of the Gentile mission (see already 2:32; 3:6). But in the flow of the immediate narrative the point is that the people of Nazareth are the losers, not that there are other potential beneficiaries.

Labeled as those who reject God's prophets and identified as outsiders to what God is now doing, the people respond in murderous rage (v 28). They hustle him out of the city in order to send him to his death (v 29). However, Jesus' hour has not yet come (cf. 22:3 and 53), so he escapes from their midst and continues on the way laid out for him in the divine pattern (v 30).

Preaching in Capernaum (4:31–37)

Bibliography

Bauernfeind, O. *Die Worte der Dämonen im Markusevangelium*. 29–34, 100–101. **Busse, U.** *Die Wunder des Propheten Jesus*. 66–90. **Buzy, D.** "Le premier séjour de Jésus à Capharnaüm." In *Mélanges bibliques*, FS A. Robert. Travaux de l'Institut Catholique de Paris 4. Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1957. 411–19. **Fenasse, J.-M.** "Le Christ 'Saint de Dieu.'" *MScRel* 22 (1965) 26–32. **Kee, H. C.** "The Terminology of Mark's Exorcism Stories." *NTS* 14 (1967–68) 232–46. **Kertelge, K.** *Die Wunder Jesu im Markusevangelium*. 50–60. **Kirchschläger, W.** *Jesu exorzistisches Wirken aus der Sicht des Lukas*. 27–54. **März, C. P.** *Das Wort Gottes bei Lukas*. 38–41. **Mussner, F.** "Ein Wortspiel in Mk 1, 24?" *BZ* 4 (1960) 285–86. **Schramm, T.** *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*. 85–91.

Translation

³¹He went down to Capernaum, a city of Galilee. He was teaching them on the sabbath; ³²and they were astounded by his teaching, because his word was with authority.

³³In the synagogue there was a man with a spirit, that is, an unclean demon. He cried out in a loud voice, ³⁴"Let me be! What common interest is there between us,^a Jesus Nazarene? You have come to destroy us. I know who you are, the Holy One of God." ³⁵Jesus rebuked him, saying, "Be quiet, and come out of him." Then,^b having projected him into the middle, the demon came out without harming him. ³⁶Astonishment overcame them all and they said to one another, "What is this word? For with authority and power he commands the unclean spirits and they come out." ³⁷A report concerning him went out into every place in the surrounding region.

Notes

^aLit., "what to us and to you?"

^bSee Note c at 4:23.

Form/Structure/Setting

For the role of vv 31–37 in the section 4:14–44 see at 4:14–15 and 4:16–30. The accounts of ministry in Nazareth and Capernaum are used by Luke to characterize an itinerant ministry that begins in Galilee (v 14) and expands throughout Palestine (v 44). While vv 31–37 parallel the Nazareth account as ministry in the synagogue, the total unit for purposes of the parallel is vv 31–43.

Luke adds in v 31 “a city of Galilee” as a link with vv 14–15.

Compared to his Markan source, Luke achieves a more unified structure for the account and clarifies the relationship between Jesus’ teaching and the exorcism by describing both as a “word with authority” (ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ . . . ὁ λόγος, v 32; ὁ λόγος . . . ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ, v 36).

Luke follows Mark closely and gives no indication of other source materials (Schramm, *Markus-Stoff*, 85–90). In the immediate interchange between Jesus and the demon (vv 34–35) the Markan text is reproduced almost exactly. The synagogue exorcism and the material concerning Jesus’ teaching may have been brought together by Mark (Haenchen, *Weg*, 86–88; Schürmann, 250).

The exorcism accounts in Luke do not follow closely a fixed formal pattern. Here 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-defense (as 8:28 where, however, the initiative is given to the commanding word of Jesus; contrast 9:42; 11:14). Jesus rebukes 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).

In the NT world exorcism may generally be placed somewhere between magic (Paris Magic Papyrus lines 3,007–85) and medicine (Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius* 4.20; Josephus, *War* 7.185) and was practiced both within (Matt 12:27; Acts 19:13; Josephus, *Ant.* 8.45–49) and outside Judaism (Lucian, *Philopseudes* 16.30–31; Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius* 3.38; 4.20; *Num. Rab.* 19.8). Sometimes there is in the texts an emphasis on the person of the exorcist (his personal power or skill—Josephus, *Ant.* 8.45–49; Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius* 3.38; 4.20). In 1QapGen 20.16–29 the exorcism is achieved by prayer and the laying on of hands. In the fragmentary *Prayer of Nabonidus* an exorcist may be credited with remitting the sins of the sick king (cf. A. Dupont-Sommer, “Exorcismes et guérisons dans les écrits de Qoumrân,” *Congress Volume, Oxford 1959* [VTSup 7, Leiden: Brill, 1960] 246–61, who, however, too quickly identifies Qumran and NT practice; Dupont-Sommer’s reading of the text is disputed by C. Tuckett, *JSNT* 14 [1982] 74 n. 29). There are no close parallels to Jesus’ exorcisms. However, extant accounts of exorcisms are few (Fitzmyer, 542).

Comment

This is Luke’s first account of one of Jesus’ deeds of power. Luke repeats (4:31–37; 8:26–39; 9:37–43) the three Markan exorcisms 1:21–28; 5:1–20; 9:14–29 (omitting 7:24–30) and adds another very brief exorcism account (11:14) which he shares with Matt 12:22.

Of particular concern here are a first approach to Luke's understanding of the place of exorcisms in the ministry of Jesus and the way Luke has honed the Markan juxtaposition of teaching and exorcism in this episode.

In the structure of 4:14–44 it is clear that Luke is depicting a fulfillment of the ministry outlined by Jesus for himself in vv 18–19 (cf. Busse, *Wunder*, 58).

31 Having omitted Mark 1:16–20, Luke changes Mark's *εἰσπορεύονται*, "they enter," into *κατήλθεν*, "he went down," which suitably expresses movement from Nazareth down to the seaside town of Capernaum. Luke uses the singular verb since no disciples have yet been introduced. As he had earlier introduced Nazareth (1:26), now he introduces Capernaum as a "city of Galilee," which also strengthens the link with vv 14–15. Mark's *εὐθύς*, "immediately," is consistently omitted by Luke (but see 6:49) and replaced by his preferred words *παραχρῆμα* and *εὐθέως* only where the reference is to the instantaneous effectiveness of Jesus' power (5:13, 25; 8:44, 55). *ἦν διδάσκων*, "he was teaching," is probably brought forward from Mark 1:22 to replace the Markan *ἐδίδασκεν* at this point. Throughout the account Luke cuts down Mark's prolixity. Luke uses the periphrastic construction to refer to the background against which the action proper is to take place. This is rendered (e.g., v 33) with simple tenses (Haenchen, *Acts*, 149 n. 7, citing G. Björck, "Hν διδάσκων": *Die periphrastischen Konstruktionen im Griechischen* [Skrifter utg. av Kgl. Humanist. Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala, 32/2, 1940] 42–46). *ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν* (lit., "on the sabbaths") should be translated "on the sabbath" (with Klostermann, 66; Luce, 123; Dietrich, *Petrusbild*, 19 n. 7; cf. 13:10 and contra Schmidt, *Rahmen*, 54–55; Cadbury, *Style*, 117) despite Luke's general preference for the singular over the plural form (Schürmann, 246 n. 175). Luke nowhere uses the plural form with a definitely plural meaning (Marshall, 191). Here *ἐν τοῖς σάββασιν* links closely with the verb and has a qualitative force ("as one does on the sabbath") and not merely a time reference (cf. 6:2; 13:10). *αὐτοὺς*, "them," lacks a proper grammatical antecedent but is to be construed according to sense as a reference to the Caperneans. Mark's *εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν*, "having entered the synagogue," is redundant for Luke after vv 15 and 16. It may, however, have left its mark on the wording of v 16.

32 *ἐξεπλήσσοντο ἐπὶ τῇ διδαχῇ αὐτοῦ*, "they were astonished at his teaching," is reproduced from Mark. Luke uses *ἐκπλήσσεσθαι*, like other words registering amazement, to mark an external effect and not a change of heart (cf. 4:22). Luke is documenting the public impact of Jesus' teaching.

The remainder of the verse has been completely reformulated by Luke: only the word *ἐξουσία*, "authority," is retained. The impact made was the impact of *ἐξουσία*. Luke thinks here not so much of authority bestowed as of authority exercised, and thus close to power (cf. v 36 where *ἐξουσία* is glossed with *δύναμις*, "power," and cf. the discussion of *χάρις*, "grace," at v 22). Luke deletes Mark's *καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς*, "and not as the scribes." Also, Mark's *ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων*, "as having authority," becomes *ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ* "with authority." For Luke the concern is not with a formal characteristic such as absence of appeal to a binding tradition. The *ἐξουσία* of Jesus' word is an intrinsic quality visible in its effects.

It is already clear in the Markan account that a close relationship is being established between *διδάσκων* . . . *ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων* ("teaching . . . as one having

authority"; 1:22) and τοῖς πνεύμασι . . . ἐπιτάσσει καὶ ὑπακούουσιν ("he commands . . . the spirits and they obey"; v 27). Luke develops this by treating the two as different aspects of a single phenomenon (Leaney, 120). What is involved in each case is Jesus' "word" (λόγος; vv 32 and 36) as a word which comes ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ (vv 32 and 36). Schürmann (244–46) treats this as a subordination of deed to word, but it is much more a matter of deeds accomplished by the powerful word of Jesus. Luke does not allow a separation of word and deed (see on v 18). In both, the saving activity of God in Jesus is visible as powerful effect.

However, in neither is God's salvation so visible that faith follows automatically. Luke's Jesus is both a dramatically powerful figure and one who shares the fate of all God's rejected prophets (v 24). The nature and scope of Jesus' present exercise of power is strictly limited. He does not come forward as a potential power figure in the structures of this world using miraculous powers to establish his position (v 23; 9:51–56). He can be, and is, rejected, and by God's will he ultimately submits to destruction by his enemies.

33 Luke now explicitly mentions the synagogue context presupposed in v 31. He sees no need for the αὐτῶν in Mark's ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ αὐτῶν, "in their synagogue." Unlike Mark, Luke does not make an event out of the turning up of the demon-possessed man in the synagogue (Mark's εὐθύς, "immediately"; 1:23), and in this way further unifies the pericope. Luke consistently avoids Mark's ἐν + dat. (lit., "in") in reference to demon possession and substitutes ἔχων + acc. etc. ("having"—8:27 and cf. 13:11 and Acts 8:7; 16:16), probably to avoid setting up a parallel between the way the Holy Spirit (2:27; 4:1, 14) and demons are present (Marshall, 192).

Where Mark talks of πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον, "an unclean spirit," Luke has the unparalleled πνεῦμα δαιμονίου ἀκαθάρτον, "a spirit of an unclean demon" or "a spirit, an unclean demon." Luke elsewhere uses πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον ("an unclean spirit"; 6:18), πνεῦμα πονηρόν ("an evil spirit"; 7:21; distinctively Lukan), πνεῦμα ("a spirit"; 9:39), δαιμόνιον ("demon"; 4:41), δαιμονισθεῖς ("having been possessed by a demon"; 8:36), and possibly πνεῦμα ἀσθενείας ("a spirit of weakness"; 13:11). Having in mind the use in Acts 17:18 of δαιμόνιον for "deity," it is perhaps best to see Luke as establishing here his basic vocabulary for demon possession: he wishes to use δαιμόνιον negatively, and in the negative sphere δαιμόνιον and πνεῦμα are interchangeable. We should read, therefore, "a spirit, that is, an unclean demon."

φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, "with a loud voice," is brought forward from Mark 1:26, possibly under the influence of Luke 8:28 // Mark 5:7 (Talbert, *RevExp* 64 [1967] 487). It underlines the degree to which the demon is disturbed by the presence of Jesus. Crying out wildly is a mark of demonized behavior (9:39; cf. Lohmeyer, *Markus*, 36). Luke compensates for this addition by deleting Mark's redundant λέγων, "saying." Luke shows no consistent pattern in his treatment of redundant uses of λέγων (see Neirynck, *Minor Agreements*, 246–49).

34 ἔα, added by Luke, is most likely the imperative of ἑάω used absolutely with the sense "let (me) alone" (Schürmann, 247 n. 194; BAGD, 211–12; and cf. 22:51). We should understand that it is the teaching of Jesus that provokes the demonic response (cf. Busse, *Wunder*, 79). τί ἡμῶν καὶ σοί (lit., "what to us and to you") is frequent in the LXX. Cf. esp. 2 Kgdms 16:10; 3 Kgdms

17:18; 4 Kgdms 3:13. It represents a denial that the parties have anything in common: "We don't belong together; how can contact with you be in our interest?"

If there was originally a wordplay connecting *Ναζαρηνέ*, "Nazarene," and *ὁ ἅγιος*, "the holy one," via the LXX translation of Nazarite by *ἅγιος* (Mussner, *BZ* 4 [1960] 286; Kertelge, *Wunder*, 53–54), there is nothing to suggest that Luke is aware of the connection.

ἦλθες ἀπολέσαι ἡμᾶς, "you have come to destroy us," should be punctuated as a statement rather than a question (cf. 1 Kgs 17:18). There is nothing in common. Rather, Jesus is intent on the demons' destruction. The contrast is with the positive intention for mankind of Jesus' ministry. The demon knows Jesus' intent because he is supernaturally aware of his identity as *ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ*, "the holy one of God"). The *ἅγιος*, "holy," and the *ἀκάθαρτος*, "unclean," have nothing in common. All their impulses are mutually destructive. More is in view here than relief by exorcism for the individual demoniac. Jesus' task involves the total destruction of the demonic world. Here "the meta-historical apocalyptic front" (Schürmann, 247) of Jesus' ministry becomes visible (cf. Robinson, *Problem of History*, 37). See further at 10:18 and 11:14–23.

ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ, "the holy one of God," is not a traditional title. Reproduced here from Mark, it also occurs at John 6:69. Samson is *ἅγιος θεοῦ* in the B text of Judg 13:7 and 16:17, but *ἅγιος* is not there a substantive and that gives a different sense to the genitive ("holy to God"). Aaron is called *ὁ ἅγιος Κυρίου*, "the holy one of the Lord," in Ps 106 [105]:16. Elisha is called *ἄνθρωπος τοῦ θεοῦ ἅγιος*, "a holy man of God," in 4 Kgdms 4:9 (cf. Freire, *EE* 51 [1976] 488–92). But for Luke the main link will be with the intimate connection with God expressed in 1:35 and cf. Acts 4:27.

35 *ἐπιτίμησεν*, "he rebuked," with its Semitic equivalent *גָּעַר*, *gā'ar*, when used of God or with reference to evil spirits, is an activity of power, not merely of criticism. It not only identifies the evil but also subdues it. (See the texts discussed by Kee, *NTS* 14 [1967–68] 232–46, who, however, eliminates the element of moral censure. The stronger meaning develops not by the removal of the element of moral censure but by shifting the focus away from the moral outrage expressed by the rebuker and onto the effect on the one rebuked. It is effective rebuke with which we are dealing.)

φιμώθητι, "be silent," may reflect the language of Hellenistic spells (Moulton and Milligan, *Vocabulary*, 672) but it probably does no more than silence the demonic protest (v 34) and uproar (v 33—*φωνή μεγάλη*; cf. Bauernfeind, *Worte der Dämonen*, 100–101). Mark's *ἐξελθε ἐξ* (lit., "come out, out of") becomes, to vary the prepositions, *ἐξελθε ἀπό* ("come out from"), as frequently in Luke (Neirynck, *Minor Agreements*, 282). The same change is introduced in the report of the demon's departure.

Luke has extensively altered the remainder of the verse. In Luke's account, after the word of command there is no last moment of struggle. The demon is instantaneously subdued. Mark's *σπαράξαν*, "convulsed," becomes *ῥῖψαν* . . . *εἰς τὸ μέσον*. *εἰς τὸ μέσον*, "in[to] the middle," means to the place of encounter with Jesus (5:19; 6:8; cf. Schramm, *Markus-Stoff*, 87). *ῥῖψαν* may be used of violent force, but since we are dealing with a gesture of defeat we should

rather translate, “the demon projected him into the middle,” i.e., he handed him over to Jesus. Mark’s *καὶ φωνήσαν φωνῇ μεγάλῃ*, “and he cried out in a loud voice,” which could be a sign of struggle, is deleted (cf. Creed, 71). Any struggle was before the word of rebuke (v 33—*φωνῇ μεγάλῃ*). Finally Luke adds *μηδὲν βλάψαν αὐτόν*, “without doing him any harm.” Capitulation was complete and at once. Luke uses *δαιμόνιον*, “demon,” for Mark’s *πνεῦμα ἀκάθαρτον*, “unclean spirit.”

36 Luke substitutes *ἐγένετο θάμβος ἐπὶ πάντας*, “fear/astonishment came upon all,” for Mark’s *ἐθαμβήθησαν ἅπαντες*, “all were astonished” (cf. 5:9; Acts 3:10). Mark’s *ὥστε*, “with the result that,” becomes *καί*, “and,” as always (Schramm, *Markus-Stoff*, 87 n. 4). *συνελάλουν πρὸς*, “discussed with” (cf. 22:4), replaces Mark’s *συζητεῖν*, “discuss/argue.” *ἀλλήλους*, “one another,” is put for *αὐτοὺς*, “them[selves]” (cf. 20:14 // Mark 12:7). The changes are essentially stylistic, but we may observe a tendency to describe the experience as objective and uniform rather than as a subjective and variable response: these people have been impacted by the presence of the divine power in Jesus.

As in v 32 Luke introduces *λόγος*, “word.” He links *ἐξουσία*, “authority,” here not to the teaching, as Mark does, but to the exorcizing word of command. As well, he makes it clear with the *ὅτι*, “because,” that the exorcizing word is (part of) the *λόγος* here in view. Luke drops Mark’s *καινῇ*, “new,” as he has the comparison with scribal teaching from v 32. They both made a point that would distract from Luke’s focus on the power of Jesus’ word. Luke glosses *ἐξουσία*, “authority,” here with *καὶ δυνάμει*, “and power” (cf. 9:1). The mention of *δυνάμει* links back to v 14 and reminds us that it is the power of the Spirit which is being witnessed in Jesus’ ministry. Where in Mark the Caperneans comment on Jesus’ teaching, then on his successful exorcism command, in Luke they comment on Jesus’ “word” which embraces both. (Note the *ὅτι*, “because,” the removal of *καινῇ* [“new”—this does not suit an exorcizing word], and the repetition from v 32 of both *ὁ λόγος*, “the word,” and *ἐν ἐξουσίᾳ*, “with authority.”) Achtemeier (*JBL* 94 [1975] 550–51) notes Luke’s balancing of teaching and miracles, but does not see that a single *λόγος* is involved. For Mark’s mention of the obedience of the unclean spirits Luke prefers to repeat the verb from v 35, *ἐξέρχονται*, “they come out.”

The generalizing form of the statement here suits Luke’s purpose. Through this incident his concern is to characterize Jesus’ ministry in Galilee.

37 Luke has almost completely reformulated the Markan text here, but with no apparent change of meaning. *τῆς Γαλιλαίας*, “of Galilee,” falls out after its anticipation in v 31. *ἀκοή* is not used by Luke for “report” (7:1; Acts 17:20; 28:26), he prefers *ἡχος* (Acts 2:2 and cf. Luke 21:25). *εἰς ὅλην*, “into all,” disappears also from Mark 1:39. *εὐθύς*, “immediately,” is removed once more. See at v 14b, where Luke has also used Mark 1:28.

Explanation

The synagogue in Capernaum provides Luke’s second illustration of Jesus’ preaching in the synagogues of Galilee (cf. vv 15 and 16). Here Jesus’ teaching is mentioned but not reported. The account this time focuses on an exorcism

that takes place in this synagogue teaching context. Exorcism is to be understood as part of the ministry announced in vv 18–19.

Jesus travels down from Nazareth to the coastal town of Capernaum. His teaching amazes as it had in Nazareth (v 22). This is because the word, which in v 22 was said to be endowed with the power of God's grace, is here experienced as a word with authority. Jesus' presence and teaching activity stirs up a demoniac, or at least the demon in him, who, threatened by Jesus' presence, asks to be left alone. Though his ministry is one of doing good (Acts 10:38), nothing good for the demons can come from contact with Jesus. Supernaturally aware of Jesus' identity as the holy one of God (cf. 1:35), the demon is aware that the holy and the unclean are implacably opposed: "you have come to destroy us," he rightly declares, and thus expresses the cosmic scope of Jesus' battle against the demonic. More is involved than relief by exorcism for the individual demoniac.

Jesus subdues the demon with an authoritative word of rebuke. He silences the demonic protest and sends the demon out of the man. The demon puts up no final struggle. Completely capitulating, he hands the man over unharmed to Jesus.

The Caperneans are overcome with astonishment. They experience Jesus' powerful authoritative word in his command to the demon as in his public teaching.

Anointed by the Spirit (4:18; cf. v 14), Jesus exhibits a manifest authority which cannot be gainsaid by those who witness it and is so impressive that it becomes public knowledge in the whole region.

Healing Simon's Mother-In-Law (4:38–39)

Bibliography

Dietrich, W. *Das Petrusbild der lukanischen Schriften*. 19–23. **Fuchs, A.** "Entwicklungsgeschichtliche Studie zu Mk 1,29–31 par Mt 8,14–15 par Lk 4,38–39." *SNTU* 6/7 (1981–82) 21–76. **Kertelge, K.** *Die Wunder Jesu im Markusevangelium*. 60–62. **Kirchschläger, W.** "Fieberheilung in Apg 28 und Lk 4." In *Les Actes des Apôtres: Traditions, rédaction, théologie*. BETL 48. Louvain: Leuven University Press, 1979. 509–21. ———. *Jesu exorzistisches Wirken aus der Sicht des Lukas*. 55–69. **Lamarche, P.** "La guérison de la belle-mère de Pierre et le genre littéraire des évangiles." *NRT* 87 (1965) 515–26. **Léon-Dufour, X.** "La guérison de la belle-mère de Simon-Pierre." *EstBib* 24 (1965) 193–216. **Pesch, R.** *Neuere Exegese—Verlust oder Gewinn?* Freiburg/Basel/Vienna: Herder, 1968. 169–74. **Sanders, E. P.** "Priorités et dépendances dans la tradition synoptique." *RSR* 60 (1972) 519–40 (see 535–36). **Schenke, L.** *Die Wundererzählungen des Markusevangeliums*. 109–29.

Translation

³⁸He set off^a from the synagogue and entered Simon's house. Simon's mother-in-law was stricken with a severe fever, and they made a request to him on her behalf.

³⁹Standing over her, he rebuked the fever and it left her. Immediately, she got up and was attending to them.

Notes

^aLit., “rose up.” The image of rising up is used to suggest the making of a start.

Form/Structure/Setting

Vv 38–39 (like the following vv 40–41) are carried in from Mark’s structure and digress from the primary theme of proclamation in the synagogues which governs 4:14–44. They are, however, meant here to be subordinated to that theme (cf. 43–44). Along with the synagogue exorcism, the healing of Peter’s mother-in-law anticipates concretely the evening healings and exorcism to follow (vv 40–41).

Luke renders the Markan account rather freely, but there is no adequate basis for postulating a second source (Busse, *Wunder*, 74; Schramm, *Markus-Stoff*, 88; contra Léon-Dufour, *EstBib* 24 [1965] 193–216).

The unpretentious simplicity of the account has produced a broad agreement that we are dealing here with a Petrine reminiscence (but cf. Lamarche, *NRT* 87 [1965] 515–21, who disputes the simplicity of the account). Luke has tightened up the account and focused attention on Jesus (Kirchschläger, “Fieberheilung,” 517; Pesch, *Neuere Exegese*, 171). Luke reproduces all Mark’s healing accounts outside the large omission (Mark 6:45–8:26). He shares with Matthew the account of the healing from a distance of the centurion’s slave who was at the point of death (Luke 7:1–10). Distinctly Lukan are the raising of the son of the widow of Nain (7:11–17); the healing of the woman bent over eighteen years by a spirit of infirmity (13:10–17); the healing of dropsy on the sabbath (14:1–6); the healing of the ten lepers (17:11–19); and the restoration of the cut-off ear (22:51). As well, there are general or summary statements (4:40–41; 7:21–22; 13:32 and cf. 9:1–2; 10:9).

Jesus heals by will (7:1–10); by word (declaration of healing [13:12]); command to behavior presupposing healing (5:25; 6:10; 7:14; 8:54 and cf. 17:14); command to health (5:13; 18:42); and/or by touch (simple touch [5:13; 22:51]; taking by the hand [8:54]; being touched [8:44]; laying on of hands [13:13]). Here alone is his word addressed to the illness and not to the person (see *Comment* below). Healing is here, as on several other occasions (5:18–26; 7:2–9; 8:41–42), in response to the initiative of other than the sick person; the initiative seems to be Jesus’ own in 7:11–17; 13:10–17; 22:51 and possibly in 6:6–11; 14:1–6. Healing is linked to faith in 5:20; 7:9; 8:48, 50; 17:19; 18:42 and cf. 5:12. Despite Luke’s keen interest in Jesus at prayer, prayer is never connected with a healing by Jesus (or by Peter or Paul in Acts). These healings are not a matter of piety and answered prayer (Acts 3:12). Their significance is eschatological (Luke 11:20) and Christological (Luke 7:18–23; Acts 3:6; 9:34).

On the relationship between Jesus’ miracles and other ancient miracle stories see esp. at 7:11–17; 8:22–25.

Comment

Following the first account of an exorcism, Luke immediately provides this first account of a healing performed by Jesus. Luke ties the two more closely

together by reporting the healing in terms reminiscent of an exorcism (see v 39 below). The release into liberty proclaimed in vv 18–19 begins to reach into people's lives.

38 As he frequently does (Neirynck, *Minor Agreements*, 203–6), Luke replaces Mark's *καί*, "and," by *δέ*, "but/and." Once again, Mark's uses of *εὐθύς*, "immediately," disappear (cf. *Comment* on v 31). Mark's *ἐκ*, "out of," becomes *ἀπό*, "from," as often (Neirynck, *Minor Agreements*, 282). Luke prefers *ἀναστās*, "having arisen," to *ἐξελθόντες*, "having gone out"—cf. esp. 1:39; 15:18, 20 and 22:45. Mark's *ἦλθον*, "they came," becomes *εἰσῆλθεν*, "he entered." Mark's awkward *μετὰ Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννου*, "with James and John," is omitted, along with *καὶ Ἀνδρέου*, "and Andrew."

The focus is on Jesus alone: the accompanying disciples have not yet been introduced. In the absence of Mark 1:16–20 the visit to Simon's house is now unmotivated (Grundmann, 125, following Rengstorf, 71, suggests after-synagogue hospitality to the preacher!). For this reason we cannot be sure that the lack of an introduction of Simon (contrast, e.g., 19:1) stems from a confidence that the reader will know of him (Dietrich, *Petrusbild*, 19–20; contra Plummer, 131; Schürmann, 251).

The omission of the article before *πενθερά* is puzzling (Marshall, 194). Luke expresses the fevered condition with *ἦν συνεχόμενη πυρετῷ μεγάλῳ*, "was distressed/seized/pressed hard by a severe fever." The *μεγάλῳ* is to be deduced from Mark's *κατέκειτο*, "she lay [sick]." For the ancient medical distinction between *μεγάλοι* (lit., "great") and *μικροί* (lit., "small") fevers see Cadbury, *JBL* 45 (1926) 194–95. *συνεχομένη* is a perfectly good word for talking about sickness (BAGD, 789), but may be chosen to align with the imagery of release from captivity and oppression (4:18; 13:16 and Acts 10:38). Anticipating the pattern of the evening healings (v 40), Luke clarifies the initiative taken on behalf of Simon's mother-in-law by replacing Mark's *λέγουσιν αὐτῷ περὶ αὐτῆς*, "they tell him about her," with *ἡρώτησαν αὐτὸν περὶ αὐτῆς*, "they make a request on her behalf"—cf. Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, 31. Luke's earlier omissions leave the "they" without possible antecedent. Presumably the members of the household are intended.

39 Luke replaces *προσελθών* ("having come") with *ἐπιστās ἐπάνω αὐτῆς*, the exact meaning of which is disputed ("came up and stood at her head"—Grundmann, 125; "stood towering above her"—Schürmann, 251; Kirchschläger, "Fieberheilung," 517; "bent over her"—Busse, *Wunder*, 72). Whatever the precise meaning (the Semitic texts cited by Schlatter, 50, support the second or third option), Luke is certainly after a visual prominence corresponding to the bold authority of Jesus' presence and words. Pesch's connection (*Neuere Exegese*, 173) of *ἐπιστās* with the *ἐπιστάτης*, "master," of 5:5 is attractive.

Where the Markan text has Jesus take the woman by the hand and raise her up, Luke has Jesus attend not to the woman but to the fever itself: he rebukes the fever as if it were a demon (cf. v 35 and *Comment*)—and the fever leaves as a demon leaves. Does Luke consider the fever to be caused by a demon (as in *Test. Sol.* 18.20, 23)? This suggestion is widely adopted (e.g., Schürmann, 252; Haenchen, *Weg*, 89; van der Loos, *Miracles*, 551–52; Leaney, 121; Busse, *Wunder*, 79–80, goes so far as to consider all illness as in Luke's view caused by demons [cf. George, "Miracle," 350–52]). The required identifi-

cation of the illness and the demon is without analogy (but cf. 11:14). It is perhaps better, then, to treat fever and illness generally as a Satanic oppression (Acts 10:38 and possibly Luke 13:16) comparable to demon possession but not to be identified with it: sickness itself is the demonic force. The connection with 4:31–37 requires more than simple personification of the illness (contra Creed, 71; Marshall, 195).

The instantaneousness and completeness of the cure is marked by Luke with *παρὰχρῆμα*, “immediately.” Simon’s mother-in-law can at once resume her household duties (Busse, *Wunder*, 72; contra Schürmann [252] and Kirchschräger [“Fieberheilung,” 518]).

Explanation

This simple, unpretentious, Petrine reminiscence enables Luke to set healing alongside exorcism as fulfilling vv 18–19. Illness, too, is a demonic force from which Jesus brings release. This healing and the exorcism anticipate concretely the evening healings and exorcisms to follow and all together clarify the fuller scope of what it meant for Jesus to be preaching the kingdom of God in the synagogues of the Jews (cf. vv 14–15, 23, 43–44).

The publicly spectacular ministry of the synagogue gives way to a private domestic scene. The intercession of those of the household enlists Jesus’ help for the severely fever-afflicted mother-in-law of Simon. His commanding presence towering over the prostrate woman, Jesus rebukes the fever as he had the demon, and it too succumbs to his authority. Free from residual incapacity, Simon’s mother-in-law sees at once to the needs of those present.

Healing Many at Sundown (4:40–41)

Bibliography

Kirchschräger, W. *Jesu exorzistisches Wirken aus der Sicht des Lukas*. 159–71. **Kowalski, T. W.** “Les sources pré-synoptiques de Marc 1, 32–34 et parallèles: Phénomènes d’amalgame et indépendance mutuelle immédiate des évangélistes synoptiques.” *RSR* 60 (1972) 541–73.

See also at 4:31–37.

Translation

⁴⁰As the sun went down, all who had people sick with various diseases brought them to him. Placing his hands on each one of them, he healed them. ⁴¹Also, demons came out from many, crying out and saying, “You are the Son of God.” He rebuked them and did not allow them to speak, because they knew him to be the Christ.

Form/Structure/Setting

The three pericopes 4:31–37, 38–39, 40–41 are linked together by the use of ἐπιτιμᾶν (“to rebuke”—cf. Talbert, *RevExp* 64 [1967] 487–88). Vv 40–41

serve to generalize the specific instances of exorcism and healing given in the preceding principles. Luke follows loosely Mark 1:32–34, incorporating elements from Mark 3:11 and 6:5, to produce a summary account of an evening of many healings and exorcisms.

The laying on of hands in v 40 is an influence from Mark 6:5. Healing through the laying on of hands is surprisingly absent from the OT and rabbinic literature (Fitzmyer, 555). In Mark the laying on of hands is not initiated by Jesus but requested from him (5:23; 7:32; 8:23 and 25—not so in 6:5, which is, however, too summary a form necessarily to constitute an exception); it is never linked with an exorcism. Of Mark's references Luke loses 7:32; 8:23 and 25 in his large omission (Luke does not reproduce any of the pericopes from Mark 6:45–8:26), and he deletes the laying on of hands from his rendering of Mark 5:23. However, he has Jesus lay hands on the bent-over woman in Luke 13:13 (and cf. Acts 28:8) and he draws in the wording of Mark 6:5 to the present verse. Since in its Lukan form this verse covers both regular healings and exorcisms (see *Comment*), Luke must be familiar with a use in exorcism of the laying on of hands (cf. in 1QapGen 20.16–17 the exorcism by Abraham through prayer and the laying on of hands). This connection is not made elsewhere in the NT.

Comment

The synagogue exorcism and the healing of Simon's mother-in-law anticipate the evening flood of healings and exorcisms, which in turn serves as the basis upon which the Capernaum seek to retain Jesus in Capernaum.

40 Luke abbreviates Mark's double time reference and uses a present participle in place of Mark's aorists, thereby obscuring Mark's attention to the sabbath observance of these people (Schürmann, 253 n. 242). He remedies the defect of Mark's indefinite "they" by providing the logical subject *ἅπαντες ὅσοι εἶχον ἀσθενούντας νόσοις ποικίλαις* ("all who had people sick with various diseases"—cf. Mark's *πάντας* ["all"], *ἔχοντας* ["having"], and in v 34 *ποικίλαις νόσοις* ["various diseases"]). Luke substitutes *ἀσθενούντας*, "sick," for Mark's *κακῶς ἔχοντας*, thus avoiding the double use of *ἔχειν*. Luke is evidently prepared to include the demon-possessed among the sick (*ἀσθενούντας*: cf. chap. 9 where *ἰᾶσθαι*, "to heal," in v 2 covers exorcism as does *θεραπεύοντες*, "healing," in v 6; by analogy *ἀσθενεῖς* in 10:9 probably covers the possessed; cf. Acts 5:15–16; 19:12—contra Wernle, *Frage*, 28, and esp. Böcher, *Dämonenfurcht*, 117, and Busse, *Wunder*, 79–80, who attributes all sickness in Luke to demon possession). He therefore drops Mark's *καὶ τοὺς δαίμονιζομένους*, "and the demon-possessed." The broader word *ἤγαγον*, "brought," replaces *ἔφερον*, "carried": not all the sick that Jesus heals need to be carried. Luke omits Mark 1:33: it may have seemed exaggerated (cf. Mark 1:5); a similar location reference is omitted from Luke's parallel to Mark 2:2.

All those brought receive individual attention from Jesus (*ἐνὶ ἐκάστῳ*, "each one"; Behm, *Handauflegung*, 12—the insertion of *ἐνὶ ἐκάστῳ* leads to an adjustment of the verb from aorist to imperfect). The laying on of hands is an influence from Mark 6:5. It is but one of Jesus' approaches in healing (see at 4:38–39). Here alone in the NT is exorcism by laying on of hands contemplated. Luke can both describe a healing like an exorcism (vv 38–39) and an exorcism

like a healing (implicitly here and in the uses of sickness and healing language cited above).

41 The exorcising is not, as in Mark, a separate activity: as many of the sick were healed, demons came out of them. As had the teaching of Jesus (v 33), so now his healing hands flush out the demons. Borrowing from Mark 3:11b (and cf. Luke's addition of ἐπιτιμῶν, "rebuking"), Luke evokes memories of the synagogue exorcism. Here in the process of being driven out by the power in the hands of Jesus (cf. Bauernfeind, *Worte der Dämonen*, 101), the demons identify their experience as an encounter with the Son of God. "Son of God" here is not different in meaning from "Holy One of God" in v 34 (cf. 1:35). While Luke can use the terms more precisely, both titles, along with the reference to "Christ" immediately following (cf. 22:67), here identify for Luke the instrument of God's final purposes in this world (contra Volkel, ZNW [1974] 65–66).

Jesus silences the demons with a word of rebuke. He would not allow them to speak because (Busse, *Wunder*, 84 n. 1; contra Cadbury, *Style*, 140) they knew him to be the Christ (τὸν Χριστὸν . . . εἶναι, "to be the Christ," is added by Luke). The silencing is certainly not because God has already declared it (as Busse, *Nazareth-Manifest*, 17)—see 9:21—nor simply because demonic testimony is an inappropriate basis for faith (Bauernfeind, *Worte der Dämonen*, 101–2); it is true that such testimony is no adequate basis for faith, but it is silenced in Acts 16:17–18 not as damaging but as irritating. Rather, a right knowledge of Jesus as Christ and redeemer is only to be had in connection with the cross. He only has a right to name Jesus publicly as the Christ (Acts, passim) who will acclaim him as the Christ in his sufferings (Luke 24:21, 25–27) and follow him in the way of the cross (9:20–23).

Explanation

The synagogue exorcism and the healing of Peter's mother-in-law prepare for this summary account of an evening of healings and exorcisms, which adds the note of extensiveness to the Capernaum ministry described thus far and lends credibility to the following attempt to retain Jesus in Capernaum.

The suffering are brought to Jesus, who attends to them individually. From some, the healing hands of Jesus flush out demons. Retreating from the power in Jesus' touch, the demons recognize that they have been encountered by the Son of God, the instrument of God's final purposes in this world. The demons are silenced: Jesus is only rightly known as Christ in connection with his sufferings.

Leaving Capernaum for a Wider Judean Ministry (4:42–44)

Bibliography

Kirchschläger, W. *Jesu exorzistisches Wirken aus der Sicht des Lukas*. 213–20. Kowalski, T. W. "Les sources pré-synoptiques de Marc 1,32–34 et parallèles: Phénomènes d'amal-

game et indépendance mutuelle immédiate des évangélistes synoptiques." *RSR* 60 (1972) 541–73. Schwarz, G. "Auch den anderen Städten? (Lukas IV.43a)." *NTS* 23 (1977) 344.

See also at 4:31–37.

Translation

⁴²When daylight came, he left and went to a wilderness place. The crowds sought him. They came to him and tried to keep him from leaving them. ⁴³He said to them, "I must announce the good news of the kingdom of God in the other cities as well, because for this I was sent." ⁴⁴And he went^a preaching in the synagogues of Judea.^b

Notes

^aLit., "was," but a summary of a whole cycle of ministry after leaving Capernaum is intended.

^bThe difficulty of this reading has produced a number of variants: "Galilee" is substituted from Mark 1:39 (D A K Θ etc.); "the Jews" is read by W; "their" is found in a few of the lectionary texts.

Form/Structure/Setting

For the role of vv 42–44 in the section 4:14–44 see at 4:14–15 and cf. at 4:16–30. Vv 42–44 complete the section begun in 4:14. V 43 is linked to v 18 by the use of *εὐαγγελίσασθαι* . . . *ἀπεστάλην*, "sent to evangelize." Luke does not intend v 44 as an introduction to the following materials. (5:1–3 has Jesus teaching in the open air. Synagogue teaching is mentioned again only in 6:6 and 13:10, and then only incidentally. Or course, in the broader sense, Luke would have us understand that announcing the good news of the kingdom of God in Judea continues [8:1 and cf. 7:17], but this does not determine Luke's structure nor provide Luke's focus of attention after 4:44.) Rather, v 44 ends the section by forming an *inclusio* (that is, the repetition at the end of an element from the beginning to indicate that the material between is to be seen as a completed unit) with v 15. The Galilean ministry, instanced by that in Nazareth and Capernaum, broadens to the whole of Judea and is repeated in city after city.

The changes from Mark are best explained as Lukan redaction (Schramm, *Markus-Stoff*, 66 and 90; contra Schürmann, 256). Only the omission of Mark's *κακεῖ προσήυχετο*, "and there he prayed," is surprising (cf. 5:16) in light of Luke's special interest in Jesus at prayer.

Comment

42 As in v 40 Luke simplifies Mark's time reference. No more precision than "the next morning" (after the previous evening's activities) is intended. As often (Neirynck, *Minor Agreements*, 207–10), Luke subordinates as a participle (*ἐξελθών*, "having gone out") one of Mark's coordinated verbs. For the latter he prefers (as frequently—Neirynck, *Minor Agreements*, 256–57) a form of *πορεύεσθαι*, "go," to Mark's usage of a form of *ἔρχεσθαι*, "come." The wilderness is in Luke a way station: a place of waiting and preparation for the next

stage (cf. 1:80; 3:2; 4:1; 5:16). The omission of Mark's *κακεὶ προσήυχετο*, "and there he prayed," is puzzling (cf. 5:16). Perhaps Luke judged that the departure to a wilderness place would more clearly mark a departure from Capernaum without the phrase (i.e., not just temporary withdrawal for an early morning vigil).

Simon does not here speak for the people; they speak for themselves (Mark's *πάντες*, "all," becomes *οἱ ὄχλοι*, "the crowds"). Mark's *κατεδίωξεν*, "pursued"/"tracked down," is too strong. Luke prefers the colorless *ἐπεζήτουν*, "were seeking" (from Mark's *ζητοῦσιν*, "seek"), which he completes with *καὶ ἦλθον ἕως αὐτοῦ*, "and they came to him." Luke makes explicit their quest: they wish him not to leave them; they want to keep him for themselves.

43 But the messenger of the kingdom may not settle down: his call is always to be moving on (cf. 9:58; 13:33). Luke changes Mark's historic present to an aorist (*εἶπεν*: as often [Neirynck, *Minor Agreements*, 223–24]), links the sentences with *δέ*, "and/but," and as usual prefers *πρὸς* + accusative to Mark's dative (Cadbury, *Style*, 203). Mark's *ἀλλαχοῦ εἰς τὰς ἐχομένας κωμοπόλεις*, "elsewhere to the neighboring towns," becomes *καὶ ταῖς ἐτέραις πόλεσιν*, "also to the other cities": Capernaum is demoted from centrality so that the other places gain equal significance (there is no need for Schwarz's appeal to an underlying Aramaic text [NTS 23 (1977) 344]). Mark's *ἄγωμεν*, "let us go," no longer suits, and Luke substitutes a programmatic statement: *εὐαγγελισασθαί με δεῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ*, "I must announce the good news of the kingdom of God" (cf. Gnllka, *Verstockung*, 131; Busse, *Wunder*, 77).

εὐαγγελισασθαί (with *ἀπεστάλην*, "sent," and *κηρύσσω*, "preaching," to follow) is an echo of v 18. *βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ* is from Mark 1:15: the whole section 4:14–43 takes the place of Mark 1:14–15 (Busse, *Wunder*, 86). The repentance of Mark 1:15 is missing, not because it is reserved for Acts (Busse, *Wunder*, 89), but because Jesus' ministry is built upon John's call to repentance (Luke 3:3 and cf. 7:29–30). The need for repentance is certainly implied by Jesus' ministry (5:32; 10:13; 11:32; 15:7; 16:30). "Announcing the kingdom of God" both summarizes and explains Jesus' activity in Nazareth and Capernaum (Busse, *Nazareth-Manifest*, 80). The kingdom of God is what is happening through Jesus' ministry. Luke knows also of a future aspect of the kingdom of God (11:2; 13:28–29; 19:11; 21:31), but here present fulfillment (cf. 10:23–24) is clearly in view (Busse, *Wunder*, 87; Merk, "Das Reich Gottes," 208–9; Schürmann, 255; contra Conzelmann, *Luke*, 40, 114 and *passim*). For further discussion of the kingdom of God see below at 6:20; 17:21; and 19:11. Mark's *γάρ*, "for," becomes *οτι*, "because," as at 4:32; *εἰς* becomes *ἐπὶ* as in 3:22; *ἐξῆλθον*, "came out," is interpreted by *ἀπεστάλην*, "was sent" (cf. 10:16; Acts 3:26; 10:36; 13:26).

44 Luke's *ἦν*, "was," is better than Mark's *ἦλθεν*, "came," since the verse serves no prospective function. Luke speaks of *Ιουδαία*, "Judea," rather than *Γαλιλαία*, "Galilee," and drops Mark's comprehensive *ὅλην*, "whole." The Galilean ministry, exemplified by the incidents in Nazareth and Capernaum, is not restricted to Galilee but repeated on equal terms in the cities of the whole of Judea (used in the wide sense for the whole of Jewish Palestine as at 1:5; 6:17; 7:17; 23:5; and in Acts; contra Grundmann, 126). Luke deletes Mark's separate reference to exorcisms: "preaching" = "announcing the good news of the kingdom of God" and this comprehends healing and exorcism.

Explanation

After his day of impressive deeds, the next morning Jesus moves off from Capernaum to a wilderness spot in transition to a fresh place of ministry. The impressed crowds come out to find him and try to keep him from leaving. But the messenger of the kingdom may not settle down; his call is always to be moving on. He must announce the kingdom of God to bring it to bear upon the other cities as he had in Nazareth and Capernaum. The length and breadth of Palestine must indeed experience this same ministry: the fulfillment of Isa 61:1–2.

Making a Response to Jesus (5:1–6:16)

Introduction

The sharp Christological focus of 4:14–44 now broadens; in this section the individual people who personally respond to Jesus become important. Sinners find a new life; apostles are called to join Jesus in his task; Pharisees prefer to stay with their old but false righteousness.

Fishing Associates for Jesus (5:1–11)

Bibliography

Abogunrin, S. O. "The Three Variant Accounts of Peter's Call: A Critical and Theological Examination of the Texts." *NTS* 31 (1985) 587–602. **Betz, O.** "Donnersöhne, Menschenfischer, und der davidische Messias." *RevQ* 3 (1961–62) 41–70, esp. 53–56. **Brun, L.** "Die Berufung der ersten Jünger Jesu in der evangelischen Tradition." *SO* 11 (1932) 35–54. **Coulot, C.** "Les figures du maître et de ses disciples dans les premières communautés chrétiennes." *RSR* 59 (1985) 1–11. **Delorme, J.** "Luc v. 1–11: Analyse structurale et histoire de la rédaction." *NTS* 18 (1971–72) 331–50. **Deltombe, F.** "Désormais tu rendras la vie à des hommes (Luc, V, 10)." *RB* 89 (1982) 492–97. **Derrett, J. D. M.,** "ἹΣΑΝ ΓΑΡ ἈΛΙΕΙΣ (Mk.I.16): Jesus' Fishermen and the Parable of the Net." *NovT* 22 (1980) 108–37. ———. "James and John as Co-Rescuers from Peril (Lk. V 10)." *NovT* 22 (1980) 299–303. **Dietrich, W.** *Das Petrusbild der lukanischen Schriften.* 23–81. **Geninasca, J.** "Pêcher-Prêcher: Récit et métaphore. Luc 5, 1–11." In *Signes et paraboles.* Group d'Entrevennes. Paris: Seuil, 1977. 144–71. = "To Fish/To Preach: Narrative and Metaphor (Luke 5:1–11)." In *Signs and Parables: Semiotics and Gospel Texts.* Entrevennes Group. PTMS 23. Tr. G. Phillips. Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1978. 185–222. **Goguel, M.** *La Foi à la résurrection de Jésus dans le Christianisme primitif: Étude d'histoire et de psychologie religieuses.* In *Bibliothèque de L'École des Hautes Études. Sciences Religieuses* 47. Paris: E. Leroux, 1933. 269–301. **Grollenberg L.** "Mensen 'vangen' (Lk. 5,10): Het redden van de dood." *Tijdschrift voor Theologie* 5 (1965) 330–36. **Haenchen, E.** "Historie und Verkündigung bei Markus und Lukas." In *Das Lukas-Evangelium,* ed. G. Braumann. 287–316. **Hengel, M.** *The Charismatic Leader and His Followers.* 73–80. **Hilgert, E.** *The Ship and Related Symbols in the New Testament.* Assen: Van Gorcum, 1962. 104–10. **Klein, G.** "Die Berufung des Petrus." *ZNW* 58 (1967) 1–44. **Leaney, R.** "Jesus and Peter: The Call and Post-Resurrection Appearance (Luke v. 1–11 and xxiv. 34)." *ExpTim* 65 (1953–54) 381–82. **Mánek, J.** "Fishers of Men." *NovT* 2 (1957) 138–41. **Matthews, A. J.** "Depart from Me; for I Am a Sinful Man, O Lord' (Luke v. 8)." *ExpTim* 30 (1918–19) 425. **Pesch, R.** *Der reiche Fischfang: Lk 5,1–11 // Jo 21,1–14: Wundergeschichte—Berufungserzählung—Erscheinungsbericht.* Dusseldorf: Patmos, 1969. ———. "La rédaction lucanienne du logion des pêcheurs d'homme (Lc., V, 10c)." In *L'évangile de Luc,* ed. F. Neirynck. 225–44. = "Luke's Formulation of the Saying on the Fishers of Men (Lk 5:10c)." *Biblehashyam* 2 (1976) 44–59. **Reicke, B. I.** *The Gospel of Luke.* Tr. R. Mackenzie. Richmond: John Knox, 1964. 66–72. **Schürmann, H.** "La promesse à Simon-Pierre: Lc 5,1–11." *AsSeign* 36 (1974) 63–70. **Smith, C. W. F.** "Fishers of Men: Footnotes on a Gospel Figure." *HTR* 52 (1959) 187–203. **Theobald, M.** "Die Anfänge der Kirche:

Zur Struktur von LK 5.1–6.19." *NTS* 30 (1984) 91–108. **Wuellner, W. H.** *The Meaning of "Fishers of Men."* Philadelphia: Westminster, 1967. **Zilleson, K.** "Das Schiff des Petrus und die Gefährten vom andern Schiff (Zur Exegese von Luc 5.1–11)." *ZNW* 57 (1966) 137–39.

Translation

¹It happened that, when the crowd was pressing upon him and listening to the word of God, he was standing by Lake Gennesaret ²and saw two boats standing by the lake. The fishermen had disembarked from them and were washing the nets. ³He got into one of the boats, which was Simon's, and asked him to put off a little from the land. He sat down and taught the crowds from the boat. ⁴When he stopped speaking, he said to Simon, "Put out into the deep and let down your nets for a catch." ⁵Simon answered, "Master, we have labored through the whole night and caught nothing, but at your word I will let down the nets." ⁶They did this and enclosed a great multitude of fish, and their nets were about to break. ⁷They signaled to their partners in the other boat to come and help them. They came and filled both boats to the point of sinking. ⁸When he saw this, Simon Peter fell at the knees of Jesus saying, "Depart from me, because I am a sinful man, Lord." ⁹For amazement had taken hold of him, and all who were with him, because of the catch of fish which they had taken—¹⁰and so it was with James and John the sons of Zebedee, who were partners to Simon. But Jesus said to Simon, "Do not be afraid; from now on you will be catching people." ¹¹Then they brought the boats to land, left everything, and followed him.

Form/Structure/Setting

In 4:14–44 the pattern of synagogue ministry has been established and illustrated; now Luke's attention moves elsewhere. In this section the people who personally respond to Jesus develop an importance for which there was no room in in the strongly Christological focus of 4:14–44. The whole of 4:14–44 has been Luke's equivalent to Mark 1:14–15 (see above); Luke wants more than a bare-bones statement introducing Jesus and his ministry before he begins to introduce those who were to be apostolic partners in Jesus' ministry. Luke now continues with his equivalent for Mark 1:16–20.

Luke uses this fishing scene as a frontispiece for the section 5:1–6:16, for the remainder of which he follows quite closely Mark 1:40–3:19, omitting only the crowd scene of 3:7–12, for which he will have an equivalent in Luke 6:17–19. Luke uses an introductory *ἐγένετο*, "it happened," to bind together the episodes of this section (Luke 5:1, 12, 17; 6:1, 6, 12).

Theobald (*NTS* 30 [1984] 91–108) has argued persuasively for a sevenfold structure in the section (5:1–11, 12–16, 17–26, 27–39; 6:1–5, 6–11, 12–16 [Theobald actually carries the final episode to v 19; but to do so is artificial since 6:17–19 is so obviously a frontispiece for 6:20–49, as Theobald admits]). Items 1, 4, and 7 are linked together as call scenes; 2 and 3 are healings; 5 and 6 are sabbath episodes. A correspondence is established by Luke between 2/3 and 5/6. The whole is structured around the Levi episode (item 4), which

is distinguished through the absence of the introductory formula (*ἐγένετο*) that marks each of the other items.

Luke 5:1-11 is reported in the form of an elaborate pronouncement story centered on v 10b (cf. Fitzmyer, 562). There is, however, good reason to suspect a complex source history for the account: the crowd and the fishermen are juxtaposed but not really related; there is a curious movement between singular and plural in the verbs of the account (vv 4, 5, 10, 11); the mention of the sons of Zebedee is not well integrated (v 10a); the fishing miracle is quite similar to that reported in John 21, while the call to catch men (v 10b) is evidently to be related to the call in Mark 1:17 to become fishermen of men; it has frequently been suspected that v 8 had originally a shore setting.

It has been popular to attribute to different sources the fishing miracle and the calling (e.g., Loisy, 173-74; Pesch, *Fischfang*, chap. 3; Fitzmyer, 560). Pesch's painstaking attempt to separate the sources founders on the incredibility of a miracle account that leaves unanswered Peter's request, "Depart from me, because I am a sinful man, Lord." Fitzmyer's judgment that these words betray the original postresurrection setting (561-62) does not really help. The evident connection with the theophany and call experienced by aiah (chap. 6) demand a resolution of v 8 in terms that involve a call to serving God.

Klein's proposal ("Berufung," 16-20) of a fishing miracle that had no mention of the sons of Zebedee or the second boat is more attractive. It is difficult to choose between a lack of any follow-up to the mention in v 6 of nets at the point of breaking (produced by Klein's omission of v 7) and a delayed reaction by Peter to the miracle (the present text). Perhaps best is a source that spoke only of anonymous partners to Peter. V 7 can be understood as the necessary rendering visible of the miracle (Pesch, *Fischfang*, 115). It is likely that the source account was ambiguous about the location of Jesus. Luke has replaced the original brief introduction (perhaps still visible in v 2) with a composite from Mark (cf. Mark 3:7, 9 and 4:1 and note Luke's omission of these texts at the corresponding parts of his narrative [6:17-18; 8:4]), and added vv 10a and 11 on the basis of Mark 1:16-20.

Undoubtedly, there is a close connection with John 21. Verbal echoes are to be attributed to an awareness in the tradition that the postresurrection miracle was quite deliberately a repetition of a preresurrection miracle, and that this phenomenon of repetition was the basis for the recognition: it is the Lord (John 21:12 and 7; cf. in Luke 24:30-31 the recognition of Jesus in the breaking of the bread).

Comment

The new section 5:1-6:16 is distinctive in a number of respects. Elements of personal response to Jesus feature prominently in the section: sinfulness is confessed in the presence of the Holy One (5:8); confidence is expressed in Jesus' ability to cleanse (5:12); faith is noted (5:20); people leave everything to follow Jesus (5:11, 28); etc. Also, although these will only come into clear focus in the next section (6:17-49), disciples of Jesus are spoken of here for

the first time (5:30, 33; 6:1, 13). The Pharisaic assessment of Jesus begins (5:17, 21, 30, 33; 6:2, 7). Clearly important is the call of apostles to share in Jesus' ministry of "catching men" (5:10). The obviously post-Pentecost setting of Luke's interest in the ministry of the apostles (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:8) with which this section begins and ends (Luke 5:1–11; 6:12–16) lends an ecclesiological coloring to the whole section.

Taking our cue from the key verses 5:32 and 38–39 from the central episode in the sevenfold structure, we may summarize the thrust of the section as follows. While sinners find a new life through the call of Jesus to repentance and from among them the apostles receive a special call to join Jesus in his task, the old but false Pharisaic righteousness has no interest in Jesus' call to the new but true righteousness which he himself practices.

After the exclusively Christological focus of 4:14–44, Luke is now prepared in this new section to begin introducing Jesus' apostolic partners. Peter's role as the central and leading apostolic figure is signaled immediately. Mark's frequent references to the seaside (and cf. references to being on the lake) are regularly omitted by Luke (Conzelmann, *Luke*, 39, 42, 45). This motif is concentrated by Luke into this one episode (and cf. 8:22–26).

1 ἐγένετο ("it happened") + καί + finite verb is a frequent Lukanism (5:12, 17; 8:1, 22; 9:28, 51; 14:1; 17:11; 19:15; 24:4, 15; also Acts 5:7; 9:19; for Luke's other ἐγένετο expressions see at 1:8 and 6:6). It usually marks a new beginning. Jesus' capacity to attract crowds is already known from 4:42 and therefore requires no explanation. ἐπικεῖσθαι αὐτῷ, "to press upon him," justifies the use of the boat (cf. Mark 3:9). The crowd is not exemplary: to hear the word of God is not enough (6:47; 8:21; 11:28). Luke continues to underline the public impact of Jesus. "The word of God" is a comprehensive designation of the Christian message applied both to Jesus' preaching and to Christian evangelism in Acts. It is God's message which is spoken by Jesus (as in Christian evangelism). The periphrastic form ἦν ἐστῶς, "was standing," subordinates this verb to the following εἶδεν ("saw"; cf. 4:31). Jesus stands to teach also at 6:17 (and cf. 24:36). Luke, like Josephus (*Ant.* 18.28), prefers λίμνη, "lake," to the θάλασσα, "sea," of the other evangelists, and Γεννησαρέτ, "Gennesaret," as the name, after the district mentioned in Mark 6:53 (similarly Josephus, *War* 3.506; 1 Macc 11:67).

2 εἶδεν, "he saw," is perhaps from Mark 1:16, as is ἀλιεῖς, "fishermen." δύο, "two," prepares for v 7. The repetition of "standing by the sea" is an instance of a characteristic failure in Luke's style (Cadbury, "Lucan Style," 97–100; Brun, *SO* 11 [1932] 39). ἐπλυνον, "were washing," i.e., after a night of fishing (Bundy, *Jesus*, 92). This activity may imply an early morning setting (cf. v 5) but such plays no role for Luke.

3 ἐμβὰς δὲ εἰς ἓν τῶν πλοίων, "getting into one of the boats," is from Mark's εἰς πλοῖον ἐμβάντα, (4:1—"getting into a boat"). The reader knows of Simon from 4:38. For the request to Simon compare Mark 3:9 and 4:1. Sitting and teaching the crowd is like Mark 4:1–2. ἐπαναγαγεῖν anticipates v 4. Jesus' teaching from the boat binds together the activities of Jesus and Peter: Jesus is fishing from the boat to catch men (Brun, *SO* 11 [1932] 37). It is to make this point that Luke has thus preferred the fishing miracle and call.

4 ὥς δὲ ἐπαύσατο λαλῶν, “as he ceased speaking,” marks the major transition in the narrative: in vv 1–3 the link with Peter is incidental; from this point it is central. The relationship between ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἐπαναγαγεῖν ὀλίγον, “to put out a little from the land”—v 3) and ἐπανάγαγε εἰς τὸ βάθος, “put out into the deep”—v 4) has encouraged an allegorical reading in terms of Jewish and gentile missions (Holtzmann, *Synoptiker*, 334–35; Loisy, 169–76; Hilgert, *The Ship*, 105; Reicke, *Luke*, 68–69). But then Simon should be depicted as fishing in close as well (9:1–6; Acts 2, etc.). The deep is simply where the (literal) fish are to be fished for; Jesus had not himself been after (literal) fish. The contrast is fish and men, not Gentiles and Jews. Any thought that the fish are to be rescued from the “chaotic waters of darkness” (Mánek, *NovT* 2 [1957] 138–41; Derrett, *NovT* 22 [1980] 121 n. 44) is also to be rejected. While ἐπανάγαγε, “put out,” is singular, χαλάσατε, “let down,” is plural: Simon is envisaged as having a crew under his command (cf. Mark 1:20).

5 ἐπιστάτα, “master,” may be from Luke (cf. 8:24, 45; 9:33, 49; 17:13). He often prefers it to the other synoptists’ διδάσκαλε, “teacher,” or ῥαββί, “Rabbi,” in the cases where Jesus’ authority in contexts not directly related to teaching is in view. Since for Luke διδάσκαλε is an objective description while ἐπιστάτα involves a personal recognition of Jesus’ authority, the latter is mostly on the lips of disciples (except 17:13). ἐπὶ τῷ ῥήματί σου, “at your word,” points to the intrinsic authority of Jesus’ words. Certainly no disrespect is implied (contra Dietrich, *Petrusbild*, 43; Derrett, *NovT* 22 [1980] 122; Matthews, *ExpTim* 30 [1918–19] 425; Delorme, *NTS* 18 [1971–72] 336).

6 The greatness of the miracle is multiply attested: πλῆθος . . . πολὺ (“a great multitude”); διερρήσσετο τὰ δίκτυα (“the nets were about to break”—cf. BDF 323.4); βυθίζεσθαι (“to be on the point of sinking” [v 7]—cf. BDF 338.1).

7 κατένευσαν is literally “they signaled by nodding their heads,” but perhaps may be used more broadly for signaling in general (Fitzmyer, 567). Either they signaled with their heads because their hands were occupied (Grundmann, 128), or they signaled because their voices would not carry the distance (Easton, 61; Lagrange, 158; Plummer, 144). The μέτοχοι were the business partners in the other boat (Wuellner, *Meaning*, 23–24). Fishing boats normally worked in pairs (Grundmann, 128). No doubt the technical problems of drawing fish into the second boat were surmountable. Pesch (*Fischfang*, 115) cites fishing stories where the marvelous catch turned out to be a dead camel, a rock, or an urn. The miracle is only fully known when the fish have been drawn from the water.

8 Only here in Luke is the double name used (but cf. 6:14), probably from the source. προσπίπτειν τοῖς γόνασιν τινος, “to fall at the knees of someone,” is a somewhat unusual expression, but see other examples at BAGD, 718. Simon’s response is appropriate to a theophany (cf. Isa 6:1–8, esp. vv 5 and 8, and Ezek 1:1–2:3, esp. 1:28 and 2:3, and cf. 1 Sam 5). This is better than finding here postresurrection remorse for the denial of Jesus (Hirsch, *Auferstehungsgeschichten*, 22–23; Fitzmyer, 561–62, and others). Κύριε is here probably not Luke’s usual “Sir,” but the “supreme Lord” of 1:43 and 2:11—and of Luke’s own narrational designation of Jesus as Lord. However, Luke offers no clear picture of the development of Christological awareness. His concern

here is more to set forth an experience of the numinous as present in Jesus and his deeds (cf. 8:22–25; Dietrich, *Petrusbild*, 46–47).

9 The others present shared something of Simon's experience, if not his precise response. Luke may be responsible for the use of *θάμβος* ("astonishment"; cf. v 36).

10 Having replaced Mark 1:16–18 with the present account, Luke (overloading his sentence) adds here a mention of James and John, sons of Zebedee, so as not to lose the main content of Mark 1:19–20. Luke sacrifices a mention of Andrew, who is less important to him (he appears in the apostolic lists only: 6:14 and Acts 1:13) and who could not be introduced into the account without sacrificing the central focus on Simon. James and John are identified as the partners of v 7. Here the less technical *κοινωνοί*, "those who share," is used. The trio appear again in 8:51 and 9:28, and James and John as a pair in 9:54 (cf. Acts 12:2). Peter and John are linked in 22:8 and Acts 3:1, 3, 4, 11; 4:13, 19; 8:14.

Attention returns immediately to Simon. Jesus' response begins with the *μὴ φοβοῦ*, "do not be afraid," familiar in epiphany scenes (cf. 1:13 and 30; 2:10; cf. Dietrich, *Petrusbild*, 46–47; Pesch, *Fischfang*, 139). The threat of the sea (*βυθίζεσθαι*, "to be at the point of sinking") is not the issue here (contra Derrett, *NovT* 22 [1980] 122, and cf. Mánek, *NovT* 2 [1957] 138–41). The miraculous catch is an encounter with the divine that makes possible Peter's call, but it is also an acting out in prophetic symbolism of his later apostolic role (cf. Hos 1–3; Ezek 4, 5, 12, etc.). The *ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν*, "from now on," is Lukan (1:48; 12:52; 22:18, 69; Acts 18:6). Luke does not use the expression strictly chronologically. Rather, it denotes a fundamental change in the state of affairs (Pesch, *Fischfang*, 140). Luke sees the new role as primarily becoming effective in the postresurrection situation (see at 1:2) but there is a prolepsis in 9:1–6 and formation of the apostolic college in 6:13–16. However, already in v 11 the situation of Simon is fundamentally changed. *ζωογρῶν* is strictly "catching alive" and is so used in the LXX (Grollenberg, *Tijdschrift voor Theologie* 5 [1965] 330–36). There is evidence of its secular use to apply a fishing metaphor to the catching of people (BAGD, 340). *ἀλιευτής* (cf. the *ἀλιεῖς*, "fishermen," of Mark 1:17) and *ἀλιεύειν*, "to fish," are both used to the same effect (Wuellner, *Meaning*, 71–72). OT judgment imagery (Jer 16:16; Amos 4:2; Hab 1:14–15, etc.) plays no part here (contra C. W. F. Smith, *HTR* 52 [1959] 187–203). Here men are gathered for salvation. The overtones of the image need not be negative (Diogenes Laertius 2.67). Despite many attempts, there is no adequate basis for determining whether the Lukan or the Markan form is more original. Translation variants for *Τῷ*, *σαγγᾶδ* ("to fish"/"to hunt"), may be involved (Hengel, *Leader*, 78–79). Behind this call as behind the sending of Jesus himself (4:43) stands the seeking God (chap. 15).

11 *καταγαγόντες*, "brought to land," assures us that the boats did not in fact sink. Where Mark itemizes (1:18, 20), Luke heightens the sense of a totally new beginning by writing *ἀφέντες πάντα*, "having left all." From his Markan source, Luke has in mind Simon, James, and John, but he has not clearly distinguished them from the anonymous crews. "Following" as an image of Christian discipleship is much less important for Luke than for Mark (but see Luke 9:23, 49, 57, 59, 61; 18:22, 28). The following here is rather for these

three the apostolic being with Jesus (1:2; Acts 4:13; cf. 1:21, etc.) which prepares them for their mission (Pesch, *Fischfang*, 141; Schürmann, 272; contra Fitzmyer, 569). Note the contrast between this following and the request to depart (De-lorme, *NTS* 18 [1971–72] 337). But the distinction between discipleship and apostleship cannot be pressed prior to Luke 6:13. James and John participate in Simon's call (have they not helped in the catch of fish?) as do the other apostles to come, but the priority is clearly preserved for Simon.

Explanation

Luke structures into his next major section the seven units 5:1–11, 12–16, 17–26, 27–39; 6:1–5, 6–11, 12–16. The section begins and ends with an interest in Jesus' apostolic partners. In between there are two healing episodes (5:12–16, 17–26) balanced by two sabbath episodes (6:1–5, 6–11) organized around as centerpiece the call of the "sinner" Levi with its appended teaching about the new and the old (5:27–39).

Jesus has thus far exercised his ministry alone. Now Luke begins to introduce Jesus' apostolic partners. Simon is to be chief among the apostles.

The public impact of Jesus' ministry continues. To connect with the later apostolic preaching, Jesus' message is here called "the word of God." The pressing lakeside crowd is the occasion for Jesus to be a fisherman catching men from a boat. Since he uses Simon's boat, the boat also brings Simon and Jesus together.

The fishermen have labored through the night without success, but when Jesus finishes teaching he bids Peter to try again. Simon recognizes the authority of Jesus' word and submits to its dictates, addressing Jesus as Master. The miraculous catch that follows acts out in prophetic symbolism Simon's call to catch men. The greatness of the miracle is multiply attested: "a great multitude," nets about to break, and two fishing boats at the point of sinking. As in the classic call of the prophet (Isa 6) this experience functions as a manifestation of the divine, provoking amazement, fear, and a sense of sinfulness in the presence of the holy. Jesus dispels the fear and issues the call to Simon: from now on he is to catch men.

James and John also experience the greatness of the event. Participating in Simon's call, along with Simon they leave everything and follow Jesus into a new life of apostolic ministry.

The Cleansing of a Leper (5:12–16)

Bibliography

Boismard, M.-É. "La guérison du lépreux (Mc 1,40–45 et par.)." *Sal* 28 (1981) 283–91. **Danker, F. W.** "Mark 1:45 and the Secrecy Motif." *CTM* 37 (1966) 492–99. **Mussner, F.** *The Miracles of Jesus: An Introduction*. Tr. A. Wimmer. Notre Dame: University Press, 1968. 27–39. **Neiryneck, F.** "Papyrus Egerton 2 and the Healing of the Leper." *ETL*

61 (1985) 153–60. **Pesch, R.** *Jesu ureigene Taten? Ein Beitrag zur Wunderfrage*. Quaestiones disputatae 52. Freiburg im B.: Herder, 1970. 52–113, esp. 98–107. **Ryrie, C. C.** “The Cleansing of the Leper.” *BSac* 113 (1956) 262–67. **Schramm, T.** *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*. 91–99. **Suhl, A.** *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markus-Evangelium*. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1965. 120–23. **Zimmermann, H.** *Neutestamentliche Methodenlehre*. 237–42.

Translation

¹²It happened that, when he was in one of the cities,^a there was a man full of leprosy. Seeing Jesus, he fell on his face and begged him, saying, “Lord, if you want to, you can make me clean.” ¹³And Jesus^b stretched out his hand and touched him, saying, “I do want to; become clean!” Immediately the leprosy left him. ¹⁴Then he commanded him to tell nobody: “Go, rather, and show yourself to the priest, and make an offering for your cleansing, just as Moses commanded for a testimony to them.” ¹⁵Then the word about him spread yet further, and many crowds would come together to hear him and to be healed of their diseases. ¹⁶But he would go off to wilderness spots and pray.

Notes

^aOr “in a certain city.”

^bGreek: “he.”

Form/Structure/Setting

This account of the cleansing of a leper is the first of a pair of healing accounts that occupy positions 2 and 3 in the sevenfold structure of the section and are balanced by two connected sabbath incidents in positions 5 and 6 (see further at 5:1–11). These healing accounts are sequential in Mark (1:40–45; 2:1–12) but structurally quite separate. Luke binds them together by (i) the use of related introductory expressions: ἐγένετο . . . ἐν μιᾷ τῶν πόλεων (“it happened in one of the towns”; 5:12) and ἐγένετο ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν (“it happened in one of the days”; 5:17); (ii) the introduction into the first episode of a teaching note (v 15) to parallel that already present in the second (v 17); and (iii) the strengthening of the emphasis on healing in the second episode (v 17b; cf. Busse, *Wunder*, 134) in line with the major emphasis on healing in the first (v 15). Theobald (*NTS* 30 [1984] 94–95) suggests further that the prayer of v 16 prepares for the exercise of the prerogatives of God of v 20. Perhaps also the legal component of the cleansing (v 14) motivates for Luke the presence in the following episode (not so in Mark) of those custodians of the keeping of the law, the Pharisees and teachers of the law (v 17), who have come to assess the legality of Jesus’ endeavors (v 21 cf. v 30; 6:2, 9). Notice also how the motifs of 6:18–19 have been distributed between the two episodes (6:18 cf. 5:15; 6:19 cf. 5:17b). For the correlation between the healings and the sabbath incidents see below at 5:17–26.

For the verbal exchange between Jesus and the leper, which constitutes the core of the account, Luke follows the Markan wording quite closely. But for the remainder the formulation is quite different. Schramm (*Markus-Stoff*,

91–99) argues confidently for a second source, partly on the basis of agreements with Matthew (*καὶ ἰδοὺ, Κύριε, αὐτοῦ λέγων*) and partly by attempting to show that aside from vv 15–16 distinctive expressions in Luke's text suit the style of Luke's special source material better than Luke's own style. The latter argument depends on a rather too confident separation of sources and redaction and rests too much weight on the ability of the latter half of Acts to reveal to us Luke's use of language. Schramm has not been followed.

Outside the dialogue, Luke has omitted from the Markan account all that does not belong to the report of a healing (Zimmermann, *Neutestamentliche Methodenlehre*, 241) and has thus produced an account in perfect miracle story form.

The canonical Gospel tradition reports only one other account of cleansing from leprosy (Luke 17:11–19; cf. the generalizing statement in 7:22 and Matt 10:8). Luke 17:14 should perhaps be seen as an Elisha motif (cf. 2 Kgs 5:10), and in Luke's hands the present account is to some degree a positive counterpart to Luke 4:27. However, Pesch's suggestion (*Jesu ureigene Taten?* 78–80) that the origin of the account is the desire to present Jesus as superior to Elisha runs aground on the lack of Elisha motifs in the original Markan account.

An account of the miraculous cure of leprosy does not seem to be included among the Jewish and pagan miracle accounts that have survived from antiquity (except the OT incidents Num 12:9–15; 2 Kgs 5:1–14; P. Feeny, *The Fight against Leprosy* [London: Elek Books, 1964] 41, reports legends of miraculous cures by Chinese emperors). There did exist a Jewish expectation that the ravages of leprosy would be removed in the time of messianic salvation (see Str-B, 1:593–96). The social exclusion of lepers (Lev 13:45–46; Num 5:2–3; 12:14–15; 2 Kgs 15:5; for Jewish sources see Str-B, 4:751–57) combined with the growing first-century Jewish preoccupation with issues of clean and unclean (the uncleanness of leprosy was communicable) separated leprosy from other forms of illness and would have given a heightened significance to its cure.

Biblical leprosy covers a range of disfiguring conditions, probably not including what we today call leprosy (i.e., Hansen's disease). See the studies cited by Fitzmyer, 574, and cf. Schürmann, 276–77.

Comment

As was Peter, so too this leper is deeply affected by the presence of Jesus. He is convinced that it is quite within Jesus' reach to cleanse him from his leprosy.

12 The first three episodes of Luke's sevenfold structuring of this section are marked by the Lukan idiom *ἐγένετο ἐν . . .* ("it happened when/while/on . . .") + *καί* + finite verb (5:1, 12, 17). (The last three episodes are linked by the equally Lukan idiom *ἐγένετο ἐν . . .* + infinitive [6:1, 6, 12].) Luke uses *ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ εἶναι*, "it happened when [he, etc.] was . . .," also at 2:6; 9:18; 11:1; and Acts 19:1. The use of *ἐν μιᾷ τῶν*, "in one of the . . .," binds together the two healing episodes (cf. v 17). The expression occurs also at 8:22; 13:10; 20:1. *ἐν μιᾷ τῶν πόλεων*, "in one of the cities," may with its definite article refer back to 4:43: this is one of the cities where Jesus is announcing the good news of the kingdom of God. If, however, there is a Semitic influence on the expression (Black, *Aramaic Approach*, 249) no definiteness need be in-

tended (so: "in a certain city"). *καὶ ἰδοῦ*, "and behold," in narrative is found ten times in the Gospel in Markan contexts and at least five other times. Mark does not use the expression, but Matthew adds it twenty-one times in Markan contexts, in five of which there is agreement with Luke (Neirynck, *Minor Agreements*, 273–74). *άνήρ*, "man," is a favorite Lukan word (27 times in the Gospel; 100 times in Acts). *πλήρης*, "full," applied to persons is also Lukan. Luke also marks degrees in an illness at 4:38.

Having juxtaposed the two figures (Jesus and the leper) Luke establishes contact between them with his *ιδών δέ τὸν Ἰησοῦν*, "seeing Jesus." *πεσὼν ἐπὶ πρόσωπον*, "falling on his face," is reminiscent of, but not identical to, Peter's *προσέπεσεν τοῖς γόνασιν*, "fell at his knees" (5:8—notice there the use also of *ιδών*, "seeing"). Both are more dramatic than Mark's *γονυπετῶν*, "kneeling" (1:40). Luke adds *δεῖσθαι*, "to beg," as also in Markan contexts at 8:28, 38; 9:38, 40. The words of the leper are a request and not simply a confession, despite the assertion form. Luke and Matthew both add *Κύριε*, "Lord," to the leper's words. The connection with Peter's use in 5:8 of the same address suggests that more is involved than a polite "Sir." Some sense of the exalted identity of Jesus draws from the leper his confident assertion about the power of Jesus: "If you want to, you can make me clean" (*ἐὰν θέλῃς, δύνασθαί με καθαρίσαι*—wording identical to Mark). In the LXX *καθαρίζειν*, "to cleanse," is applied both to the healing of the leper (e.g., Lev 14:4; perfect participle) and (more often) to the ritual cleansing declared by the priest (e.g., Lev 14:11). The choice of the verb focuses attention on the sense of defilement that attached to the condition.

The uncleanness of leprosy is a potentially powerful image for human defilement in sin. Anticipating the word of forgiveness of 5:20 and bearing in mind the generally ecclesiological tone of the section, Schürmann, 274, understands Luke to be treating the cleansing in this way. But Luke does not make this clear.

13 Luke, as does Matthew, omits here from the Markan account the words that express Jesus' inner feelings, as he does elsewhere (Luke 6:10; Pesch, *Jesu ureigene Taten?* 103). He improves the Markan word order by setting *αὐτοῦ*, "him," after *ἥψατο*, "he touched." Again with Matthew, he eliminates a Markan parataxis by using the participle *λέγων*, "saying," as he often does (Neirynck, *Minor Agreements*, 207–8). Jesus' words are those of the Markan text: *θέλω, καθαρίσθαι*, "I want to; be clean." Luke prefers *εὐθέως* to Mark's *εὐθύς*, "immediately" (see at Luke 4:33), and brings the subject *ἡ λέπρα*, "the leprosy," forward for a more natural word order.

The touch is particularly significant given the unclean state, but despite the regular assumption of the commentators does not seem to violate the rules of the cultic and ritual system. Only for the priests was there prescription about contracting uncleanness under certain circumstances (e.g., Lev 21:1–4). In any case, the uncleanness retreats before the touch and command of Jesus. Jesus' word of command echoes the confession of the leper: the leper's confidence in Jesus' power to heal requires no comment; Jesus' sovereign will to heal is affirmed and the commanding word uttered. The effect is immediate. Here is a leper in Israel who does find cleansing (cf. 4:27).

14 Luke omits Mark's rather violent-sounding dismissal of the man. He

adds an *αὐτός*, “he,” to denote change of subject (cf. at 3:23), strengthens Mark’s *λέγει*, “says,” to *παρήγγειλεν* (“commanded”; cf. 8:29, 56; 9:21), omits the double negative present in Mark, and recasts the first part of Jesus’ words into indirect speech. Mark’s *ὑπαγε*, “depart,” is perhaps reflected at Luke 17:14, but here Luke prefers to repeat the verb of the previous verse (*ἀπέρχεσθαι*). Luke reverses to verb-object order Mark’s *σεαυτὸν δείξον*, “yourself show,” and prefers *καθώς*, “as,” to Mark’s *ἅ*, “what.” A similar preference for *καθώς* is evident in Luke’s rendition in 6:31, 36; 11:30; 17:26 of material shared with Matthew. Otherwise he reproduces the Markan form of Jesus’ words.

Freed from the Markan context, the injunction to silence (*μηδενὶ εἰπεῖν*, “tell nobody”) serves merely to underline Jesus’ concern here for compliance with the OT law: a public claim to cleansing from leprosy was inappropriate prior to priestly investigation; indeed, in the public realm the cleansing was finally a priestly prerogative, and this Jesus does not usurp. Jesus’ directive is based on Lev 14:1–32. *εἰς μαρτύριον αὐτοῖς*, “for a witness to them,” is best taken as referring to a public authentication of healing by the priestly ritual and understood as the reason for the Mosaic command (cf. Lev 14:57). Despite Schürmann, 277, the preoccupation with legal observance in the infancy narratives and the Pharisaic assessment of Jesus that permeates this section (5:17, 21, 30, 33; 6:2, 7) justify a reading of the text here as highlighting Jesus’ own attention to Mosaic stipulations: Jesus does not encourage infidelity to the law any more than Paul does after him (Acts 21:24). Jesus’ evident concern for the law here provides the beginning perspective for a question that is implicit in the five central items of Luke’s sevenfold structure (i.e., 5:12–6:11): in the new state of affairs inaugurated by Jesus’ ministry, whose approach (that of Jesus or that of the Pharisees) represents true faithfulness to the law?

15 Luke completely reformulates the conclusion of the episode, retaining from Mark only the notion of increasing crowds and wilderness withdrawal. The publicly certified healing leads to an even greater dissemination of an awareness of Jesus (cf. 4:14, 37; 7:17; and more remotely 8:39). Luke neatly balances the spreading out (*διήρχετο*) of the report and the coming together (*συνήρχοντο*) of the crowds (Zimmermann, *Neutestamentliche Methodenlehre*, 240). V 15 functions to generalize the single healing reported in the episode (Zimmermann, 241; against Marshall, 210). In this generalizing statement Luke corrects the one-sided attention to healing with his *ἀκούειν καὶ θεραπεύεσθαι*, “to hear and to be healed.”

16 Luke’s reporting here of Jesus’ withdrawals into wilderness locations (reiterative imperfect verb with the plural *ἐρήμοις*, “wildernesses”) is influenced by Mark 1:35 (parallel to Luke 4:42), and together with v 15 functions as a generalizing of the episodes 4:38–41 and 4:42–44: while Jesus teaches and heals the crowds he will not be at their disposal and be taken possession of by them. To be a successful preacher and healer does not achieve the goal of Jesus’ ministry: he must continue to move on. The prayer motif which Luke passed over at 4:42 is introduced at this point.

Explanation

Individual responses to Jesus mark this section of Luke. The lakeside setting is now replaced by a setting in an unnamed town. A leper there experiences

an encounter with Jesus in terms reminiscent of that of Peter (Luke 5:8). He prostrates himself before Jesus, addresses him with the exalted title Lord, and confesses Jesus' ability to cleanse him from his leprosy. To speak of cleansing rather than healing focuses attention not so much on the disease itself as on the sense of defilement that attached to the condition.

Since the uncleanness of leprosy was communicable, it is especially significant that Jesus responds by touching the man: not that Jesus violates the rules of cultic cleanness; rather, the uncleanness retreats before the touch and command of Jesus (cf. at 4:40, 41). The touch of Jesus represents a "welcome back" to the isolated leper. The words of Jesus echo those of the leper. The affirmation of Jesus' ability is allowed to stand and his sovereign will to heal is affirmed. The healing of this leper is a positive counterpart to the dreadful possibility proposed in 4:27: here at least there is a leper in Israel who is cleansed.

According to the law, however, cleansing from leprosy is not publicly effective without the role of priest and sacrifice (Lev 14:1–32). So the man must not claim his healing until he has fulfilled the stipulations of the law which provide for its public authentication (cf. Lev 14:57). Jesus is attentive to Mosaic stipulations: he does not encourage infidelity to the law any more than Paul does after him (Acts 21:24). The following episodes, where the Pharisees object to Jesus' practices, are to be read in this light.

This new mighty deed of Jesus causes word of him to spread yet further. And as the word goes out the crowds come in. Jesus teaches them and heals them, as he had the leper. Nevertheless, he will not place himself at their disposal or be taken possession of by them. To be a successful preacher and healer does not achieve the goal of Jesus' ministry: he must continue to move on.

The Forgiveness of a Paralyzed Man (5:17–26)

Bibliography

Albertz, M. *Die synoptischen Streitgespräche: Ein Beitrag zur Formgeschichte des Urchristentums.* Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn, 1921. **Beilner, W.** *Christus und die Phariseer.* 9–14. **Boobyer, G. H.** "Mk II, 10A and the Interpretation of the Healing of the Paralytic." *HTR* 47 (1954) 115–20. **Branscomb, H.** "Mark 2,5, 'Son Thy Sins Are Forgiven.'" *JBL* 53 (1934) 53–60. **Ceroke, C. P.** "Is Mk 2,10 a Saying of Jesus?" *CBQ* 22 (1960) 369–90. **Dabb, J. H. M.** "Luke v. 26." *ExpTim* 45 (1933–34) 45. **Duplacy, J.** "Marc, 2,10. Note de syntax." In *Mélanges bibliques*, FS A. Robert. Travaux de l'Institut Catholique de Paris 4. Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1957. 420–27. **Dupont, J.** "Le paralytique pardonné (Mt 9,1–8)." *NRT* 82 (1960) 940–58. **Feuillet, A.** "L'ἐξουσία du fils de l'homme (d'après Mc. II,10–28 et parr.)." *RSR* 42 (1954) 161–92, esp. 164–81. **Gnilka, J.** "Das Elend vor dem Menschensohn (Mk. 2:1–12)." In *Jesus und der Menschensohn*, FS A. Vogtle, ed. R. Pesch and R. Schnackenburg. Freiburg: Herder, 1975. 196–209. **Hay, L. S.** "The Son of Man in Mark 2,10 and 2,28." *JBL* 89 (1970) 69–75. **Hooker, M. D.** *The Son of Man in Mark.* London: SPCK, 1967. 81–93. **Kertelge, K.** "Die Vollmacht des Menschensohnes zur Sündenvergebung (Mk 2, 10)." In *Orientierung an Jesus*, FS J. Schmid, ed. P. Hoffmann et al. Freiburg i. B.: Herder, 1973. 205–13. **Klauck, H.-J.**

"Die Frage der Sündenvergebung in der Perikope von der Heilung des Gelähmten (Mk. 2.1–12 parr)." *BZ* 25 (1981) 223–48. **Loos, H. van der.** *The Miracles of Jesus.* NovTSup 9. Leiden: Brill, 1965. 440–49. **Maisch, I.** *Die Heilung des Gelähmten: Eine exegetisch-traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Mk 2,1–12.* SBS 52. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1971. **Mead, R. T.** "The Healing of the Paralytic—A Unit?" *JBL* 80 (1961) 348–54. **Neiryneck, F.** "Les accords mineurs et la rédaction des évangiles: L'épisode du paralytique (Mt., IX, 1–8/Lc., V, 17–26, par. Mc., II, 1–12)." *ETL* 50 (1974) 215–30. **Reicke, B.** "The Synoptic Reports on the Healing of the Paralytic: Matth. 9:1–8 with Parallels." In *Studies in New Testament Language and Text*, FS G. D. Kilpatrick, ed. J. K. Elliott. NovTSup 44. Leiden: Brill, 1976. 319–29. **Rich, A. T.** "Luke V.26." *ExpTim* 44 (1932–33) 428. **Rolland, P.** "Jésus connaissait leurs pensées." *ETL* 62 (1986) 118–21. **Schramm, T.** *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas.* 99–103. **Thissen, W.** *Erzählung der Befreiung: Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu Mk 2.1–3.6.* Forschung zur Bibel 21. Würzburg: Echter, 1976. 47–54 and passim. **Tödt, H. E.** *The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition.* 125–30. **Tuckett, C.** "The Present Son of Man." *JSNT* 14 (1982) 58–81. **Wibbing, S.** "Die Heilung eines Gelähmten." In *Wundergeschichten*, Handbuch für den Religionsunterricht 2, ed. U. Becker and S. Wibbing. Gütersloh: Gütersloher, 1965. 12–33. **Wrede, W.** "Zur Heilung des Gelähmten (Mc 2,1ff)." *ZNW* 5 (1904) 354–58.

Translation

¹⁷It happened on one of those days, when^a he was teaching and there were seated Pharisees and teachers of the law who had come^b from every village of Galilee and Judea and from Jerusalem, and power from the Lord was there for him^c to heal, ¹⁸that there were men carrying on a bed a man who was paralyzed. They tried to bring him in and place him before Jesus. ¹⁹But not finding any way to bring him in, because of the crowd, they went up on the roof and lowered him, along with the bed, through the tiles into the middle, in front of Jesus. ²⁰Seeing their faith, he said, "Man, your sins have been forgiven you." ²¹The scribes and the Pharisees began to ponder and to say, "Who is this, who speaks blasphemies? Who is able to forgive sins but God alone?" ²²Jesus, knowing their thoughts, responded and said to them, "Why do you ponder in your hearts? ²³Which is easier, to say, 'Your sins have been forgiven you,' or to say, 'Get up and walk?'" ²⁴Know that the Son of Man has authority on the earth to forgive sins!—He said to the paralyzed man, "I say to you, get up and, when you have picked up your bed, go home." ²⁵Immediately, having risen up in front of them and picked up what he was lying on, he went off to his home glorifying God. ²⁶Astonishment gripped them all, and they glorified God and were filled with fear, saying, "We have seen strange things today."

Notes

^aLit., "and."

^bD(e) has here a reading which when linked to the opening ἐγένετο, "it happened," is reminiscent in grammatical structure of Luke 3:21: αὐτοῦ διδάσκοντος συνελθεῖν κ.τ.λ. ("when he was teaching that [Pharisees and teachers of the law] came together"). The flow into the following text is achieved with ἦσαν δὲ συνελθυότες ("they had come together . . .").

^cThe attempt to read αὐτόν, "him," here as an object has produced various attempts to "correct" it to αὐτούς ("them") [A C D etc.], πάντας ("all") [K Cyril]), αὐτοὺς πάντας ("them all") [syr Pal] etc.

Form/Structure/Setting

Luke 5:17–26 is the third item in the sevenfold structure Luke adopts for 5:1–6:16 (see at 5:1–11) and the second of two closely linked healing episodes

(see at 5:12–16), which will in turn be balanced by two connected sabbath incidents in 6:1–5 and 6–11.

Luke establishes, in particular, links between 5:17–26 and 6:6–11 (cf. Theobald, *NTS* 30 [1984] 95–96). Note the following shared words and phrases: *ἄνθρωπος* (“a man”; 5:18; 6:6); *εἰς τὸ μέσον* (“into the middle”; 5:19; 6:8); *οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι* (“the scribes and Pharisees”; 5:21; 6:7); *τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς αὐτῶν* (“their thoughts”; 5:22; 6:8); *ἐπλήσθησαν* (“they were filled”; 5:26; 6:11). Also, both accounts begin with reference to Jesus’ teachings (5:17; 6:6). None of this commonality is to be found in the Markan original. Each incident pivots around a question used by Jesus in response to his opponents which poses difficult alternatives for them (5:23; 6:9).

In its present form (and already in Mark) the episode exhibits a quite complex structure which corresponds to none of the form-critical categories. Most scholars detect an original healing account in Mark 2:1–5a, 11–12 to which has been added additional material as a formulation which reflects later Christian interests (see the literature reviewed by Maisch, *Die Heilung des Gelähmten*, and his own defense of this position). Vv 1–5a, 11–12 produce a perfect miracle story form. Others would argue for the inclusion of v 5b in the original account (e.g., Schürmann, 286), sometimes in connection with the exclusion of v 11 (e.g., W. Manson, *Jesus*, 42). Some have been content to excise v 10 as a later insertion (e.g., Ceroke, *CBQ* 22 [1960] 379–82).

Absent from the discussion has been a recognition that the failure of the account to register any final response from those who questioned Jesus is a common feature in the set of controversy incidents linked together in Mark 2:1–3:6 (but see Albertz, *Streitgespräche*, 6–7). 3:6 serves this function as an overall response predicated on the growing hostility to Jesus occasioned by the series of incidents. But prior to Markan or pre-Markan editing each episode is content to present a challenge and to leave the response open.

It is perhaps best to trace the account to a pronouncement story built around v 9, to read v 10 as a Markan comment to the reader (Ceroke, *CBQ* 22 [1960] 382; Boobyer, *HTR* 47 [1954] 115–20; Cranfield, *Mark*, 96, 100), and to treat v 12b as a Markan or pre-Markan redactional addition (this is what actually spoils the form) made under the influence of the normal miracle story form. This would account for the failure of 2:10 to fit the pattern of uses of “Son of Man” on the lips of Jesus evidenced in the remainder of the Gospel (with the exception of 2:28 where the logic of the pericope encourages a similar judgment). It is possible that vv 1–4 with their circumstantial information stem from a separate healing account, but there is no compelling reason for such a separation.

Luke has considerably altered the Markan account, especially at the beginning and the end, but there is insufficient reason to postulate a second source despite some agreements between Matthew and Luke against Mark. (See Schramm, *Markus-Stoff*, 99–103, for arguments in favor of a second source and Neirynck, *ETL* 50 [1974] 215–30, for reasons for considering the Matthew/Luke agreements as redactional in the Matthean text.) The Lukan alterations do not affect the structure, with two exceptions. (i) The elaborate introduction of the Pharisees and teachers of the law in v 17 subordinates from the beginning those who come for healing. The theme is dominantly Jesus’ interaction with

his Pharisaic evaluators. (ii) Luke records a crowd response at the end (cf. Mark 2:12b), but he reformulates so that the response is more appropriate for the forgiveness/healing complex.

This is the only healing of a paralytic reported by the canonical Gospels. Matthew speaks also of the centurion's servant (Matt 8:6) as paralyzed (*παρλυτικός*) but in that case the paralysis is a symptom of the acute phase of an illness. For further discussion of Jesus' healings see at 4:38–39 and 8:26–39.

That the historical Jesus pronounced words of forgiveness has been questioned (P. Vielhauer, "Jesus und der Menschensohn: Zur Diskussion mit H. E. Tödt und E. Schweizer," in *Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament* [München: Chr. Kaiser, 1965] 121–22). The Gospel tradition reports such pronouncement only in this incident and in the distinctly Lukan episode 7:36–50 (for the difficulties in the structure of that episode see there). Against this sparsity needs to be set the fact that the synoptic tradition is not generally prone to the multiplication of instances of the various activities attributed to Jesus. One or two examples normally suffice, sometimes supplemented with general or generalizing statements.

In the earliest form we have an account of a provocative action challenging the status quo, rather than a direct affirmation of Jesus' personal authority to forgive sin. Where the old way of Pharisaic orthodoxy was content to leave sinners shackled by their sin and could only leave paralytics bound to their beds, God's new action was full of possibility for release from both constraints. Neither the Christological nor the ecclesiological (i.e., baptismal forgiveness) interests of the church exercise any controlling interest over this earliest form of the account.

For Jesus to declare the forgiveness of sins is of a piece with his reputation as friend of tax collectors and sinners (Luke 7:34). The explicit declaration is, however, motivated by the presence of Pharisaic (scribal) interlocutors (cf. Luke 7:36–50). Its motivation is not to be sought in either the particular situation of the paralytic (as Caird, 94; cf. Schürmann, 282) nor in the general Jewish connection of sin and sickness (Exod 20:5; 1QapGen 20.16–29; Str-B, 1:495). Rather it renders explicit the challenge to the religious leaders of Jesus' ministry to call sinners (Luke 5:31–32 [cf. Wrede, ZNW 5 (1904) 358; Daube, *Rabbinic Judaism*, 170–75]).

The historicity of the episode has also been denied on the basis that here Jesus is portrayed as proving by miraculous sign—a procedure that the historical Jesus utterly refused to follow (Mark 8:11–12). But, as Maisch (*Die Heilung des Gelähmten*, 46) recognizes, it is only the presence of Mark 2:10a (understood as a word of Jesus) that gives a strict legitimation function to the healing. V 9 moves in the realm of challenge rather than proof: offended at the one act of Jesus, the religious leaders are asked to make what they will of another deed. There is, therefore, no good reason for denying to the episode an original setting in the ministry of Jesus. For discussion of the use of "Son of Man" by Jesus see at Luke 9:22.

Comment

This third item in the section 5:1–6:16 introduces the Pharisees and scribes who will play an important ongoing role both in this section (5:21, 30, 33;

6:2, 7) and beyond. With the heroic measures undertaken by the friends to bring the paralytic to the teacher, the theme of individual response to Jesus is continued. The forgiveness of sins implicit in the call of Peter (5:8, 10 and cf. v 32) here comes into specific focus, and does so as a function of the authority on earth of the Son of Man, which in turn sets the background for the mission statement of 5:32.

17 For the structuring role of the ἐγένετο, "it happened," see at 5:12. ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν, "in one of the days," echoes the ἐν μιᾷ τῶν πόλεων, "in one of the cities," of v 12 (see there). Luke has in mind one of the days in which great crowds gathered to hear and to be healed (v 15; as Schürmann, 280–81). Luke uses periphrastic tenses (ἦν διδάσκων ["was teaching"], ἦσαν καθήμενοι ["were seated"], ἦσαν ἐληλυθότες ["had come"]) to set the background for the action of the story (cf. at 4:31). The location of the event in Capernaum (Mark 2:1) is omitted as well as the impression of the Markan text that Capernaum was in some sense Jesus' home: a return to Capernaum would be confusing after the resolve of Luke 4:42–44, and the Son of Man has nowhere to lay his head (9:58). That Jesus is teaching indoors is left to be inferred from the unfolding narrative (esp. v 19). καθήμενοι, "seated," is brought forward from Mark 2:6 where the verb choice is more natural. Where Mark spoke of scribes (γραμματεῖς) seated, Luke introduces Jesus' interlocutors as Pharisees and teachers of the law (Φαρισαῖοι καὶ νομοδιδάσκαλοι) and introduces them right at the beginning of the pericope. νομοδιδάσκαλος is Lukan (cf. Acts 5:34; the usage in 1 Tim 1:7 is somewhat different) and appears to be Luke's descriptive definition of the more technical γραμματεὺς, "scribe," which he allows to stand in v 21 (cf. 5:30; 6:7; 9:22, etc.). Later, Luke also uses νομικός, "lawyer," as an alternative designation (7:30; 10:25; 11:45, 46, 52, 53; 14:3).

Luke treats the Pharisees and scribes as those who, in the view of his readers, will evaluate Jesus most strictly and subject him to the most searching scrutiny (cf. Acts 26:5). Pharisaism is the potential alternative to Christianity. Luke recognizes a certain affinity between Jesus and the Pharisees (thus the invitation to dinner [7:36; 14:1]) and Christianity and Pharisaism (Acts 25:6–9; 26:4–8 and cf. 5:34–39). At the same time he includes in his work strong criticism of the Pharisees (Luke 7:30; 11:39–44; 12:1; 16:14 and cf. Acts 15:5). In the past an unduly negative portrait of the Pharisees of the NT period has been produced by an almost exclusive concentration on the criticisms found in the synoptic record. At best this produces a caricature, at worst it produces anti-Semitism and serious misunderstanding of the NT criticisms themselves, which in many cases gain their proper force only when it is recognized that they are directed at what was probably the most highly respected group in Jewish society. On the Pharisees see Meier and Weiss, *TDNT* 9:11–48; J. Neusner, *From Politics to Piety: The Emergence of Pharisaic Judaism* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1973); J. Bowker, *Jesus and the Pharisees* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1973); U. Luz, "Jesus und die Pharisäer," *Judaica* 38 (1982) 229–46.

The teachers of the law (= scribes = lawyers) were the antecedents to the later Jewish rabbis, and those of Pharisaic persuasion (cf. Luke 5:30; the majority were of Pharisaic persuasion) constituted a leadership group within the Pharisaic movement. The teachers of the law had a significant place in the political power structure of Judea (note their involvement alongside the chief priests

in the events of the final days in Jerusalem [19:47; 20:1, 19; 22:2, 66; 23:10]). The teachers of the law functioned both as scholars of the law and teachers, and also had a role in the administration of justice. See further Schürer, *Jewish People*, ed. Vermes, Millar, and Black, 2:322-36.

The presence, according to Luke, of Pharisees and teachers of the law from every village of Galilee and Judea and from Jerusalem is hardly to be taken literally. It is part of Lukan schematization: Jesus' encounter is with the whole of Pharisaism, just as John's answer (3:10) was to all Israel. The Pharisaic scrutiny is a response to the spreading report about Jesus (5:15).

The reference to "power" (*δύναμις*) links back to 4:14 and prepares for the coming references to tangible power proceeding from Jesus (6:19; 8:44): the power that flows out of Jesus and brings healing is the power of God himself. An intermittent presence of this power with Jesus (as Klostermann, *Markus*, 27; Bundy, *Jesus*, 141) is hardly likely to be Luke's point. It is more likely that Luke is continuing to clarify what it means for Jesus to have become through the descent of the Spirit the repository of the power of God (3:22; 4:1, 14, 18-19; 6:19; 8:44). If anything varies, it will be the use to which the power of God is to be put. The juxtaposition of "to hear" and "to be healed" in v 15 has its correlate in the mention of teaching and being ready to heal which forms a bracket in v 17 around the introduction of the Pharisees and teachers of the law. *ἦν εἰς*, "was for," must be read as part of a pregnant construction (cf. BAGD, 230): "The power of the Lord was there for him to heal [with]."

18 *καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες* (lit., "and behold men") is Lukan (see at 5:12), and replaces Mark's *ἔρχονται* ("they come"; cf. Mark 1:29, 45; 5:1; etc.) with its unspecified subject. *φέροντες*, "carrying," is Markan but the remainder of the verse is completely recast by Luke: the clarifying *ἐπὶ κλίνης*, "on a bed," compensates for the loss of the "four" (here Luke agrees with Matthew); Mark's *πρὸς αὐτόν*, "to him," is too simple for what actually transpired, so Luke expands it into the whole second half of the verse; the four helpers are awkwardly introduced by Mark; Luke uniformly prefers the verbal form *παραλελυμένος*, "having been paralyzed" (cf. Luke 5:24; Acts 8:7; 9:33), to Mark's *παραλυτικός*, "paralytic." The imperfect *ἐξήτουν*, "they-were trying," points to the failure of their efforts.

19 Lukan recasting continues in v 19. Only *διὰ τὸν ὄχλον*, "because of the crowd," remains from Mark's wording. As in v 18 the reference to Jesus is delayed to a final climactic position. Luke introduces *εὕρισκεν*, "to find," into Markan contexts on six occasions (Schramm, *Markus-Stoff*, 102). *ἀναβάντες*, "having gone up," is a logical prerequisite for working on the roof. Luke uses different words for "roof," for "bed" (the diminutive of that used by him in v 18, but quite different from Mark's word), and for the lowering of the man. For Mark's description of the opening up of the roof, Luke contents himself with *διὰ τῶν κεράμων*, "through the tiles," and in the process has either consciously or unwittingly replaced the reinforced clay roof of a poorer Palestinian home (with Mark's *ἐξορύξαντες*, "having dug out," compare Josephus' *ἀνασκάπτων*, "digging up" [*Ant.* 14.459]) with a Hellenistic tiled roof (see A. Bertholet, *A History of Hebrew Civilization*, tr. A. K. Dallas [London: Harrap, 1926] 168-69; G. Dalman, *Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina*, vol. 7 [Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1942] 74-75, 87, 119; C. C. McCown, "Luke's Translation of

Semitic into Hellenistic Custom," *JBL* 58 [1939] 213–16). As already in v 18, the Lukan recasting focuses more attention on the paralytic himself. εἰς τὸ μέσον, "into the middle," is Lukan and represents the place of encounter with Jesus (see at 4:35). Luke brings the name Jesus forward from the following verse to emphasize this coming before Jesus.

20 Here, where we have at least in part words of Jesus, Luke stays closer to his Markan source. As usual Luke replaces Mark's historic present with εἶπεν, "he said" (Neirynck, *Minor Agreements*, 224–29). He drops τῷ παραλυτικῷ, "to the paralytic," as the addressee is obvious, especially with Luke's greater focus on the paralytic. Mark's τέκνον, "child," becomes ἄνθρωπε, "man." Luke restricts the use of τέκνον in address to father/child relationships (2:48; 15:31; 16:25 [metaphorical in this last case, but note the use of πᾶτερ, "father," in v 24]). Luke replaces Mark's aoristic present (ἀφίενται, "are forgiven") with the more forceful perfect (ἀφέωνται, "have been forgiven") and stresses the subjectivity of the experience of forgiveness with the addition of σοι ("to you"; this addition pushes the σου, "your," to a position after the noun).

"Faith" (πίστις) is used here for the first time in Luke, though the importance of the issues of belief and unbelief has already been stressed (1:20, 45). Faith, in Luke, is attributed to those who act decisively on the basis of the conviction that God's help is to be found with Jesus and gratefully receive God's action through him (7:9, 50; 8:48; 17:19; 18:42 and cf. 8:25; the usage is not quite the same in 22:32, and different again in 17:5–6; 18:8).

The importance of the forgiveness of sins has already been stressed at 1:77 and 3:3 (see *Comment*). Forgiveness has already been proleptically conferred in the baptism of John, but here the orientation to the future of that forgiveness gives way to a full experience of salvation in the present moment of encounter with Jesus. Especially in the Lukan context the words of forgiveness are a provocative act on the part of Jesus, rendering explicit the challenge to the religious leaders of his ministry to call sinners (Luke 5:31–32; see *Form/Structure/Setting* above). No doubt the verb is a theological passive (i.e., the forgiveness is by God), but that does little to reduce the scandal of Jesus' words.

21 Having already introduced Jesus' interlocutors, Luke must change Mark's introduction of the scribes at this point. Mark's periphrastic form becomes ἤρξαντο διαλογίζεσθαι, "they began to ponder." Luke deletes Mark's ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις αὐτῶν, "in their hearts," possibly to allow for interchange within the group (but note v 22b). He adds here a pleonastic λέγοντες, "saying," as often elsewhere (Neirynck, *Minor Agreements*, 246–49).

For Mark's "why" question Luke substitutes the Christologically focused question τίς ἐστὶν οὗτος ("who is this?"; cf. 7:49; 8:25; 9:9); to it he appends ὃς λαλεῖ βλασφημίας, "who speaks blasphemies," in place of Mark's separate affirmation βλασφημεῖ, "he blasphemes." The rest of the verse follows Mark closely: Luke moves ἀφεῖναι, "to forgive," for emphasis to the end of the phrase, and substitutes μόνος, "alone," for the Semitic εἷς, "one," which, however, he allows to stand at 18:19.

βλασφημία, "blasphemy," is used much more loosely in the NT than in later rabbinic discussion. What is expressed here is an objection in the strongest terms to Jesus' act of making that declaration of the forgiveness of God which in their understanding God had reserved as his own prerogative for the final

day. (For the place of forgiveness in Jewish thought see E. Sjöberg, *Gott und die Sünder im palästinischen Judentum nach dem Zeugnis der Tannaiten und der apokryphisch-pseudepigraphischen Literatur* [BWANT 79; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1938]; H. Thyen, *Studien zur Sündenvergebung im Neuen Testament und seinen alttestamentlichen und jüdischen Voraussetzungen* [FRLANT 96; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970]; R. Gradwohl, "Sünde und Vergebung im Judentum," *Concilium* 10 [1974] 563-67; Klauck, *BZ* 25 [1981] 236-41. For the possibility of God's mercy at the end cf. *b. Roš. Haš.* 16b-17a, 17b; *b. Pesah* 54b. The expectation of eschatological forgiveness is built on the prophetic hopes of the exilic period [Isa 43:25-26; 44:22; Jer 31:34; Ezek 16:63 and cf. 36:25 and Mic 7:19].) Jesus' claim to bring this eschatological forgiveness forward into the very midst of history is for them nothing short of blasphemy. (It is this same eschatological forgiveness that is later offered in Jesus' name as part of the Christian proclamation [Luke 24:47; Acts 2:38; 5:31; 10:43; 13:38; 26:18].) The statement of forgiveness is particularly blasphemous because of its implicitly eschatological scope (contrast *b. Ned.* 41a: "No-one gets up from his sick-bed until all his sins are forgiven").

22 Luke abbreviates Mark here: Mark's much-used *εὐθύς*, "immediately," is eliminated (see at 4:31); there is no special point in noting with Mark that Jesus perceives *τῷ πνεύματι αὐτοῦ*, "in his spirit"; Mark's *ὅτι* ("that") clause is reduced to *τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς αὐτῶν*, "their ponderings"; Mark's *ταῦτα*, "these things," is left to be understood from the context. Lukan touches are *δέ*, "and"/"but," for *καί*, "and," the pleonastic *ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν* (lit., "having answered he said"), and the *πρός*, "to," after a verb of speaking.

For Jesus' awareness of people's thoughts see at 4:23. To answer a question with a question is frequent in the synoptic material (Luke 6:3; 20:4, 24 cf. 13:15; 14:5 and Matt 17:25) as in rabbinic material (Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 41).

23 Luke moves the question from the realm of the particular case of this paralytic to that of general principle by dropping from his Markan source *τῷ παραλυτικῷ*, "to the paralytic," and *καὶ ἄρον τὸν κράββατὸν σου*, "and take up your bed." The form of the statement of forgiveness is conformed to the wording used by Luke in v 20.

To Jesus' question there is no easy answer. He who says "stand up and walk" calls for what can be immediately verified and so subjects himself to a searching test of authenticity (thus healing is the more difficult according to Albertz, *Streitgespräche*, 8; Schürmann, 283; Fitzmyer, 584). He, however, who declares God's eschatological forgiveness confers a much greater benefit, and does what no mere healer ever could (thus the more difficult according to Lohmeyer, *Markus*, 54; Grundmann, *Markus*, 58). Perhaps with Dibelius (*Tradition*, 66) and Schmid (*Markus*, 58) we should consider the question to have no clear answer. Each activity would presume upon the exercise of the divine authority to produce the desired effect (Ceroke, *CBQ* 22 [1960] 379). The challenge of Jesus' question is: "You are scandalized at this act of mine which is not subject to public verification. What will you make of this other which is plain for all the world to see?" Where Pharisaic orthodoxy was content to leave sinners shackled by their sin and could only leave paralytics bound to their beds, God's new action in Jesus was full of possibility of release from both constraints.

24 Apart from changes in word order, Luke follows Mark exactly from *ἵνα δὲ εἰδῆτε* (lit., “that you may know”) to *ἀφιέναι ἁμαρτίας*, “to forgive sins.” As in v 20 Luke replaces Mark’s historic present with the aorist *εἶπεν*, “he said,” and the perfect participle of the verb (*τῷ παραλελυμένῳ*: as in v 18) is used to refer to the paralyzed man. Where Mark coordinates the three imperatives *ἐγείρε*, “get up,” *ἄρον*, “lift up,” and *ὑπάγε*, “depart,” Luke uses a participle for the second (*ἄρας*) and subordinates it to the third, for which he prefers (cf. 8:48; 22:10) the verb *πορεύεσθαι*, “to go.” Both Matthew and Luke frequently transform a Markan coordinated finite verb into a participle (Neirynck, *Minor Agreements*, 207–10). As in v 19 *κλινίδιον* replaces *κράβαττος* as the word for “bed.”

As indicated in *Form/Structure/Setting* above, the first part of the verse should be read as an editorial comment to the reader and not as part of the words attributed to Jesus. Either the *ἵνα εἰδῆτε* should be treated imperatively (“know”), as is evidenced occasionally for this construction (BAGD, 378), and the clause treated parenthetically (this is likely in Mark, where something similar is undoubtedly present in 13:14 and makes best sense in 2:28 [cf. Cranfield, *Mark*, 96, 100, 118; Lane, *Mark*, 96–98, 117–20]), or the clause should be attached as a purpose clause to the following *εἶπεν*, “he said”: “So that you might know . . . he said” (Fitzmyer, 579, 585). The imperative probably fits the mood of the context better. The text assumes an identity between Jesus and the Son of Man, while the emphatic position into which Luke has moved *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, “the Son of Man,” suits a first introduction to the reader of this identity. “Son of Man” is clearly a title of dignity in Luke’s usage. There is, of course, no need to seek a tradition of a Son of Man who confers forgiveness (against Tuckett, *JSNT* 14 [1982] 62 and n. 29). The forgiveness connection is offered as a distinctly Christian contribution to the understanding of Son of Man. (For discussion of the origin of the synoptic Son of Man title see excursus on the Son of Man following 9:21–22.) The authority of the Son of Man is to be traced back originally to Dan 7:13–14.

Luke shifts *ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, “on the earth,” from its Markan position to make clear that it should be read in connection with the authority of the Son of Man and not joined to *ἁμαρτίας*, “sins.” The contrast implicit in “on the earth” may be that between God in heaven and the Son of Man on earth (as Schürmann, 284), but the context of eschatological forgiveness favors the sense: “before the eschaton, while life on the earth still goes on.”

Jesus’ healing word takes the form here of a command to behavior presupposing healing (see *Form/Structure/Setting* for 4:38–39).

25 Though the sense is close, Markan wording is scarcely visible in v 25. As often, Mark’s *εὐθύς* becomes *παραχρῆμα*, Luke’s favorite word for “immediately,” and the word is brought forward to the point where the healing first becomes visible. Mark’s later *ἐμπροσθεν πάντων*, “before all,” also comes forward to this high point and is represented by Luke as *ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν*, “before them.” For *ἠγέρθη*, “he got up,” Luke uses the synonymous verb *ἀνιστάναι* and subordinates as a participle (cf. at v 24). This time the disliked *κράβαττος*, “bed,” becomes a short clause: *ἐφ’ ὃ κατέκειτο*, “that on which he was lying.” *ἐξῆλθεν*, “he went out,” becomes *ἀπῆλθεν*, “he went off”: Luke prefers *ἀπό* (Neirynck, *Minor Agreements*, 282), and in any case *ἀπῆλθεν* suits better the *εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ*, “to his home,” which Luke adds to make explicit the full compliance

with Jesus' directive. Finally Luke makes good the lack in Mark of an appropriate gesture of response by the paralytic to his healing (cf. 17:18). For this he merely anticipates the wording of part of the general response that follows.

26 Mark's *ὥστε*, "with the result that," becomes a simple *καί*, "and" (Luke does not retain any of Mark's uses of *ὥστε*). For the change from *ἐξίστασθαι*, "to be astonished," to *ἐκστασις ἔλαβεν*, "astonishment gripped," compare 7:16 and the similar change to *ἐγένετο θάμβος*, "astonishment came upon," at 4:36 (and see *Comment*). Those who glorify God are those who recognize the action of God in Jesus (2:20; 7:16; 13:13; 17:15; 18:43; 23:47). Luke elaborates the people's reaction with *ἐπλήσθησαν φόβου* ("they were filled with fear"; cf. the similar expansion at 8:37). Fear is the natural reaction to the presence of the action of God (cf. 1:12, 65; 2:9; 7:16). The words of the crowd change from the negatively expressed *οὕτως οὐδέποτε εἶδαμεν*, "we have never seen anything like this," to the positive *εἶδαμεν παράδοξα σήμερον*, "we have seen strange things today." *παράδοξα* (lit., "things contrary to opinion or expectation") is appropriately chosen in light of v 21, while *σήμερον*, "today," echoes the "today" of fulfillment of 4:21 (cf. 19:9 and perhaps 23:43). Luke's version of the public response fits better the complex of forgiveness and healing than does that of the Markan source. As with Mark, however, we probably need to reach back behind the scribal interlocutors to the crowds (Mark 2:2; Luke 5:15 cf. v 17) for the identity of the "all" whose response is recorded. The response of the scribes and Pharisees is reserved until Mark 3:6; Luke 6:17.

Explanation

The action of this episode is set in one of the days of teaching and healing of v 15, and is to be closely linked to 5:12–16. Jesus' spreading reputation provokes Pharisaic and scribal scrutiny, and Jesus' continued ministry to crowds and individuals now takes place in the context of such scrutiny. What begins here as Pharisaic evaluation of Jesus will quickly move into Jesus' evaluation of Pharisaism (5:31, 33–34, 36–39; 6:9) in which the way of Jesus emerges as the new and better way, set over against the whole of the Pharisaic movement.

From the day when the Spirit descended upon Jesus, the power of God has been with him (3:22; 4:1, 14, 18–19; and cf. Acts 10:38) and periodically manifesting itself as tangible power flowing out of Jesus and bringing healing (6:19; 8:44).

The crowds who have come for teaching and healing make it impossible for a group of men bearing a paralytic to make it through the crowds and into the building where Jesus is. However, in tangible demonstration of faith, they act imaginatively and decisively on the basis of the conviction that God's help is to be found with Jesus: they will reach Jesus not through the crowd but from above (cf. Luke 19:3–4). They lower the man through the tiles of the roof "into the middle," the place of encounter with Jesus (cf. 4:35).

Jesus perceives their faith and declares to the paralytic that forgiveness of sins which in the Pharisaic understanding God had reserved as his own prerogative for the final day of judgment. These words of forgiveness are a provocative act on the part of Jesus, rendering explicit the challenge to the Pharisees of his ministry to call sinners (Luke 5:31–32).

Jesus' Pharisaic evaluators ask the Christologically focused question "who is this?" (cf. 7:49; 8:25; 9:9), but immediately follow this up with their own negative evaluation: "who speaks blasphemies." This man has sought to rob God of his eschatological prerogative.

Jesus knows their ponderings and asks his riddling question about which is easier: which is easier depends on whether we are dealing with a word of power or hot air. The conviction of Luke is that Jesus, the Son of Man, has authority on the earth, in the midst of history, to declare God's eschatological forgiveness. And he commends that conviction to his reader: "Know that the Son of Man. . . ."

Jesus makes his own contribution to answering the question he has posed. Of the alternatives he sets, he has already taken upon himself the one; now he proceeds to take up the other. But this time the claim involved is open to public scrutiny. Jesus' directive to behavior presupposing healing is promptly obeyed by the paralytic, who finding himself healed gives glory to God. Others too recognize the activity of God in Jesus. Indeed, everyone (but perhaps not the Pharisaic and scribal evaluators) is gripped with astonishment and filled with fear (both markers of the divine presence) and declares, "Today [echoing the today of fulfillment and salvation of 4:21 and 19:9] we have seen things contrary to our expectation [i.e., to the orthodoxy of v 21]."

The New and the Old: The Call of Levi, Eating with Sinners, and the Question of Fasting (5:27–39)

Bibliography

(i) 5:27–32

Burkitt, F. C. "Levi Son of Alphaeus." *JTS*, o.s., 28 (1926–27) 273–74. **Frickel, J.** "Die Zöllner, Vorbild der Demut und wahrer Gottesverehrung." In *Pietas*, FS B. Köting, ed. E. Dassmann and K. S. Frank. JACE 8. Münster: Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1980. 369–80. **Iersel, B. M. F. van.** "La vocation de Lévi (Mc., II, 13–17; Mt., IX, 9–13; Lc., V, 27–32): Traditions et rédactions." In *De Jésus aux évangiles*, ed. I. de la Potterie. BETL 25/2. Gembloux: Duculot, 1967. 212–32. **Jeremias, J.** "Zöllner und Sünder." *ZNW* 30 (1931) 293–300. **Klauck, H.-J.** *Allegorie und Allegorese in synoptischen Gleichnistexte*. 148–60. **Lamarche, P.** "L'appel de Levi: Marc 2, 13–17." *Christus* 23 (1967) 107–18. **Malbon, E. S.** "τῇ οἰκῇ αὐτοῦ: Mk 2:15 in Context." *NTS* 31 (1985) 282–92. **Mouson, J.** "'Non veni vocare iustos, sed peccatores' (Mt. ix, 13 = Mc, ii, 17 = Lc. v, 32)." *Collectanea mechlinsiensia*, n.s., 28 (1958) 134–39. **Pesch, R.** "Das Zöllnergastmahl (Mk 2, 15–17)." In *Mélanges bibliques*, FS B. Rigaux, ed. A. Descamps and A. de Halleux. Gembloux: Duculot, 1970. 63–87. ———. "Levi-Matthäus (Mc 2,14/Mt 9,9; 10,3)." *ZNW* 59 (1968) 40–56. **Schulz, A.** *Nachfolgen und Nachahmen: Studien über das Verhältnis der neutestamentlichen Jüngerschaft zur urchristlichen Vorbildethik*. SANT 6. Munich: Kösel, 1962. 92–116. **Zimmermann, H.** *Neutestamentliche Methodenlehre*. 90–104, 177–80.

(ii) 5:33–39

Afkinson, C. W. "The New Patch on an Old Garment (Matth. IX.16, Mark II.21, Luke V.36)." *ExpTim* (1918) 233–34. **Bartsch, H.-W.** "Review of F. G. Cremer, *Die Fastenansage Jesu Mk. 2, 20.*" *TZ* 23 (1967) 135–37. **Beckwith, R. T.** "The Feast of New Wine and the Question of Fasting." *ExpTim* 95 (1984) 334–35. **Beilner, W.** *Christus und die Pharisäer*. Vienna: Herder, 1959. 19–25. **Braumann, G.** "'An jenem Tag' Mk 2,20." *NovT* 6 (1963) 264–67. **Brooke, G.** "The Feast of New Wine and the Question of Fasting." *ExpTim* 95 (1984) 175–76. **Cremer, F. G.** *Die Fastenansage Jesu Mk 2, 20 und Parallelen in der Sicht der patristischen und scholastischen Exegese*. BBB 23. Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1965. ———. "'Die Söhne des Brautgemachs,' (Mk 2, 19 parr) in der griechischen und lateinischen Schrifterklärung." *BZ* 11 (1967) 246–53. ———. "Lukanisches Sondergut zum Fastenstreitgespräch: Lk 5,33–39 im Urteil der patristischen und scholastischen Exegese." *TTZ* 76 (1967) 129–54. **Dillistone, F. W.** "St Mark ii. 18–22: A Suggested Reinterpretation." *ExpTim* 48 (1936–37) 253–54. **Dunkerley, R.** "The Bridegroom Passage." *ExpTim* 64 (1952–53) 303–4. **Dupont, J.** "Vin vieux, vin nouveau (Luc 5,39)." *CBQ* 25 (1963) 286–304. **Ebeling, H. J.** "Die Fastenfrage (Mk 2, 18–22)." *TSK* 108 (1937–38) 387–96. **Feuillet, A.** "La controverse sur le jeûne (Mc 2, 18–20; Mt 9, 14–15; Lc 5, 33–35)." *NRT* 90 (1968) 113–36, 252–77. **Flusser, D.** "Do You Prefer New Wine?" *Immanuel* 9 (1979) 26–31. **Gnilka, J.** "'Bräutigam'—spätjüdisches Messiasprädi- kat?" *TTZ* 69 (1960) 298–301. **Good, R. S.** "Jesus, Protagonist of the Old, in Lk 5:33–39." *NovT* 25 (1983) 19–36. **Hahn, F.** "Die Bildworte vom neuen Flecken und vom jungen Wein." *EvT* 31 (1971) 357–75. **Jülicher, A.** *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1910. 2:188–202. **Kee, A.** "The Question about Fasting." *NovT* 11 (1969) 161–73. ———. "The Old Coat and the New Wine: A Parable of Repentance," *NovT* 12 (1970) 13–21. **Klauck, H.-J.** *Allegorie und Allegorese in synoptischen Gleichnistexte*. 160–174. **Kuhn, H. W.** *Ältere Sammlungen im Markusevangelium*. SUNT 8. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971. 61–72. **Mercurio, R.** "And Then They Will Fast." *Worship* 35 (1961) 150–54. **Muddiman, J. B.** "Jesus and Fasting: Mark 2, 18–22." In *Jésus aux origines de la christologie*, ed J. Dupont. BETL 40. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1975. 271–81. **Nagel, W.** "Neuer Wein in alten Schläuchen (Mt 9, 17)." *VC* 14 (1960) 1–8. **O'Hara, J.** "Christian Fasting Mk. 2, 18–22." *Scr* 19 (1967) 82–95. **Reicke, B.** "Die Fastenfrage nach Luk 5, 33–39." *TZ* (1974) 321–28. **Rice, G. E.** "Luke 5:33–6:11: Release from Cultic Tradition." *AUSS* 20 (1982) 127–32. **Rolland, P.** "Les prédécesseurs de Marc: Les sources présynoptiques de Mc, II, 18–22 et parallèles." *RB* 89 (1982) 370–405. **Roloff, J.** *Das Kerygma und der irdische Jesus: Historische Motive in den Jesus-Erzählungen der Evangelien*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970. 235–37. **Schäfer, K. T.** "... und dann werden sie fasten, an jenem Tage' (Mk 2,20 und Parallelen)." In *Synoptische Studien*, FS A. Wikenhauser, ed. J. Schmid and A. Vögtle. Munich: K. Zink, 1953. 124–47. **Schramm, T.** *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*. 105–11. **Steinhauser, M. G.** "Neuer Wein braucht neue Schläuche: Zur Exegese von Mk 2, 21 f. par." In *Biblische Randbemerkungen*, FS R. Schnackenburg, ed. H. Merkley and J. Lange. Würzburg, 1974. 113–23. **Syngé, F. C.** "Mark ii.21 = Matthew ix.16 = Luke v.36: The Parable of the Patch." *ExpTim* 56 (1944–45) 26–27. **Trudinger, P.** "The Word on the Generation Gap: Reflections on a Gospel Metaphor." *BTB* 5 (1975) 311–15. **Wibbing, S.** "Das Zöllnergastmahl (Mk 2, 13–17; vgl. Mt 9, 9–13, Lk 5, 27–32)." In *Streitgespräche*, ed. H. Stock, K. Wegenast, and S. Wibbing. Gütersloh: Mohr, 1968. 84–92. **Ziesler, J. A.** "The Removal of the Bridegroom: A Note on Mark ii. 18–22 and Parallels." *NTS* 19 (1972–73) 190–94.

Translation

²⁷ Afterwards he went out and saw a tax collector named Levi seated at the tollhouse, and he said to him, "Follow me." ²⁸ Leaving everything, he got up and followed

him. ²⁹ Levi put on in his house a huge banquet for Jesus,^a and there was a great crowd of tax collectors and others who were reclining at table with them. ³⁰ The Pharisees and their scribes were grumbling and saying to his disciples, "Why do you eat and drink with tax collectors and sinners?" ³¹ Jesus answered them, "Those who are healthy do not have need of a doctor, but those who are sick do. ³² I have not come to call righteous people, but rather sinners to repentance."

³³ They said to him, "The disciples of John^b fast frequently, when they offer prayers, similarly also those of the Pharisees,^c but yours eat and drink. ³⁴ Jesus said to them, "Are you able to make the wedding attendants fast, while the bridegroom is with them? ³⁵ Days will come, and when the bridegroom is taken from them, then they will fast in those days."

³⁶ He also told them a parable: "No one tears a patch out of a new garment and puts it on an old garment; otherwise, he both tears the new, and the patch from the new does not match the old. ³⁷ And no one puts new wine into old wineskins; otherwise, the new wine will burst the skins and it will pour out and the skins will be destroyed. ³⁸ Rather, new wine is to be put into new skins. ³⁹ But^d no one drinking the old desires the new. For he says: 'The old is good.'"

Notes

^aLit., "for him."

^bQuite a strong textual witness conforms the Lukan text to the $\delta\alpha\tau\iota$, "why," of Mark (8*2 A C D f^{1,13} etc.).

^cBecause of its awkwardness the phrase "similarly also those of the Pharisees" here has been accused of being a later gloss, but there is no textual support for this.

^dMarcion and quite a lot of the Western witnesses omit v 39 (D it a,b,c,d,e,ff^{2,1,r}). The opening $\kappa\alpha\iota$, "and," is uncertain, being omitted by P⁴ 8² B 700, 892, 1241.

Form/Structure/Setting

Luke 5:27–39 is the fourth and central item in the sevenfold structure of 5:1–6:16 (see at 5:1–11). It is marked off from the other items by a distinctive introduction ($\kappa\alpha\iota\ \mu\epsilon\tau\grave{\alpha}\ \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$, "and after these things"), by its evidently composite nature, and by the concentration of important words of Jesus into this unit (vv 31–32, 34–35, 36–39). For the interpretation of the larger section 5:1–6:16, this central unit must be given pride of place.

V 32 clarifies the nature of the call of Jesus (cf. 5:1–11, and note how the "following" of v 28 [with the leaving all] echoes that of v 11), and consequently what it will mean for others to share in that call (5:10 and 6:12–16). The presence of the bridegroom (v 34) is of a piece with the liberty resulting from the presence of the Son of Man (6:5). The contrast between the new and the old (5:36–38) casts its light forward onto the sabbath behavior of Jesus and his disciples (6:1–5, 6–11) and its contrast to the dictates of Pharisaic piety.

That the unit for Luke is in fact 5:27–39 can be clearly seen from his redactional work. The call of Levi and the dispute over eating with tax collectors and sinners, Luke found already as a unit in Mark (2:13–17). Luke strengthens the unity by explicitly calling Levi a tax collector in v 27 (cf. vv 29, 30). In Mark the fasting question is presented as a separate episode (2:18–22). Luke drops the introduction (v 18a) and allows the material to be read as a continua-

tion of Jesus' exchange with the Pharisees and scribes at the banquet in Levi's house. Luke further binds together the materials by repeating at v 33 the reference to eating and drinking which he has placed at v 30 and by having both relate to the behavior of the disciples. (Mark has in the first place [2:16] eating only and relates it to Jesus alone. He has in the second place [v 18] a reference to not fasting and this relates to the disciples.) The addition of *μετάνοια*, "repentance," in v 32 may prepare for the reference to John's disciples in v 33 (cf. 3:3 [Roloff, *Kerygma*, 236]). Cf. Dupont, *CBQ* 25 (1963) 299-301; Hahn, *EvT* 31 (1971) 374. The suggestion that v 36a opens up a new separation has long ago been attacked by Jülicher (*Gleichnisreden*, 2:189; the address of vv 36-39 is *πρὸς αὐτοὺς*, "to them") and has rightly been dropped.

In the present structure, the call of Levi (vv 27-28) functions as introduction and provides a rationale for the following banquet scene. The banquet introduced in v 28 provides the setting for the remainder of the episode to follow and is the occasion for questioning the behavior of the disciples of Jesus in two different respects (the second is strictly speaking a critical observation, but it functions as a question): concerning the company they keep at meals (vv 30-32); and concerning their festive eating and drinking, when in the judgment of the Pharisees (and presumably of John's disciples) frequent fasting and prayers would be a better expression of repentance (vv 33-39). The first question is addressed to the disciples (v 30) but answered by Jesus (vv 31-32), which leads naturally to the second question's being addressed directly to Jesus (v 33). The answer to the second question is more extensive (vv 34-39). It opens with a question of its own (v 34)—clearly rhetorical; it continues by alluding to a dark shadow to come (v 35); then it goes on to set the particular matter of dispute into the context of broader principles by introducing two brief parables (vv 36-38); at the end there is allusion again to the same dark shadow, now in more general terms (v 39).

The present structure is clearly a literary one, Luke's own, but based extensively on the Markan construction. The source is entirely Markan except for v 39.

Pesch (ZNW 59 [1968] 43-45) has shown the likelihood that Mark 2:13-14 (parallel Luke 5:27-28) is a Markan construction based on 1:16-20 and drawing on material (in particular the name) which originally stood in 2:15. As well as establishing the status of Levi as a disciple in preparation for the episode in vv 15-17, this introduction functions parenetically as an ideal model of response to Jesus. This function is carried over by Luke and strengthened by the addition *καταλιπὼν πάντα*, "leaving everything."

As it stands, Mark 2:15-17 is a pronouncement story (Bultmann, *History*, 18). Its original unity has, however, been severely questioned on the grounds that the double pronouncement does not closely fit the setting. Certainly the pronouncement is more general than the situation here envisaged, but nevertheless it is quite appropriate. Pesch ("Das Zöllnergastmahl," 71-80) has shown that a somewhat simplified form of vv 15-17 is the earliest form in which the content here can have existed (the parts cannot have been separately transmitted), and that such a form fits well the earliest period of the tradition. Somewhat conjecturally, he even offers an attractive proposal for an earliest first-person form of the account in which Jesus' response is a private response to the

disciples. Pesch's reconstruction can only be faulted for its omission of v 17a which leaves the final pronouncement inadequately motivated (cf. van Iersel, "La vocation de Lévi," 218).

Earlier doubts about the authenticity of Jesus' use of "I came" (ἦλθον) language (v 17b) have been adequately countered by J. Jeremias, "Die älteste Schicht der Menschensohn-Logien," *ZNW* 58 (1967) 166–67, and van Iersel, "La vocation de Lévi," 223.

Mark 2:18–22 (parallel Luke 5:33–38) is clearly quite a separate tradition from the foregoing, and contains materials of different origins. There is broad agreement that vv 21 and 22 were originally transmitted apart from their present context but do reflect authentic words of Jesus (e.g., Hahn, *EvT* 31 [1971] 357–75). Their original unity is assumed by some (as Hahn [362] on the basis of close parallelism of structure) and disputed by others (as Cremer, *Fastenansage*, 4–5; Muddiman, "Jesus and Fasting," 279). Luke has entirely recast the first of the parables to conform it to the second.

The situation is much more complex for vv 18–20, where doubt has been cast on each part of the account. The simple pronouncement-story/controversy-dialogue form is somewhat burdened with the development in v 20 (and probably v 19b), which seems to move beyond the scope suggested by the requirements of the setting and the form.

V 20 is most successfully defended as an original part of the pericope by those who treat the episode in its earliest form as reporting an exchange between Jesus and the disciples of John in the setting of either John's imprisonment or more likely his death (see Feuillet, *NRT* 90 [1968] 135–36, and others cited there; an original exchange between Jesus and the disciples of John is widely accepted). John's disciples want to know why the disciples of Jesus do not fast with them in the time of crisis induced by the loss of John. A twofold answer is given: despite the tragedy of John's arrest (execution), (i) the mood of the present for those who recognize in the ministry of Jesus the inbreaking of the kingdom of God can only continue to be appropriate celebration, and (ii) in fact the real crisis with respect to the coming of the kingdom of God is yet to come.

There is every reason to think that the fate of John would have been seen by Jesus in the light of the close parallel he saw between the response to John's ministry and to his own (Luke 7:31–35). Certainly Mark saw the fate of Jesus as prefigured in that of John (Mark 1:14; 9:11–13), and he may in this reflect Jesus' own viewpoint.

If this connection with John's imprisonment and death is not accepted, then v 20 may indeed be a secondary expansion, though hardly, as is the common assumption, to justify the later church's fasting practice. The immediately following parables (Mark 2:21 and 22) show that the early church was not at all prepared to admit that the time of salvation had receded into the past. And while there is definitely a synoptic Gospel theme of the time of the absence of the Lord (Luke 9:48; 12:35–40, 42–48; 19:12–14; etc.), it is nowhere regarded as a departure to be mourned. Sadness is connected only with the period from Good Friday to Easter Sunday (Luke 24:17; John 16:20; 20:11; Mark 16:20; *Gos. Pet.* 7.27). So, strictly speaking, no postresurrection fast can be justified from the text. Cremer (*Fastenansage*) has shown that, in fact, the

church of the early centuries did not seek to justify its fasting practice on the basis of this text.

Mark 2:19b is probably to be judged as a Markan repetition for emphasis, not designed to contribute any additional content (cf. Schläfer [“. . . und dann werden sie fasten,” 140], who observes a repetitive Markan style in 3:7–8, 14–16; 4:30; 5:3–4, 15; 8:22; 12:14, 44; note the omission of Mark 2:19b by both Matthew and Luke).

Luke 5:39 reflects proverbial wisdom (cf. Sir 9:10; *m.* 'Abot 4:20; *b. Ber.* 51a; and for classical examples see Wettstein, *Novum Testamentum* 1:689–90). Jesus' application of this proverb in a context now lost to us (but apparently known to Luke, since while one can imagine the transition with loss of context of either enigmatic or “obvious” words of Jesus, such a common proverb as a word of Jesus could not be transmitted without context) stands behind Luke's introduction of the proverb into the present context. (There is no reason other than methodological skepticism for denying a use of this proverb to Jesus.)

Comment

This fourth and central item in 5:1–6:16 offers important interpretive keys for the larger unit. The major emphasis is on the new state of affairs inaugurated by the coming of Jesus. It is a time of joyful celebration in which the pardoning hand of God reaches out to restore sinners. The new thing that God is doing is not to be treated as only a patch for the old, nor constrained within the limits of the old. As the new eschatological movement of God it must be allowed its own integrity.

27 Luke concentrates the Markan interest in Jesus by the seaside into the one episode 5:1–11 and thus deletes Mark's *πάλιν παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν*, “again by the sea.” Luke marks episodic separation from what precedes by “after these things” (as at 10:1; see also 17:8 and 18:4; Luke is the only synoptist to use this construction). Mark's *καὶ πᾶς ὁ ὄχλος ἤρχετο πρὸς αὐτόν καὶ ἐδίδασκεν αὐτούς*, “and all the crowd were coming to him, and he taught them,” seemed unnecessary: Luke has recently provided a generalizing statement about Jesus' teaching (5:15). *καὶ παράγων*, “and going along,” no longer has a role after Luke's earlier deletions. Luke uses the more formal verb *εθεάσατο* for Mark's simple *εἶδεν*, “he saw.” Levi is introduced in a more Lukan manner (see esp. 1:5; 10:38; 16:20; 23:50; 24:18 and cf. 19:2) in which the inclusion of Mark's *τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου*, “son of Alphaeus,” would be clumsy. The specific mention of the trade anticipates v 29. Mark's *λέγει*, “he says,” becomes Luke's usual *εἶπεν*, “he said.” Because Luke does not use Mark 1:16–20, we meet here for the first time Jesus' call to follow him. It is a call to do what Peter has in fact done (5:11). The same radical call to follow is heard again in 9:59 and 18:22, and in the context of the way of the cross in 9:23. Cf. also with different language 14:26–27. The “following” here is not distinctly that which involved participation in Jesus' task of “catching people” (but it is potentially so until 6:12–16). It is rather the general call to discipleship, but not at all the less radical for that! See further on Luke's use of “following” at 5:11; 9:23 and 49. There is nothing to indicate that Luke is aware of the Matthean tradition that the tax collector is to be one of the Twelve (Matt 9:9 cf. 10:3).

28 Luke's addition of *καταλιπὼν πάντα*, "leaving everything," echoes 5:11 (and cf. 14:33; 18:28). The stylistic difficulty created by its emphatic position ("leaving . . . getting up" does not make a good sequence) marks the Lukan text here as secondary (cf. Schürmann, 288 n. 7). As an ideal model of response to Jesus, Levi's action illustrates the nature of Jesus' call to repentance (5:32). Luke uses the imperfect tense *ἠκολούθει* for Levi's following (Mark has the aorist) probably to indicate that what comes next is an expression of Levi's following (not, as Schürmann [289] suggests, to explain on the basis of a yet imperfect following Levi's continued possession of the wherewithal to host a banquet).

29 Mark's *καὶ γίνεται*, "and it happens," is deleted: the historic present is not acceptable, and an aorist here would disrupt Luke's schematic use of *καὶ ἐγένετο* to introduce the units of 5:1–6:16 and would separate what Luke is at pains here to unite. From the large number at the meal Luke concludes that it was a large banquet and says so in language reminiscent of 14:13 and reflecting LXX idiom. Banquets are a traditional expression of joy. Levi here rejoices publicly over what Jesus has brought into his life (cf. 15:6, 9, 22–24; 19:6). Luke clarifies the ambiguity of Mark's text over whether Levi was in Jesus' house or vice versa. Luke maintains continuity with his earlier mentions of crowds around Jesus (4:42; 5:1, 3, 15, 19) by speaking of an *ὄχλος πολὺς*, "great crowd." The crowd consists of *τελωνῶν καὶ ἄλλων*, "tax collectors and others," rather than Mark's "tax collectors and sinners," since the *ἄλλων* must now include Jesus' disciples, who will not be separately introduced by Luke (Lamarche's [*Christus* 23 (1976) 115 n. 10] explanation that they are no longer sinners since they have accepted the call of Christ is overinterpretation). Luke prefers once again a periphrastic tense for setting the scene for the action to follow. He uses here the verb *κατακεῖσθαι*, "to recline at table," which he had passed over from Mark's text earlier in the verse. Mark's *τῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ*, "with Jesus and his disciples," becomes *μετ' αὐτῶν*, "with them," i.e., with Levi as the host and Jesus the guest of honor (van Iersel ["La vocation de Lévi"] has difficulty here with the Lukan text because he is misled by the Markan text). Mark rather oddly chooses this point to introduce and define his vocabulary of discipleship, but this does not suit Luke, who deletes the remainder of the verse.

30 Luke labels the coming negative reaction to this fraternization as grumbling (*ἐγόγγυζον*). A cognate verb (*διαγογγύζειν*) is used elsewhere by Luke (15:2; 19:7) to express an adverse reaction to Jesus' keeping company with sinners. Grumbling is normally the practice of those who consider that due regard has not been paid to them or who think that their (earthbound?) sense of what is fitting has been violated (Matt 20:11; John 6:41, 43, 61; 7:32; 1 Cor 10:10). Mark's *οἱ γραμματεῖς τῶν Φαρισαίων*, "the scribes of the Pharisees," is expanded to *οἱ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν*, "the Pharisees and their scribes," to identify the antagonists with those introduced in the previous pericope (5:17–26; see there). The *αὐτῶν*, "their," confirms that Luke had had in mind there Pharisaic scribes. The presence of the Pharisees is unexplained. A question after the event would be easier to account for, but the evangelists economize and consolidate. Mark's explanatory clause *ιδόντες ὅτι ἐσθίει μετὰ τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν καὶ τελωνῶν*, "seeing that he eats with sinners and tax collectors,"

is pruned away as repetitive. With verbs of saying Luke prefers *πρός* + accusative to Mark's dative construction. After *ἐγόγγυζον*, "they were grumbling," Mark's *ἔλεγον*, "they said," becomes a participle and is positioned later in the sentence. Mark's rather unusual *ὅτι* interrogative ("why") becomes the *διὰ τί* ("why") of Mark 2:18. Luke changes Mark's *ἐσθίει*, "he eats," to the second person plural and uses the standard (cf. 5:33; 7:33, 34; 10:7; 12:19, etc.) pair *ἐσθίετε καὶ πίνετε*, "you [pl.] eat and drink." The behavior of the disciples is now in question in both parts of this episode, and Luke will underline this in v 33 by reexpressing Mark's *οὐ νηστεύουσιν*, "they do not fast," as *ἐσθίουσιν καὶ πίνουσιν*, "they eat and drink."

The address of a question to the disciples is distinctive (elsewhere only Matt 17:25). In Mark it represents a stage in the development toward confrontation with Jesus and total hostility to him (Mark 2:1–3:6). But this cannot be the case for Luke, because in 6:2 he also has the disciples addressed by the Pharisees.

This is Luke's first use of the term *μαθητής*, "disciple," though disciples have been in evidence in his Gospel since 5:11. The term refers to those who give up everything to follow Jesus (see esp. 14:26–27, 33) and involves hearing and doing what Jesus says (6:47–48 cf. v 20). From the circle of disciples the apostles are chosen (6:13), and for the most part it is the Twelve who represent discipleship, though the term is much broader (19:37).

On tax collectors see at 3:12–13. On the social stigma attached to the position see Str-B, 1:378–79, 498. The shared definite article suggests that tax collectors and sinners should be seen as a single class. "Sinner" here is used more severely than simply to denote those not committed to Pharisaic standards of ritual purity. The term should be understood sociologically as identifying those publicly known to be unsavory types who lived beyond the edge of respectable society (see Jeremias, *ZNW* 30 [1931] 293–300; Mouson, *Collectanea mechlinsiensia* 43 [1958] 134–39). Pharisaism had strong separatist tendencies, and because of the prominence in Pharisaic piety of food and ritual cleanliness rules, Pharisees would only accept hospitality from one another. By analogy with the avoiding of communicable ritual uncleanness, the Pharisees considered it necessary also to avoid contamination from contact with the morally suspect elements of Jewish society (and Gentiles).

31 Mark's *ἀκούσας*, "having heard," is deleted: the Lukan Jesus knows anyway (cf. v 22). *λέγει*, "he says," becomes *ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν πρὸς* (lit., "having answered he said to") in accord with Lukan taste (cf. v 22). Mark's *ισχύοντες* (lit., "strong") gives way to *ὕγιαίνοντες*, "in good health."

Jesus does not dispute the Pharisaic evaluation of his table company. But where Pharisaic interest because of its separatism stopped short at assessment, Jesus' concern moves on to treatment. To appreciate the behavior of those under Jesus' sway involves seeing sinners as needy and able to be helped, rather than as contaminating and deserving to be spurned. There is a distinctly eschatological ring to the possibility Jesus holds out of the renovation of sinners (see at 5:21).

32 Luke replaces Mark's aorist *ἦλθον*, "I came," with the perfect *ἐλήλυθα*, "I have come," probably because he sees a permanently changed state of affairs introduced by Jesus and carried on into the life of the church. He also adds at the end of the verse *εἰς μεάνοιαν*, "to repentance": Luke assures his reader

that Jesus with his magnanimity in no way condones sin. The addition also facilitates the application of the medical similitude of v 31 to this verse. Jesus' sentiment is: "Where the need, there the deed." Jesus' ministry is a ministry of restoration. To ask whether there are, or who are, the righteous whom Jesus does not call to repentance misses the thrust (as it does in 15:7). The contrast is determined by the imagery of v 31.

While it would be attractive to consider Jesus' call as an invitation to the great eschatological banquet of God (so H. Schürmann, *Worte des Herrn: Jesu Botschaft vom Königtum Gottes* [Freiburg: Herder, 1961] 38: Jesus as host; Pesch, "Das Zöllnergastmahl," 79–80: Jesus as messenger), at least for the Lukan text with its "call to repentance" only a more general sense for "call" may be claimed.

33 Luke deletes Mark's fresh setting for what follows: he would have it read as a continuation of the conversation with the Pharisees and their scribes, and so begins simply *οἱ δέ*, "they" (here denoting change of speakers in a conversation). This allows the banquet setting to exemplify the eating and drinking of Jesus' disciples (*οἱ δέ σοι ἐσθίουσιν καὶ πίνουσιν*) which is set over against pious fasting practices. Mark's *λέγουσιν*, "they say," becomes Luke's preferred *εἶπαν πρὸς*, "they said to." Luke makes the Markan question into a critical observation. He economizes by omitting the second and third of Mark's uses of the word "disciples" (*μαθηταί*). He avoids any too-close identification of the practices of John's disciples and those of the Pharisees by delaying the mention of the latter to an appended *ὁμοίως* ("similarly") phrase. John is for Luke a transitional figure, sometimes standing alongside (but subordinate to) Jesus (Luke 1–3 for the most part; 7:31–35), sometimes linked to a now past era (here; 3:15–17; 7:18–23, 28b; it is difficult to categorize 16:16), but even in the latter case John is one to be uniquely honored (7:28a). Curiously, Luke adds *πυκνὰ καὶ δεήσεις ποιοῦνται*, "frequently and offer prayers," to the fasting. *πυκνὰ* is intelligible as a concern not to deny entirely to Jesus' disciples a practice of fasting (cf. Acts 13:2–3, and the Lukan alteration of v 34 *ποιῆσαι νηστεύσαι* "to make to fast"). Since there can be no question of denying a practice of prayer to Jesus and his disciples (even one that stands in parallel with that practiced by the disciples of John [Luke 11:1–2]), we should probably read the *καί* as (Semitic?) parataxis (cf. BDF 442 [4]): the disciples of John fast frequently as they offer prayers; the prayers of the disciples are accompanied by the life-style of celebration. For Mark's *οὐ νηστεύουσιν*, "they do not fast," Luke says positively *ἐσθίουσιν καὶ πίνουσιν*, "they eat and drink" (see at v 30), which leads more directly into the wedding banquet imagery to follow.

The statement with its mention of Pharisees in the third person comes a little awkwardly from the Pharisaic interlocutors of Jesus. But Luke is not always attentive to such niceties (see esp. Acts 21:25 cf. chap. 15).

34 Luke substitutes *δέ*, "and/but," for Mark's *καί*, "and," brings *ὁ Ἰησοῦς*, "Jesus," to the front of the sentence, and adds a *πρὸς*, "to," after *εἶπεν*, "he said" (cf. v 33). His main alteration is, however, to shift the focus from a not being able to fast (*μὴ δύνανται . . . νηστεύειν*) to a not being able to be made to fast (*μὴ δύνασθε . . . ποιῆσαι νηστεύσαι*). Luke drops the reiteration of Mark 2:19b (see *Form/Structure/Setting* above).

υἱοὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος (lit., "sons of the wedding hall/bridal chamber") is a Semitism

and designates the bridegroom's attendants and thus those most closely identified with the bridegroom in the joy of the wedding celebration (Levi, *Wörterbuch*, 4:526–27; Str-B, 1:500–518; 2:439; *TDNT* 4:1103). It is clear that the presence of Jesus is what makes the present a time of wedding festivities and—at least with the development as we now have it in v 35—that Jesus is allegorically identified as the bridegroom (Jeremias [*TDNT* 4:1101–3] has argued that v 34 did not originally allegorically identify Jesus as bridegroom). However, despite Feuillet's labors (*NRT* 90 [1968] 132–35), it is impossible to claim “bridegroom” here as either a divine or a messianic self-designation. A more general connection to eschatological consummation via OT language of marriage (Hos 2:19–23; Isa 62:4; and cf. rabbinic examples at Str-B, 1:517–18) and joy (Isa 36:10; 61:10) is rather to be accepted (cf. Luke 4:21; 7:21–22).

35 Where Mark's *ὅταν* (“when”) clause is linked to *ἐλεύσονται δὲ ἡμέραι*, “days will come,” Luke links his to the following *τότε* (“then”) clause, by shifting the *καί*, “and,” from before the *τότε* to before the *ὅταν*: Luke's interest is in the period in which the bridegroom is removed, not (as would be possible for Mark) in a period beyond that again. He points to the crisis period of the passion (Luke 22:15–16, 18, 32, 35–38; 24:17–20), before the renewal of joy occasioned by the resurrection and Pentecost (24:32, 41, 52; Acts 2:11, etc.). The relocation of *καί* produces a rather clumsy parataxis (the *καί* itself must have a temporal or relative function), which is, nevertheless, defended as more correct by BDF 382(3). Luke conforms Mark's *ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ*, “in that day,” to the plural reference with which the verse opens, and in so doing produces a locution (*ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις*, “in those days”) which is normally linked by him to the motif of fulfillment (see at 4:2 and cf. 24:25–26). The movement from the presence of salvation to a dark shadow is also represented at Luke 2:29–32 cf. vv 34–35; 4:18–21 cf. vv 28–29; 5:36–38 cf. v 39; and 13:32. Luke's interest is in the sadness that would produce fasting, not in the activity of fasting as such. *ἀπαρθῇ*, “is taken away,” must refer to an unnatural removal, since in marriage customs of the day it was the guests who departed, not the newly married couple (Feuillet, *NRT* 90 [1968] 264–65). It is not at all certain that an allusion to Isa 53:8 is intended.

36 Luke supplies the lack of any introduction with *ἔλεγεν δὲ καὶ παραβολὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὅτι*, “he also told them a parable” (cf. 6:39). For a discussion of parables, see excursus on Parables at the end of the *Introduction*. Luke also completely recasts the Markan parable. Afkinson (*ExpTim* [1918] 233–34; and cf. Synge, *ExpTim* [1944–45] 26–27) has argued that Luke has correctly understood Mark's *ράκους ἀγνάφου* as referring to a new garment and has simply paraphrased Mark with an additional comment added about the new and the old not matching. *τὸ καινὸν τοῦ παλαιοῦ*, “the new from the old,” gives Afkinson trouble and is without evidence rejected as a gloss. What is quite possible is that Luke had difficulty getting Mark's point (especially the *ἀγνάφου*) and allowed the following parable to determine his own formulation. Luke's sentence would be better balanced if we could read *σχίσαι* intransitively: “the new is torn”; but there is no evidence for an intransitive use in the period. V 35 has been an aside. It announced, not the end of the time of happy celebration, but only its necessary interruption. Now we are taken back to the original issue at stake (celebration and not fasting), which in light of Jesus' response (v 34) and generalized beyond the question of fasting is that of how the new state

of affairs inaugurated by Jesus should be related to what has gone before. In both of the parables (vv 36 and 37–38) the focus is on what is (not) to be done with the new. And in each case the point is made that the new must be allowed to have its own integrity (cf. Hahn, *EvT* 31 [1971] 373): it is not to be reduced to a patch on the old; nor is it right to attempt to contain the new within the constraints of the old.

For Luke, this is not a rejection of any particular elements within the old. He does not see the two as fundamentally incompatible (against the whole thrust of Dupont's study, *CBQ* 25 [1963] 286–304). Luke stresses rather the continuity between Judaism and Christianity (see especially Luke 1 and 2 passim and Acts 2) and even between Pharisaism and Christianity (see at 5:17), and the Christian movement absorbs the baptism of John (now linked to Jesus) into its own practices (see at 3:6). The need for the new to be allowed to have its own integrity shows for Luke rather in the issues raised in Acts 11:2–3 and 15:1.

The apparent absurdity of such a method of repair needs to be placed in the light of v 39 to come: the high value set on the old may indeed lead to inappropriate attempts to preserve it. The Lukan parables, however, do not address themselves to what is to be done with the old in the light of the presence of the new: their attention is restricted to what is (or is not) to be done with the new.

37 Luke (like Matthew) adds a γέ to Mark's εἰ δὲ μή, "otherwise," to agree with his usage in v 36; he specifies that it is the *new* wine (νέος) that breaks the skins; he uses a more precise verb for the loss of the wine (ἐκχυθήσεται, "will be poured out"; cf. Matthew's ἐκχέεται, "is poured out"), and then is content with αὐτός, "it," for the wine. Mark's ἀπόλλυται, "it perishes," he transfers in plural form to the skins (as does Matthew) and conforms the tense to the other futures of the verse.

Skins of small animals were sewn up for wine containers (Josh 9:4, 13). When new, they could expand with the pressure created by the fermenting wine, whereas an old skin would split. It has been suggested that old skins were better for the flavor of the wine (Schäfer, ". . . und dann werden sie fasten," 134; cf. Good, *NovT* 25 [1983] 27), and would thus have been used if possible. But no definite evidence has been adduced.

No special significance should be attributed to the destruction of wine or skins any more than to the eyesore of the inappropriately patched garment of v 36. The damage done simply renders compelling, in terms of the imagery, the leading statement.

38 Luke adds the verbal adjective βλητέον ("placed"; cf. Matthew's βάλλουσιν, "they place"), which gives the statement the character of a prescription (Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden* 2:194). This is the only verbal adjective ending in -τέος to be found in the NT and is a literary touch of Luke's (BDF 65 [3]). The point is that the new wine must have room to expand.

39 This verse is distinctly Lukan and has frequently been thought to be merely a casual catchword addition to this point, taken by Luke from elsewhere in the tradition. But when Luke does link material by catchword association, he does so to contribute sense to its context (Dupont, *CBQ* 25 [1963] 294 and n. 32). The close link intended is seen from the leaving of the word "wine" to be understood from the context.

Convinced of the importance of v 39, several interpreters treat it as a Lukan radical reinterpretation of the preceding materials (Flusser, *Immanuel* 9 [1979] 26–31; Good, *NovT* [1983] 19–36), and Jesus becomes the one who preserves the old. However, it should be noted that the inappropriate behavior of vv 36 and 37–38 in each case has involved a preference for the old. Further, a negative reading of v 39 allows for the parallelism of the structural flow discerned above for vv 27–39 (See *Form/Structure/Setting*), with its double movement from celebration of the new to a coming dark shadow.

Luke has not spelled out the precise connection that he has in mind (see the range of essentially similar interpretations and those who propose them in Dupont, *CBQ* 25 [1963] 291 and notes), but perhaps the following captures the Lukan connection: “I tell you that what I bring is like new wine in one respect; but I see that you will treat it as like new wine in quite a different respect, i.e., as inferior to the old wine.”

Explanation

Luke combines into a single episode the call of Levi, the banquet at Levi’s house, and the question of fasting in the new era created by the presence of Jesus. This episode has pride of place as the centerpiece in the sevenfold structuring of 5:1–6:16. Here the nature of the call of Jesus is clarified both as a call to repentance (v 32) and as a call to share in festive celebrations (v 34); and that which comes with Jesus is made known as the “new” which cannot be reduced to being a patch repairing the “old” (v 36) and which may not be constrained within the bounds of the “old” (vv 37–38).

The episode opens with the radical call of Levi to discipleship. Levi’s call to follow Jesus provides the rationale for the banquet that he hosts in honor of Jesus, indeed as an expression of having followed. Among the crowd with Levi and Jesus at the banquet are many tax collectors. The Pharisees object to this keeping company with sinners which those under the sway of Jesus seem to have no qualms about. Pharisaic piety treated such contact analogously to contact with things or people that could communicate ritual uncleanness to them (e.g., the leper of 5:12–16): it must contaminate. The disciples are questioned, but Jesus answers for them (he has their answers, they do not of themselves). Jesus does not disagree with the Pharisaic assessment of those who live beyond the edge of respectable society: they are sinners. But he brings to bear a radically different perspective. Where Pharisaic interest stopped short at assessment, Jesus’ concern moves on to treatment: the sinners are sick and needing to be helped, not contaminating and deserving to be spurned. At the heart of Jesus’ mission is the calling of sinners to repentance.

As the banquet scene continues a second question is addressed, this time to Jesus. If Jesus calls to repentance, how is it that those who have responded to his call spend their time partying rather than fasting? John’s movement is a repentance movement, and his disciples fast frequently, as do those in Pharisaic circles. Jesus responds: you can’t make wedding attendants fast during the marriage festivities. Being with Jesus calls for joyful celebration. Jesus’ words echo OT themes of eschatological consummation.

There is, however, a dark shadow ahead. As in Luke 2:29–35; 4:18–29;

5:36–39 and 13:32 there is a movement from the presence of salvation to the impending sorrow. Jesus points to the crisis period of the passion (Luke 22:15–18, 32; 24:17–20, etc.) before the renewal of joy occasioned by the resurrection and Pentecost (Luke 24:32, 41, 52; Acts 2:11, etc.).

V 35 is logically an aside. With v 36 we return again to the issue raised by the question of fasting. In light of what has now been identified for us in v 34 as a new era of joyful celebration, the more general issue raised by the question of fasting is: what do we do with the new in relation to the old? The question is addressed by two brief parables. In each case the point is made that the new must be allowed to have its own integrity: it is not, on the one hand, to be reduced to a patch on the old; nor is it right, on the other hand, to attempt to contain the new within the constraints and limitations of the old.

Such an emphasis is for Luke no denial of the continuity between Judaism and Christianity: that is very important to him (see especially Luke 1–2). The need for the new to be allowed its own integrity shows rather in such issues as those raised in Acts 11:2–3 and 15:1.

Under the image of the new wine, there is, however, a grimmer prospect that can be illuminated. The new vintage may be full of exciting possibility, but people prefer old wine. What Jesus offers as new wine in one respect is to be, by many, passed over as *only* new wine in a quite different respect. As in vv 34–35, a dark shadow stands beside the new era of joy.

Provision for the Sabbath by the Son of Man (6:1–5)

Bibliography

Aichinger, H. "Quellenkritische Untersuchung der Perikope vom Ährenraufen am Sabbat Mk.2:23–28 par Mt.12:1–8 par Lk.6:1–5." In *Jesus in der Verkündigung der Kirche*, ed. A. Fuchs. SNTU A. 1. Freistadt: Plöchl, 1976. 110–53. **Audet, J.-P.** "Jésus et le 'Calendrier sacerdotal ancien': Autour d'une variante de Luc 6,1." *ScEcll* 10 (1958) 361–83. **Bammel, E.** "The Cambridge Pericope: The Addition to Lk 6.4 in Codex Bezae." *NTS* 32 (1986) 404–26. **Baumgarten, J.** "The Counting of the Sabbath in Ancient Sources." *VT* 16 (1966) 277–86. **Beare, F. W.** "The Sabbath Was Made for Man?" *JBL* 79 (1960) 130–36. **Benoit, P.** "Les épis arrachés (Mt 12,1–8 et par.)." In *Exégèse et théologie*. Vol. 3. Cogitatio fidei, 30. Paris: Cerf, 1968. 228–42. ———. "Les épis arrachés (Mt 12,1–8 et par.)." *SBFLA* 13 (1962–63) 76–92. **Bornhäuser, K.** "Zur Perikope vom Bruch des Sabbats (Matth. 12,1 ff; Mark. 2,23–3,6; Luk. 6,1 ff)." *NKZ* 33 (1922) 325–34. **Buchanan, G. W., and Wolfe, C.** "The 'Second-First Sabbath' (Luke 6:1)." *JBL* 97 (1978) 259–62. **Casey, M.** "Culture and Historicity: The Plucking of the Grain (Mark 2.23–28)." *NTS* 34 (1988) 1–23. **Cohen, B.** "The Rabbinical Law Presupposed by Matthew XII.1, and Luke VI.1." *HTR* 23 (1930) 91–92. **Cohn-Sherbok, D. M.** "An Analysis of Jesus' Arguments Concerning the Plucking of Grain on the Sabbath." *JSNT* 2 (1979) 31–41. **Daube, D.** "Responsibilities of Master and Disciples in the Gospels." *NTS* 19 (1972–73) 1–16, esp. 4–8. **Delebecque, É.** *Études grecques sur l'Evangile de Luc*. Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1976. 71–83. ———. "Sur un certain sabbat, en Luc,6,1." *Revue de Philologie* 48 (1974) 26–29. ———. "Les épis 'égrenés' dans les

Synoptiques." *Revue des Études Grecques* 88 (1975) 133-42. **Feuillet, A.** "L'Exousia du fils de l'homme (d'après Mc.II,10-28 et parr.)." *RSR* 42 (1954) 161-92, esp. 181-89. **Gils, F.** "Le sabbat a été fait pour l'homme et non l'homme pour le sabbat," (Mc.II,27)." *RB* 69 (1962) 506-23. **Grassi, J. A.** "The Five Loaves of the High Priest (Mt xii,1-8; Mk ii,23-28; Lk vi,1-5; I Sam xxi,1-6)." *NovT* 7 (1964-65) 119-22. **Hinz, C.** "Jesus und der Sabbat." *KD* 19 (1973) 91-108. **Hooker, M. D.** *The Son of Man in Mark*. 93-102. **Hübner, H.** *Das Gesetz in der synoptischen Tradition: Studien zur These einer progressiven Qumranisierung und Judaisierung innerhalb der synoptischen Tradition*. Witten: Luther, 1973. 113-41. **Hultgren, A. J.** "The Formation of the Sabbath Pericope in Mark 2:23-28." *JBL* 91 (1972) 38-43. **Käser, W.** "Exegetische Erwägungen zur Seligpreisung des Sabbatarbeiters Lk 6,5D." *ZTK* 65 (1968) 414-30. **Kuhn, H.-W.** *Ältere Sammlungen im Markusevangelium*. SUNT 8. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971. 72-81. **Lindemann, A.** "Der Sabbat ist um des Menschen willen geworden. . . .": Historische und theologische Erwägungen zur Traditionsgeschichte der Sabbatperikope Mk 2,23-28 parr." *WD* 15 (1979) 79-105. **Lohse, E.** "Jesu Worte über den Sabbat." In *Judentum—Urchristentum—Kirche*, FS J. Jeremias, ed. W. Eltester. BZNW 26. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1960. 79-89. **Metzger, E.** "Le sabbat 'second-premier' de Luc." *TZ* 32 (1976) 138-43. **Morgan, C. S.** "When Abiathar Was High Priest (Mark 2:26)." *JBL* 98 (1979) 409-10. **Murmeltstein, B.** "Jesu Gang durch die Saatfelder." *ΑΓΓΕΛΟΣ* 3 (1930) 111-20. **Neiryneck, F.** "Jesus and the Sabbath: Some Observations on Mark II,27." In *Jésus aux origines de la christologie*, ed. J. Dupont. BETL 40. Gembloux: Duculot, 1975. 227-70. **Neuhäusler, E.** "Jesu Stellung zum Sabbat." *BibLeb* 12 (1971) 1-16. **Pfäffisch, J. M.** "Der Herr des Sabbats." *BZ* 6 (1908) 172-78. **Rogers, A. D.** "Mark II.26." *JTS*, n.s., 2 (1951) 44. **Roloff, J.** *Das Kerygma und der irdische Jesus*. 52-62, 69-73, 80. **Sühl, A.** *Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium*. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1965. 82-87. **Troadéc, H.** "Le fils de l'homme est maître même du sabbat (Marc 2,23-26)." *BVC* 21 (1958) 73-83. **Trossen, C.** "Das Ährenpflücken der Apostel." *TGl* 6 (1914) 466-75. **Vogt, E.** "Sabbatum 'deuteróprōton' in Lc 6,1 et antiquum kalendarium sacerdotale." *Bib* 40 (1959) 102-5. **Wegenast, K.** "Das Ährenrupfen am Sabbat (Mk 2,23-28; vgl. Mt 12,1-8; Lk 6,1-5)." In *Streitgespräche*, ed. H. Stock, K. Wegenast, S. Wibling. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1968. 27-37. **Wenham, J. W.** "Mark II.26." *JTS*, n.s., 1 (1950) 156.

Translation

¹It happened on a sabbath^a that he was going through grainfields and his disciples were plucking and eating^b the heads of grain, rubbing them in their hands. ²Some of the Pharisees said, "Why do you do what is not lawful^c on the sabbath?" ³Jesus answered them, "Have you not even read what David did, when he was hungry, and those who were with him, ⁴how he went into the house of God and took and ate the presentation loaves which it is not lawful to eat, except for the priests alone, and gave them^d to those who were with him?" ⁵Then he said to them, "The Son of Man is Lord of the sabbath."

Notes

^aA qualifying δευτεροπρώτω, "second-first," is added by A C D etc., which in f¹³ 28 1344* becomes δευτέρω πρώτω, "second, first." See discussion in *Comment*.

^bThe word order from ἤσθιον, "were eating," to χερσίν, "hands," appears in various ways, probably under the impact of a scribal concern to ensure that the rubbing is understood to take place between the plucking and the eating.

^c N A C f^{1,13} etc. add ποιεῖν, "to do," conforming the text to Matt 12:2.

^d N A D f¹³ etc. add καί, "also," at this point in agreement with Mark 2:26.

Form/Structure/Setting

Luke 6:1–5 is the fifth unit in the sevenfold structure of 5:1–6:16 (see at 5:1–11). Where the first three units were introduced with ἐγένετο ("it happened") + καί ("and") + finite verb, the final three units are each introduced with ἐγένετο ("it happened") + infinitive (6:1, 6, 12 [in the Markan source only the parallel to 6:1 makes use of this idiom]). The linked healing episodes in positions two (5:12–16) and three (5:17–26) are balanced here by a linked pair of sabbath incidents (6:1–5, 6–11) in positions five and six, which Luke already found juxtaposed in his Markan source (Mark 2:23–28; 3:1–6). Luke strengthens the connection between these incidents with his addition in v 6 of ἐν ἑτέρῳ σαββάτῳ, "on another sabbath," and perhaps with the specific mention of Φαρισαῖοι, "Pharisees," in v 7 (cf. v 2). These sabbath episodes need to be viewed in the light of the central unit 5:27–39 and in particular in relation to the theme there of the new and the old.

The account has the form of a pronouncement story of the controversy dialogue kind. However, the obviously separable parts of the reply of Jesus (note Luke's omission of Mark 2:27) and the difficulties of clarifying the logic of the relationship of these parts (and of their relationship in turn to the narrative setting) have suggested to most that the present unit is not the original transmission unit.

The original unit is variously taken to have consisted of (from Mark 2) vv 23–26; vv 23–24 and 27; vv 23–26 and 28; vv 23–24 and 27–28; or v 27 alone (a good overview is provided by Neirynck, "Jesus and the Sabbath"). The arguments depend heavily on the sense attributed to the specific elements (which can be quite various) and on the currents in critical reconstruction of both the ministry of Jesus and of the beliefs and practices of the early church. No adequate interaction with the scholarship can be undertaken within the present format, but a few brief remarks must be made.

It is difficult to see how the details of v 23 would be generated in the production of a later setting for v 27 (Haenchen, *Weg*, 122; Kuhn, *Ältere Sammlungen*, 75; cf. Roloff, *Kerygma*, 55). Indeed, it is sufficiently idiosyncratic to suggest that only a historical reminiscence will adequately account for its form. Vv 25–26 have been clearly formulated for the present context (see *Comment* below) and cannot have had a separate existence, while v 27 with or without v 28 could have had a separate existence. The strongest arguments in favor of vv 23–24 and 27 as the original unit are really arguments against vv 25–26, which scholars are unwilling to attribute to Jesus either because of difficulty with its suitability as response to the situation of vv 23–24 (see *Comment*) or because their reconstruction of the historical Jesus will not allow him to express the Christological affirmation thought to be implied. These arguments are not insuperable. There is no good reason to question the scholarly consensus that v 27 is to be attributed to Jesus (despite Beare, *JBL* 79 [1960] 132). V 28 is best understood as originally an editorial comment indicating what was understood to have been implied by Jesus' words and actions (cf. Kuhn, *Ältere Sammlungen*, 75–76, and see at 5:17–26). In Luke it has become explicitly a word of Jesus.

The view adopted here, therefore, is that the original unit was vv 23-26, to which has been added a separately transmitted word of Jesus (v 27) and an editorial comment (v 28). Luke drops v 27 and reformulates v 28 as a statement of Jesus.

On the basis of Luke's reformulation, 6:5 becomes the first occurrence of *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, "the Son of Man," that Luke sets on the lips of Jesus (the use in 5:24 has been treated as an editorial comment). The Lukan uses of Son of Man are treated by Higgins, *Jesus and the Son of Man*, 76-96; Tödt, *The Son of Man*, 94-112, 133-34, 151-52; Lindars, *Jesus Son of Man*, 132-44. However, none of these studies is really satisfactory at the level of Lukan composition. Luke reproduces almost all of Mark's uses of the term (twelve from fourteen); he uses the expression eleven times in the context of additional material shared with Matthew (in eight of these cases Matthew also has the term); and there are two further instances in the context of material unique to Luke.

The term is used ten times in relation to a future coming of Jesus, six times in connection with the passion, seven times in reference to Jesus' earthly life and ministry, once in reference to future glory but not to a coming (22:69), and once in a blessing on those who suffer for the sake of the Son of Man (6:22).

Luke follows Mark in establishing a certain relationship between the terms *ὁ Χριστός*, "the Christ," and *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, "the Son of Man." While the identification of Jesus as the Christ is emphatically given in the privileged perspective of the infancy narratives (and cf. 4:41), Jesus comes forward on the story line (and also in the editorial comment 5:24) as a figure of authority and dignity under the designation "the Son of Man" (6:5, 22; 7:34). The apostolic confession of Jesus as Christ in 9:20 is treated ambivalently by Jesus (cf. at 4:41), and precipitates a quite different set of affirmations about the Son of Man (9:22, 44; 18:31-32; 22:22, 48; 24:7 and cf. 9:58 [the passion predictions]), and perhaps even a further set of affirmations (9:26; 12:8, 40; 17:22, 24, 26, 30; 18:8; 21:27, 36; cf. 22:69 [the coming of the Son of Man; for Luke, the suffering is the way to glory (24:26), which in turn is the basis for the coming (again, 19:12); the suffering Son of Man and the coming Son of Man are linked (9:22-26) on the basis that the coming Son of Man will be ashamed of those who do not confess the suffering Son of Man by following him in the way of the cross]). Meanwhile the original stream of Son of Man references continues (11:30; 12:10; 19:10). Finally, in the hour of the power of darkness (22:53), when Jesus stands as a powerless and rejected sufferer (already 22:63-64), he is questioned about being the Christ (22:67), and answers in terms of the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of God (v 68), which is understood as a claim to be the Christ (v 70 ["Son of God"; cf. 23:2 and at 3:22 and 4:41]). From this point the title "Christ" replaces "Son of Man" as the term in relation to which Jesus is described as suffering (and as being established in glory [24:26, 46; cf. Acts 3:18, etc., and the dramatic exploitation of the paradox of the suffering Christ in Luke 23:35, 39]). We are led to a suffering Christ by means of a suffering Son of Man (and probably also to a Christ of cosmic rule through a Danielic [Jewish apocalyptic?] Son of Man).

Luke's pattern would be fitted by an understanding of Son of Man as a

mysterious term of dignity with a good measure of plasticity: "The Man," perhaps "the man, divinely raised up and given authority, with whom the destiny of humankind (Israel) is bound up." Neither a simple periphrasis for "I" (cf. the editorial usage in 5:24), nor the exalted messianic Son of Man of apocalyptic Judaism (the shifts between Christ and Son of Man hardly fit this view, and cf. also 12:10) are adequate to the Lukan pattern; nor is Tödt's "the traditional agent of God's reign" (*The Son of Man*, 109), nor any appeal to promiscuity in the use of Christological titles (see at 4:18).

Further discussion on the Semitic background for ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, "the Son of Man," and its usage by the historical Jesus will be found in the excursus following 9:21–22.

Comment

The theme of the old and the new from 5:27–39 provides the perspective from which to approach 6:1–5 (and 6:6–11). The situation created by the presence of Jesus opens up new freedoms and possibilities which cannot be contained within the constraints of Pharisaic piety, and which, despite Pharisaic preference for the old, correspond to the true purpose of God for his people.

1 Once again Mark's *καί*, "and," becomes *δέ*, "and/but." Luke prefers as usual (see note at 4:31) the singular form for "sabbath" (*σαββάτω*) and drops the definite article after *ἐν*, "on": the reference is indefinite as in 6:6; 14:1. None of Mark's uses of *παρὰ πορεύεσθαι*, "to go along," are retained by Luke, who prefers here *διαπορεύεσθαι*, "to go through," cf. 13:22; 18:36; Acts 16:4. *σπορίμων*, "grainfields," loses its article in Luke. Luke simplifies and clarifies the activity of the disciples: Mark's difficult *ἤρξαντο ὁδὸν ποιεῖν*, "they began to make a way," is eliminated (as in Matthew), and the *καὶ ἔσθιον*, "and they were eating," is added (cf. Matthew), which makes specific the reason for plucking the grain and probably assures the reader that no violation of Deut 23:24–25 is involved. The addition also prepares for v 26 (cf. at 5:32). Strictly speaking the *στάχυες*, "heads," were not eaten (cf. the following addition), but the construction is to be read according to sense. The explanatory *ψάχοντες ταῖς χερσίν*, "rubbing [them] in their hands," is also added. Not only the plucking (reaping) but also the rubbing (threshing) is work proscribed by Pharisaic sabbath regulation. This is better than the suggestion of Delebecque (*Revue des Études Grecque* 88 [1975] 141) that Luke mentions the use of hands to reduce to its proper proportions the charge of harvesting on the sabbath. As in the previous section (5:27–39), while the presence of the disciples is intrinsic to the action of the pericope (5:30), the focus remains sharply on Jesus (5:27–29) and the presence of the disciples is left to be discovered incidentally. *σπόριμα* are fields sown with grain (a substantival use of the adjective "sown"). *στάχυες* are the heads or ears in which the grain grows to maturity. A C D K etc. have modifying *σαββάτω*, "sabbath," the curious *δευτεροπρώτῳ*, "second-first[?]," which in f¹³ 28 etc. has the form *δευτέρῳ πρώτῳ*, "second, first." This much-discussed variant has been explained in various ways, some of which take us into ancient calendrical matters which are beyond the scope of the present work. Perhaps best is the view that an early scribe considered, on some basis or other, that the second sabbath of the first month (the time of the first ripening barley) was the correct date for this episode (*δευτέρῳ πρώτῳ*). The use of *πρώτῳ* for the first

month would reflect Semitic idiom (cf. Baumgarten, *VT* 16 [1966] 283-84) as do other Western readings in Luke. The unintelligibility of this idiom produced in turn the more frequent *δευτεροπρώτω*.

2 As in v 1, *καί* becomes *δέ*. *τινές*, "certain ones," is added before "the Pharisees": Mark tends to treat the Pharisees as a fixed group; Luke is more ready to differentiate. Mark's imperfect *ἔλεγον*, "they were saying," becomes the aorist *εἶπαν*, "they said," as often (Neirynck, *Minor Agreements*, 229-35). *αὐτῷ*, "to him," is omitted and the following verb is changed to the second person plural (*ποιεῖτε*, "you do"): the question is now addressed to the disciples as in 5:30 (contrast 5:33). Jesus' taking responsibility for the behavior of the disciples is made that much more dramatic. Luke drops Mark's emphatic *ἰδε* (lit., "behold"): he never uses the word. By moving *τοῖς σάββασιν*, "on the sabbath," later in the sentence he makes clear that the problem is not with the action itself but rather with the fact that the action is performed on the sabbath (as in Matthew).

Sabbath rest even in the harvest period, enjoined by Exod 34:21, was safeguarded to an extremity in rabbinic thought by identifying as proscribed work (reaping) the plucking by hand of a few ears of grain (*m. Šabb.* 7:2; *j. Šabb.* 7.9b; Str-B, 1:617). Also, elaborate rules were developed for avoiding food preparation on the sabbath (see, e.g., *Jub.* 2.29; 50.3). It is likely that neither Jesus nor the early church agreed with the Pharisaic reading of the legal situation, but the matter is not pursued here in terms of scriptural interpretation.

3 *λέγει αὐτοῖς*, "he says to them," becomes in Lukan style *ἀποκριθεὶς πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπεν* (lit., "having answered, he said to them") as in 5:21 and 31. Since the disciples have been addressed, Luke needs to reintroduce Jesus at this point, so he adds, *ὁ Ἰησοῦς*. Luke's *οὐδὲ τοῦτο*, "not even this," sharpens the suggestion of ignorance already to be found in Mark's *οὐδέποτε*, "never." Mark's relative use of the interrogative pronoun *τί* is replaced by the true relative pronoun *ὃ*, "which." Luke uses the more literary *ὁπότε* (only here in the NT) for Mark's *ὅτε*, "when." He drops Mark's more general *χρεῖαν ἔσχεν*, "he had need," and concentrates attention on the hunger that we are to understand had been the basis of the disciples' action. Luke fills out the final phrase with the participle *ὄντες*, "being," anticipating the participle of Mark 2:26.

In view is the incident reported in 1 Sam 21:1-6. The formal similarity to rabbinic argument from Scripture has been frequently noted, especially in view of the introduction and question form (cf. Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 41-46). The adequacy, however, of the argument, when judged by the formally developed rules of rabbinic exegesis, has been questioned (Cohn-Sherbok, *JSNT* 2 [1979] 31-41).

4 Mark's *πῶς* becomes *ὥς*, "how," but without change of meaning. *ἐπὶ Ἀβιαθάρ ἀρχιερέως*, "in the time of Abiathar the high priest," is dropped (as by Matthew): 1 Sam 21:1 speaks of Ahimelech not Abiathar. Luke adds *λαβὼν*, "taking," before *ἔφαγεν*, "he ate." He elsewhere avoids this kind of pleonastic expression (Luke 20:12, 15 cf. Mark 12:4, 8), except in meal settings (Luke 9:16; 22:19; 24:30, 43; Acts 27:35) where he may be influenced by eucharistic language. Luke brings forward from the end of the verse Mark's *καὶ ἔδωκεν καὶ τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ οὔσῳ*, "and he also gave to those who were with him," in the

process dropping the second *καί*, “also,” and replacing *σύν* with *μετά* (“with”; cf. v 3 [also in Matthew]): Mark’s double action corresponds with nothing in the action of v 1. *μόνους*, “alone,” is added for emphasis (cf. Matthew).

The presentation loaves (*τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως*) are the loaves set out before God week by week in the tabernacle or temple. The fresh bread was set out on the sabbath, and the old bread was to be consumed by the priests (Exod 25:30; 35:13; 39:36; 4:23; Lev 24:5–9; Num 4:7; 1 Kgs 7:48; 1 Chr 9:32; 2 Chr 4:19). Of the shrine at Nob we have no further knowledge.

A comparison between the description provided here of David’s act and 1 Sam 21:1–6 reveals that the connection between David and his associates, originally peripheral (the references to the young men in 1 Sam 21:1–6 arise from an act of deception on the part of David), has come to be of central importance, and that the role of the priest has disappeared from sight in favor of a total emphasis on the initiative and responsibility of David (Roloff, *Kerygma*, 56; cf. Sühl, *Alttestamentlichen Zitate*, 85, 86–87: Sühl notes that Mark tends to conform OT texts to what they are related to in the Gospel account; it is David’s act which is defended by later rabbinic discussion [see Str-B, 1:618–19]).

Jesus is clearly understood to be taking responsibility for the disciples’ action: “I have provided in this way food for my disciples; I have told them that it is quite all right for them to satisfy their pressing hunger here on the sabbath with grain plucked from the field.” The claim is that Jesus in doing so is behaving like David. But can we be more precise? Is it that David shows that Pharisaic interpretation of the law is not necessarily correct, and Jesus follows David in adopting a more lenient view of the law (cf. Sühl, *Alttestamentlichen Zitate*, 86)? Or is it, rather, that David, because of his special place in the purpose of God, was free from the restraints of the law, and this freedom Jesus claims for himself and his followers (cf. Grundmann, *Markus*, 70; Schürmann, 303–4)? Or is the intention Christological in another way: is it the role of David (the man after God’s heart who will do all God’s will [Acts 13:22]) as interpreter of the divine intention in the law that Jesus antitypically takes upon himself? The first alone lacks the Christological focus demanded by the changes from 1 Sam 21 and the following verse (Luke 6:5), especially in Luke with the omission of Mark 2:27. The second is controlled by a view of the Christian abrogation of the sabbath laws and hardly fits the concern of the immediately following episode with what is lawful on the sabbath (Luke 6:9) and the pervasive concern in Luke’s Gospel with the performance of the prescriptions of the law, including those for sabbath (Luke 23:56). Only the third escapes these difficulties. David, too, looked like a law-breaker when he acted according to the law’s true intention.

5 Apart from the introductory *καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς*, “and he said to them,” which uncharacteristically is allowed to stand without a change to the aorist + *πρός*, Luke omits completely the Markan verse (as does Matthew). He may have had difficulty correlating Mark’s 2:27 and 28 or in linking v 27 to the preceding. It is not the sentiment of v 27 that deters Luke: it would fit quite nicely with Luke 14:1–6. Luke also deletes the *ὥστε*, “with the result that,” and *καί*, “also,” by means of which Mark, in the one case, identifies v 28 as a

deduction from the action of Jesus in vv 23-27 (Luke treats the text more simply as an independent statement by Jesus), and in the other case, sets v 28 in parallel with the earlier affirmation of the authority of the Son of Man in 2:10 (Luke has many more Son of Man statements, and sees no need to form a special link between these two). In line with Luke's Christological thrust, he shifts τοῦ σαββάτου, "of the sabbath," out of the emphatic position, which now falls to ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, "the Son of Man."

In line with v 4 the Lordship here will be the right to authoritatively represent the divine intention for the sabbath. Roloff (*Kerygma*, 61) is perhaps right to see an implicit criticism of the Pharisees as having made themselves lords of the sabbath (cf. Luke 6:9; 14:3). In the face of Pharisaic restriction, in this new situation the Son of Man is able to open up the full potential of the sabbath as God's gift to humankind. On "Son of Man" see *Form/Structure/Setting* above.

Explanation

The theme of the new and the old from 5:27-39 finds its first illustration in this first of the two sabbath episodes which occupy positions four and five in the sevenfold structure of 5:1-6:16. Although it is clearly unacceptable to the Pharisees with their old restrictive ways, in this new situation the Son of Man authoritatively represents, according to the divine intention, the full potential of the sabbath as God's gift to humankind.

Accompanying Jesus, the disciples feel free on the sabbath to pluck the ears of grain from a field, and having separated off the husks with a rubbing action, to satisfy the immediate demands of their hunger. A general freedom for such action is assured by Deut 23:24-25, but Pharisaic interpretation of Exod 34:21 would identify their actions as reaping (plucking) and threshing (rubbing) on the sabbath. The Pharisees challenge the disciples accordingly. But Jesus takes responsibility for the disciples' behavior and answers them.

The Pharisees seem to be ignorant of Scripture. They have not observed that David, the man after God's own heart who will do all his will (Acts 13:22), acted quite similarly. The presentation loaves, after sitting for a week before God, were to be eaten only by the priests (Lev 24:9). But David saw fit to take upon himself the responsibility for using these loaves to satisfy the hunger of both himself and those with him (in 1 Sam 21:1-6 the role of the priest in supplying the food to David is much more prominent, and the role of David's companions quite peripheral).

Just as, when David acted in this way, it is to be understood that he interpreted the true intention of the enscripturated will of God, so also it should be understood that when the Son of Man makes provision for his disciples on the sabbath, he is not violating the sabbath but as Lord of the sabbath revealing its true significance.

"Son of Man" is a rather elastic title of dignity and authority clearly used in Luke's Gospel in some special relationship to the title Christ, and by means of which the specific content of Jesus' messianic claim and destiny is gradually unfolded.

Doing Good on the Sabbath (6:6–11)

Bibliography

Dautzenberg, G. *Sein Leben bewahren: Psychē in den Herrenworten der Evangelium*. SANT 14. Munich: Kösel, 1966. 154–60. **Hübner, H.** *Das Gesetz in der synoptische Tradition*. 128–36 (see at 6:1–5). **Roloff, J.** *Das Kerygma und der irdische Jesus*. 63–66, 69–73, 80.

See also at 6:1–5.

Translation

⁶*It happened on another sabbath that he went into the synagogue and taught. There was a man there whose^a right hand was withered.* ⁷*The scribes and the Pharisees were watching him to see whether he healed on the sabbath so that they might find out how to make an accusation against him.* ⁸*He knew their thoughts, so^b he said to the man who had the withered hand, "Get up and stand in the middle." And he got up and stood there.* ⁹*Then^b Jesus said to them, "I ask you whether it is lawful on the sabbath to do good or to do evil, to save life or to destroy it?"* ¹⁰*And looking around at them all, he said to him, "Stretch out your hand." He did so, and his hand was restored.* ¹¹*They were filled with madness, and discussed with one another what they might do with Jesus.*

Notes

^aLit., "and his right hand. . . ."

^bGreek δέ.

Form/Structure/Setting

The sixth position in the sevenfold structure of 5:1–6:16 (see at 5:1–11) is occupied by 6:6–11, a second sabbath incident set in parallel with 6:1–5 (see there). The two sabbath incidents are to be read closely together. For the links in the sevenfold structure between 6:6–11 and 5:17–26 see there.

Here also, the form is broadly that of the controversy dialogue, but as Roloff has shown (*Kerygma*, 63–64; and cf. Hübner, *Gesetz*, 130; Taylor, *Mark*, 220) there are many elements that go beyond the stylized limitation of material transmitted in that form and justify our speaking here of historical reminiscence. The words of Jesus' pronouncement (Mark 3:4 = v 9: a question) will not have been transmitted apart from a narrative setting, for which a sabbath healing such as that recorded here is the obvious candidate. The place of Mark 3:6 in the oral transmission unit has been questioned on the basis that its function is literary, as the conclusion of the linked set of episodes Mark 2:1–3:6. Despite Roloff (pp. 63–64), it is probably right to separate Mark 3:6, but this is not to deny that we have here also a genuine historical reminiscence.

Luke reproduces the Markan account without extensive alteration, the most

significant changes being the deletion from Mark 3:5 of reference to the emotions of Jesus and the alteration of Mark 3:6 so that the Markan planning for Jesus' destruction is left more general and the Herodians drop from sight.

Healing on the sabbath is already reported at Luke 4:38–39 (and cf. 4:31–37 and 40–41) but only becomes an issue here where Jesus' action is deliberately provocative. Further sabbath healings are found at 13:10–17; 14:1–5. On Jesus' healing activity see at 4:38–39 and 8:26–39.

Comment

The illustration of the theme of the old and the new (5:27–39) continues here with a further instance of Jesus' action as Lord of the sabbath (6:5). As he has provided on the sabbath for the needs of his disciples, so now on the sabbath he meets the need of the man with the withered right hand.

6 To mark the structure, Luke here begins with the *ἐγένετο* ("it happened") + infinitive construction he used at 6:1 and will repeat at 6:12. The added *ἐν ἑτέρῳ σαββάτῳ*, "on another sabbath," strengthens the link with 6:1–5. *συναγωγὴν*, "synagogue," gains a definite article in accord with Luke's idiom. The added *καὶ διδάσκειν*, "and to teach," is one of the series of links between 5:17–26 and 6:6–11. Luke simplifies Mark's double participle construction *ἐξηραμμένην ἔχων* (lit., "having been dried up") with the paratactic *καὶ . . . ἦν ξηρά* ("and it was withered" [cf. Mark 3:3]), which enables *ἐκεῖ*, "there," and *ἄνθρωπος*, "a man," to change places for a more natural word order. The hand becomes the *ἡ δεξιὰ*, "the right": the hand with the more important function. This underlines the misfortune of the man and betrays a slight influence from the miracle story form. This verse and the following merely set the scene for the action to come.

7 *παρετήρουν*, "they were keeping watch," is replaced by the middle form (cf. 14:1, but contrast 20:20 and Acts 9:24). Mark's *καί*, "and," becomes a *δέ*, "and/but." For Mark's indefinite "they," Luke provides from the context *οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι*, "the scribes and the Pharisees." Left in place at 6:2, Mark's *τοῖς σάββασιν*, "on the sabbath [pl.]," here becomes the singular *ἐν τῷ σαββάτῳ*, a phrase which occurs nowhere else in Luke or Acts. Luke prefers the present for Mark's future tense after *εἰ*, "if/whether": what they are after is whether Jesus makes a practice of healing on the sabbath (note the omission of Mark's *αὐτόν*, "him," after the verb). Mark's *κατηγορήσωσιν*, "they might accuse," becomes the rather awkward *εὕρωσιν κατηγορεῖν*, "they might find to accuse." Despite the awkward lack of any object for *εὕρωσιν*, "they might find," it is best not to translate as "they might be able" either with Fitzmyer (610–11) who regards this is an Aramaism on the basis of 1QapGen 21.13; 4QEnGiants^b 1 ii 13, etc., or with BAGD, 325, where appeal is made to a fifth-century A.D. Greek text. Luke sees from his Markan source that the opponents are not concerned to lay an accusation there and then; rather, as on a fact-finding mission, they are seeking out a basis on which to accuse him. And this is what he wishes to express. The construction is analogous to the use of the infinitive after a verb of knowing (Matt 16:3; Luke 12:56). *κατηγορεῖν*, "to accuse," here refers to a legal accusation in court.

8 Here Luke prefaces his Markan source with *αὐτὸς δὲ ᾔδει τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς αὐτῶν*, "he knew their thoughts," to underline his interest in Jesus' uncanny

awareness of people's thoughts (cf. at 4:23). Mark's historic present gives way to the aorist *εἶπεν*, "he said," and the *καί* becomes a *δέ*, but here the following dative is not disturbed by Luke (contrast v 9 below). *ἀνδρί*, "man," replaces *ἀνθρώπῳ*, "man," to provide a variation from the use in v 6. The word order of *τὴν χεῖρα ἔχοντι ξηράν*, "having the dry hand," is changed so less emphasis falls on *ξηράν*, "dry" (in Mark the word is occurring for the first time). For completeness Luke adds *καὶ στῆθι*, "and stand," to help Mark's elliptical *ἔγειρε εἰς τὸ μέσον*, "get up into the middle," and *καὶ ἀναστὰς ἔστη*, "and he got up and stood [there]," to indicate compliance with the directive of Jesus.

εἰς τὸ μέσον, "into the middle," is the place of encounter with Jesus (see at 4:35), but here more prominently the place for a public confrontation between Jesus and his Pharisaic investigators. Jesus' behavior is plainly provocative.

9 Mark's *καὶ λέγει αὐτοῖς*, "and he says to them," becomes Luke's usual *εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτοὺς*, "he said to them." ὁ Ἰησοῦς, "Jesus," is introduced for clarity because the antecedent verb has the disabled man as subject. Luke adds *ἐπερωτῶ ὑμᾶς εἰ*, "I ask you whether." See *Comment* at 6:5 suggesting that the Pharisees had made themselves lords of the sabbath. Mark's *τοῖς σάββασι*, "on the sabbath [pl.]," becomes the singular *τῷ σαββάτῳ* (cf. 13:14, 15; 14:3). Luke uses *ἀγαθοποιῆσαι*, "to do good," to complete the parallel with *κακοποιῆσαι*, "to do evil." Luke conforms the opposite of *σῶσαι*, "to save," to the *ἀπολέσαι*, "to destroy," to be found in that role in Luke 9:24 (cf. Num 24:19 LXX). He deletes Mark's *οἱ δὲ ἐσιώπων*, "and they remained silent," conforming to the pattern of 5:17–26, 27–32, 33–39; an overall response is reserved for 6:11.

The first more general and the second more specific set of antitheses interpret one another: the first generalizes from the second, which taken alone and literally could only be applied to extreme cases (cf. the Pharisaic view mentioned below); the second shows that the first is to be understood within the sphere of interpersonal relationships. *ψυχὴ* here means "life," with overtones of the worth and dignity of human life. Only here is it used in this sense without a possessive or a definite article (Dautzenberg, *Sein Leben*, 154, 158–60). There may be some resonance between the use of *σῶσαι*, "to save," here and the extensive use of salvation language and the designation of Jesus as savior elsewhere in the Gospel, but *σῶσαι* is here not at all theological.

The Pharisees were in no doubt that it was lawful to save life on the sabbath (*Mek.* to Exod 31:13) and perhaps would recognize an echo of their own sentiment here, but they were unwilling to set the alternatives in the manner Jesus chooses. Rather, rabbinic thought set itself to keep to a strict minimum on the sabbath any help to another that could be in any way at all construed as work: *in extremis* only was the priority of sabbath keeping to be disturbed (Hübner, *Gesetz*, 135–36; cf. Roloff, *Kerygma*, 61). Schürmann (308) rightly finds the key to the formulation of the alternatives in Jesus' conviction that the love of God is inseparably linked to love of neighbor (10:25–37). That which honors God cannot dishonor my neighbor. That which leaves my neighbor in his suffering can only be evil. Not even on the sabbath (or perhaps especially not on the sabbath) can there be a comfortable neutrality that is content to define one's responsibilities negatively in terms of what is not to be done.

10 Luke adds *πάντας*, "all," before *αὐτοὺς*, "them": Jesus' words and his healing deed (which by its own evident goodness [cf. at 11:14–23] dramatically underlines the point of Jesus' statement) invite engagement by all, not simply

the Pharisaic critics. Luke omits reference to Jesus' emotion (anger, grief): it presupposes a fixed attitude on the part of the Pharisees for which Luke is not yet ready. λέγει becomes εἶπεν as in v 8. Mark's τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, "to the man," is reduced to an αὐτῷ, "to him." χεῖρα, "hand," gains a possessive, σου, "your." Luke has in v 8 taken pains to spell out the obedient response of the man; here where Mark does so, Luke is content with the generic description, ὁ δὲ ἐποίησεν, "and he did [so]."

The healing here is by means of a directive to behavior presupposing healing.

11 Luke completely reformulates here. He brings to the fore the degree to which the Pharisees and scribes were upset by Jesus' action, but tones down any suggestion that fixed plans for Jesus' destruction are now already set in place. Luke sees no point in mentioning here the otherwise unknown Herodians.

Explanation

This second sabbath incident comes in the next-to-last position of the seven-fold structure of 5:1–6:16, and is to be read closely with the first such incident. Jesus as Lord of the sabbath has provided on the sabbath for the needs of his disciples; now on the sabbath he meets the needs of the man with the withered right hand. The Pharisees with their old restrictive ways are scandalized.

The incident of 6:1–5 has made it clear that Jesus' sabbath behavior invited scrutiny if one were to seek a basis for laying an accusation against him that he was a law-breaker. Jesus was known to be a healer (5:17–26), and to heal on the sabbath, except *in extremis*, would be a clear violation of the Pharisaic understanding of sabbath rest. The Pharisees lie in wait, but Jesus provokes a public confrontation: he sets the disabled man in the middle and questions his Pharisaic investigators about fitting sabbath behavior. The saving-of-life pole, from the second of the antitheses proposed by Jesus, echoes the Pharisaic rule that the saving of life overrides the requirement to keep sabbath. But for Jesus the two sets of antitheses interpret each other, and so he is not interested in only the extreme situation. Jesus' approach to sabbath keeping is governed by the conviction that love of God is inseparably linked to love of neighbor (Luke 10:25–37). Therefore, that which dishonors my neighbor cannot honor God, and that which leaves my neighbor in his suffering can only be evil.

The Pharisees, who in their fixed and restrictive ways are determined that the sabbath be defined negatively in terms of what is not to be done, cannot see this, and are made furious by Jesus' liberality.

The Call of the Twelve Apostles (6:12–16)

Bibliography

Agnew, F. H. "The Origin of the NT Apostle-Concept: A Review of Research." *JBL* 105 (1986) 75–96. Arbeitman, Y. "The Suffix of Iscariot." *JBL* 99 (1980) 122–24. Barrett, C. K. *The Signs of an Apostle: The Cato Lecture 1969*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972.

- . "The Apostles in and after the New Testament." *SEÅ* 21 (1956) 30–49.
- . "Shaliah and Apostle." *Donum Gentilicium*. FS D. Daube, ed. E. Bammel et al. Oxford: Clarendon, 1978. 88–102. **Becq, J.** "Il en choisit douze." *BTS* 5 (1965) 18–19. **Bläser, P.** "Zum Problem des urchristlichen Apostelats." In *Unio Christianorum*, FS L. Jaeger, ed. O. Schilling and H. Zimmermann. Paderborn: Bonifacius, 1962. 92–107. **Blinzler, J.** "Simon der Apostel, Simon der Herrenbruder und Bischof Symeon von Jerusalem." In *Passauer Studien*, FS S. K. Landersdorfer. Passau: Passavia, 1953. 25–55. **Campenhause, H. von.** *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries*. Tr. J. A. Baker. London: A. C. Black, 1969. 12–29. ———. "Der urchristliche Apostelbegriff." *ST* 1 (1947) 96–130. **Cerfaux, L.** "La mission de Galilée dans la tradition synoptique." *Recueil L. Cerfaux*. Vol. 1. BETL 6. Gembloux: Duculot, 1954. 425–69, esp. 438–48, 457–58, 465–68. ———. "L'Unité du corps apostolique dans le Nouveau Testament." In *L'Église et les églises*, FS L. Beauduin. Chevetogne: Abbey, 1954. 99–110. ———. "Pour l'histoire du titre *apostolos* dans le Nouveau Testament." *Recueil L. Cerfaux*. Vol. 3. BETL 18. Gembloux: Duculot, 1962. 185–200. **Cohn, M.** "Die Stellvertretung im jüdischen Recht." *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft* 36 (1920) 124–213, 354–460. **Cullmann, O.** "Le douzième apôtre." *RHPR* 17 (1962) 133–40. **Dietrich, W.** *Petrusbild*. 83–94. **Dupont, J.** "Le nom d'apôtres a-t-il été donné aux Douze par Jésus." *OrSyr* 1 (1956) 267–90, 425–44. **Ehrman, A.** "Judas Iscariot and Abba Saqqara." *JBL* 97 (1978) 572–73. **Farmer, G.** "A Group of Four Apostles." *ExpTim* 31 (1919–20) 331. **Fitzmyer, J. A.** "Aramaic *Kepha* and Peter's Name in the New Testament." In *Text and Interpretation*, FS M. Black, ed. E. Best and R. McL. Wilson. Cambridge: University Press, 1979. 121–32. ———. "The Name Simon." *HTR* 56 (1963) 1–5. ———. "The Name Simon—A Further Discussion." *HTR* 57 (1964) 60–61. **Freyne, S.** *The Twelve: Disciples and Apostles*. London: Sheed and Ward, 1968. **Fridrichsen, A.** *The Apostle and His Message*. UUA 3. Uppsala: Lundequistska, 1947. **Gavin, F. G.** "Shaliach and Apostolos." *ATR* 9 (1926–27) 250–59. **Gerhardsson, B.** "Die Boten Gottes und die Apostel Christi." *SEÅ* 27 (1962) 89–131. **Giblet, J.** "Les Douze: Histoire et théologie." *Aux origines de l'église*. RechBib 7. Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1964. 51–64. **Halas, R. B.** *Judas Iscariot, a Scriptural and Theological Study of His Person, His Deeds, and His Eternal Lot*. Washington: Catholic University of America, 1946. 10–23. **Ingholt, H.** "The Surname of Judas Iscariot." *Studia Orientalia Ioanni Pedersen*. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1953. 152–62. **Kasting, H.** *Die Anfänge der urchristlichen Mission: Eine historische Untersuchung*. BEvT 55. Munich: Kaiser, 1969. 61–81. **Klein, G.** *Die zwölf Apostel: Ursprung und Gestalt einer Idee*. FRLANT 77. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961. **Kredel, E. M.** "Der Apostelbegriff in der neueren Exegese: Historisch-kritische Darstellung." *ZKT* 78 (1956) 169–93, 257–305. **Lake, K.** "The Twelve and the Apostles." In *Beginnings*, ed. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake. 5:37–59. ———. "Simon Zelotes." *HTR* 10 (1917) 57–63. **Lindars, B.** "Matthew, Levi, Lebbaeus, and the Value of the Western Text." *NTS* 4 (1957–58) 220–22. **Lohfink, G.** *Die Sammlung Israels*. 63–67, 72. **Lohse, E.** "Ursprung und Prägung des christlichen Apostolates." *TZ* 9 (1953) 259–75. **Mosbech, H.** "Apostolos in the New Testament." *ST* 2 (1948) 166–200. **Munck, J.** "Paul, the Apostles, and the Twelve." *ST* 3 (1949) 96–110. **Rigaux, B.** "Die 'Zwölf' in Geschichte und Kerygma." In *Der historische Jesus und der kerygmatische Christus: Beiträge zum Christusverständnis in Forschung und Verkündigung*, ed. H. Ristow and K. Matthiae. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1960. 468–86. ———. "The Twelve Apostles." *Concilium* 4/4 (1968) 4–9. **Roloff, J.** *Apostolat—Verkündigung—Kirche: Ursprung, Inhalt, und Funktion des Apostelamts nach Paulus, Lukas, und den Pastoralbriefen*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher, 1965. **Roth, C.** "The Name Simon." *HTR* 54 (1961) 91–97. ———. "The Name Simon—A Further Discussion." *HTR* 57 (1964) 60. **Schille, G.** *Die urchristliche Kollegialmission*. ATANT 48. Zürich: Zwingli, 1967. 7–18, 111–49. **Schmahl, G.** "Die Berufung der Zwölf im Markusevangelium." *TTZ* 81 (1972) 203–13. **Schmithals, W.** *The Office of Apostle in the Early Church*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1969. **Schnackenburg, R.** "Apostles before and during Paul's Time." In *Apostolic History and the Gospel*, FS F. F.

Bruce, ed. W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970. 287–303. **Schürmann, H.** “Der Jüngerkreis Jesu als Zeichen für Israel.” *Ursprung und Gestalt*. 45–60. (In abbreviated form, an ET may be found in *TD* 15 [1967] 138–43.) **Torrey, C. C.** “The Name ‘Iscariot.’” *HTR* 36 (1943) 51–62. **Trilling, W.** “Zur Entstehung des Zwölferkreises: Eine geschichtskritische Überlegung.” In *Die Kirche des Anfangs*, FS H. Schürmann, ed. R. Schnackenburg et al. Leipzig: St. Benno, 1977. 201–22. **Verheul, A.** “De moderne exegese over ἀπόστολος.” *Sacris erudiri. Jahrbok voor Godsdienstwetenschap* 1 (1948) 380–96. **Vogelstein, H.** “The Development of the Apostolate in Judaism and Its Transformation in Christianity.” *HUCA* 2 (1925) 99–123. **Wagemann, J.** *Die Stellung des Apostels Paulus neben den Zwölf in den ersten Jahrhundert*. BZNW 3. Giessen: A. Töpelmann, 1926.

Translation

¹²*It happened in those days that he went out to the mountain to pray, and he passed the whole night in prayer to God.* ¹³*When day came, he called out to his disciples and chose from them twelve whom he called apostles:*^a ¹⁴*Simon, whom he called Peter, and Andrew his brother; and James, and John, and Philip, and Bartholomew,* ¹⁵*and Matthew, and Thomas; and James son of Alphaeus, and Simon who was called a zealot, and Judas son of James, and Judas Iscariot^b who became a traitor.*

Notes

^aD “improves” the text here by distinguishing between being “called apostles” (ἐκάλεσεν) and being “named Peter” (ἐπωνόμασεν [the accepted text lacks the prefixed ἐπὶ]).

^b“Iscariot” is represented in various ways in the textual witness: Ἰσκαριώθ in P⁷⁵ B R* etc.; Ἰσκαριώτης (cf. Matt 10:4) in R^c A K etc.; Σκαριώθ in D it.

Form/Structure/Setting

With 6:12–16 we come to the end of the major section 5:1–6:16, which has been structured into seven units (see at 5:1–11). Call scenes have been part of the first, the middle (i.e., fourth), and now this final unit: in 5:1–11 Simon is both “caught” (i.e., called) and designated as one who will share in “catching men”; 5:27–39 clarifies the nature of the call of Jesus (and thereby also what it will mean for others to share in the calling activity of Jesus); 6:12–16 marks the choice of twelve (including Simon, and with him James and John who have been previously marked out for this role) from among those who have responded to the call of Jesus to have a special role in the calling of others.

Those who would treat 6:12–16 as preface to the sermon to follow (e.g., Schürmann, 310–11; Fitzmyer, 613) are unduly influenced by the Markan unit 2:1–3:6 and/or a postulated Q connection of the choice of the Twelve and the sermon, and the chronological connection (Luke 6:17). Against this is to be set (i) the symmetry of the three call episodes, and especially the links with 5:1–11; (ii) the pattern of introductory formulae (see at 5:1–11 and 6:1–5); (iii) the connecting ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις, “in those days”; and perhaps (iv) vocabulary links through the mention of prayer (6:12; 5:16 [in

6:28 it is not Jesus at prayer]) and disciples (6:13; 5:30; 6:1 [but mention of disciples continues in 6:17–49 at vv 17, 20, 40]).

This section has formal similarities to 3:21–38 with its preparation (including Jesus' prayer), commissioning, and identification by means of a list of names (admittedly, a genealogy), and it may be fair to see some reflection of Jesus' own commissioning as Son in this commissioning of the Twelve as apostles (cf. at 5:1–11; and note the verb shared by 6:13 and 9:35).

For the most part, we have a rewriting of Mark 3:13–19, but the inclusion of Judas son of James (Ἰούδαν Ἰακώβου) and the loss of Thaddaeus (Θαδδαῖος) from the list guarantee the influence of another tradition (neither name plays any further role in the Gospel), which may also account for the translation of the transliterated Καναναῖον, "Cananaean," as ζηλωτήν, "zealot." Whether another full list of the Twelve is involved cannot be established (though the different position of Thomas in the Acts 1:13 list suggests that more than one list circulated—other changes of order can be explained redactionally). A second list could explain the use in Matt 10:2 of "the twelve apostles" (τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων), which Matthew does not elsewhere use.

It is clear from the difficulties in Mark's text created by his attempt at one and the same time to provide a list of the names of the Twelve and to report the naming by Jesus of Simon, James, and John that Mark's text has some literary basis and is not merely the formulation by Mark of an oral tradition.

Much has been made of the uncertainty in the tradition even about the names of the Twelve, to suggest that the Twelve soon became unimportant in the developing life of the church. But this is surely exaggerated: only one of the twelve names is at all in doubt! (Only the variant Λεββαῖος for Θαδδαῖος is of any further significance.) And while it may be too easy for conservatives to harmonize by identifying Thaddaeus with Judas, son of James (as does Jeremias, *Jesus als Weltvollender* [BFCT 33/4; Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1930] 71 n. 4), the form of name given in Acts 1:23 (Ἰωσήφ . . . Βαρσαββᾶν ὃς ἐπεκλήθη Ἰούστος ["Joseph . . . son of Sabba who was called Justus"]) is suggestive of the naming pattern implied by such a harmonization. It should further be noticed that the form Ἰούδαν Ἰακώβου ("Judas, son of James") creates a symmetry in the list which would have been broken by the name Θαδδαῖον ("Thaddaeus") standing alone, and this may have encouraged a switch to an alternative way of speaking of Thaddaeus.

The Twelve have also been precluded by some from the pre-Easter situation, but the role of the Twelve as traditional witnesses to the resurrection (but not sole witnesses) in 1 Cor 15:5 and the uniform identification of Judas Iscariot as one of the Twelve provide an adequate basis for confidently assigning Jesus' call of the Twelve to the period of his pre-Easter ministry (see, e.g., Trilling, "Zur Entstehung des Zwölferkreises," 208–13).

The situation with respect to the identification of the Twelve as apostles is much more complex. Despite an immense scholarly labor, no clear consensus has emerged as to the background of the Christian use of the term apostle (ἀπόστολος), the stages of its use, or the meaning of the term in these various stages.

ἀπόστολος ("apostle"; cognate with ἀποστέλλειν, "to send") is not at all a common word in pre-Christian Greek, but it does occur in various usages

that have in common the idea of being sent out. Of greatest interest for the NT usage is the occasional use of the word for "messenger" (Herodotus 1.21; 5.28; 3 Kgdms 14:6; Isa 18:2 [Sym.]). In the NT, however, the emphasis is much more on the commissioning by Christ than on being sent off somewhere, and the Greek background seems hardly adequate.

The Jewish sources come much closer with their "authorized representative" מְלִיץ, *šālīah*, (see references at Rengstorff, *TDNT* 1:414-20; Str-B, 3:2). Such an emissary was entrusted with full authority to represent the one for whom he had been commissioned to act. The evidence usually adduced for this use of מְלִיץ is all considerably later than the NT, but as has been shown by Gerhardsen, standing behind this later use is already the use in the OT of the cognate verb מָלַח, *šālah*, for the act of entrusting with a task. There is especially in the case of the divine "sending" of the prophets a close parallel with NT, especially Pauline, apostleship (*SEA* 27 [1962] 110-16).

Leaving aside for the moment the possibility that the Gospels may preserve an even earlier use of the term, our earliest documented Christian usage of the term is to be found in Paul. A major difficulty in appealing to Paul resides in the task of deciding how much of what Paul attributed to his own apostleship is to be comprehended directly under the term "apostle" and, therefore, applied more generally to others to whom he grants this title. We therefore restrict our attention here to the question, To whom and under what circumstances does Paul apply the title ἀπόστολος?

There can be little doubt from the discussion of Gal 1 and 2 that Paul places on an equal footing with himself "those who were apostles before [him]" (Gal 1:17) at least as their apostleship is summed up in that of their central figure Peter (2:7-8). Presumably those who were apostles before Paul are the same group to which the resurrected Christ appeared according to 1 Cor 15:7, where the "all" (πᾶσιν) is almost certainly broader than "the Twelve" of v 5.

It is not really possible to tell whether Apollos should be included among the apostles in 1 Cor 4:9 (cf. 1:12; 3:5-6, 22; 4:6) and what we should understand by that if he were. Whether James and the other brothers of the Lord are to be termed apostles remains doubtful (Gal 1:19; 1 Cor 9:5: in Galatians the grammar is ambiguous; in 1 Corinthians the climax from apostles to brothers to Cephas is probably determined by a desire to exclude a "higher" ascetic spirituality [note that whether apostles or not, the brothers of the Lord are on some scale set on a higher level than the other apostles, with the exception of Peter]).

Paul can somewhat generously cast the mantle of his own apostleship over his fellow workers (1 Thess 2:7; cf. 1:1), and it can be difficult to distinguish this from the attribution of a separate apostolic identity. (Where does Barnabas fit [Gal 2:19; 1 Cor 9:6]? A somewhat separate apostolic identity is most natural, but he cannot easily be identified as, in Paul's reckoning, one of those who were apostles before him [Gal 1:17; cf. 2:1].)

Apostles of the churches (2 Cor 8:23; Phil 2:25) can easily be set off in a different category, but it does seem necessary to include Andronicus and Junia (Rom 16:7; figures otherwise entirely unknown to us) as notables among the apostles. Can Paul mean to place them on an equal footing with himself?

Paul's competition in 2 Cor 11–13 (esp. 11:5, 13; 12:11, 12) for recognition as apostle over against apostles of a very different stripe who have established their influence among the Christians in Corinth is to a considerable degree conducted in terms set by his opponents and must therefore lie under suspicion of containing a considerable *ad hominem* component.

In 1 Cor 15:8–9; 9:1, and cf. Gal 1, apostolic status is connected with an encounter with the risen Christ. But if we restrict apostleship to the “all the apostles” of 1 Cor 15:7 (plus Paul from v 8), then Apollos must be excluded from the apostolic list, as well as Barnabas. Also, Andronicus and Junia can hardly be fitted in (the “who were also in Christ before me” of Rom 16:7 becomes tautologous). This leaves only Peter of those whom Paul mentions by name in connection with apostleship, which is hardly satisfactory. Without allowing a broadening of the term in Paul to the point where “apostle” is simply a word for missionary, we must conclude, therefore, that Paul reflects a somewhat wider use of “apostle” which is nevertheless closely connected with his use of the word for those whose apostleship involved a meeting with the risen Christ. (There is actually nothing in Paul to preclude a preresurrection commissioning of apostles. With his focus on the resurrection, however, Paul's interest never reaches back to such a possibility. Only in his own case does he actually speak of the apostolic commissioning as such [Gal 1].) Greater precision does not seem to be possible concerning the identity and calling of apostles in the Pauline usage.

For the Gospels and Acts, outside the Lukan writings “apostles” is not the normal way of referring to the Twelve (exceptionally Matt 10:22: “the names of the twelve apostles”; Mark 6:30: “οἱ ἀπόστολοι returned to Jesus” [where the translation “those sent out” would accurately reflect the context of the mission of the Twelve]; and cf. John 13:16: “a slave is not greater than his master, nor an ἀπόστολος than he who sent him”). By contrast, in Luke-Acts “apostles” is the favorite designation for the Twelve (Luke 6:13; 9:10; 17:5; 22:14; 24:10; and many times in Acts).

It does not seem likely that Luke connected the term etymologically with a missionary sending out by Jesus: in Luke 24 the words about the preaching to all nations (v 47) neither use the verb ἀποστέλλειν, “to send out,” nor restrict the task to the Twelve, who in the context are most recently in any case termed “the eleven” (v 33) and not “the apostles”; in Acts 1, where the specified task is more narrowly that of witness, there is a restriction to “the apostles,” who are, however, called such in a context (v 2) strongly recalling their original selection and appointment by Jesus (Luke 6:12–13), and once again the verb ἀποστέλλειν is absent; the role of Luke 5:1–11 already predisposes an understanding of apostles as those chosen by Jesus to participate with him in his own work, or (reexpressed in terms of the post-ascension context and in light of the Jewish usage discussed above) as those chosen by Jesus to be fully authorized to act on his behalf.

Against this one might possibly set Luke's preservation from Mark of a mission of the Twelve and of Mark's use of ἀπόστολοι in the context of the conclusion of this mission (Luke 9:10); Luke's introduction in 6:13 of οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν, “whom he named apostles,” at the point where Mark had ἵνα ἀποστέλλῃ αὐτοὺς κηρύσσειν, “that he might send them out to preach”;

and the reproduction in Luke 11:49 of a tradition, also found in Matthew, in which there is a juxtaposition of the verb and the noun: ἀποστέλω εἰς αὐτοὺς προφήτας καὶ ἀποστόλους, “I will send to them prophets and apostles.” The last reflects the divine authorization seen in the OT usage discussed above. And for the others, it can hardly be maintained that Luke called the Twelve “apostles” because they had been sent out on the mission of the Twelve (cf. Luke 10:1). The journeying of Luke 9:1–6 is indeed literal, but that is of no intrinsic interest to Luke; it is in their “having been sent” (that is, delegated) to act in Jesus’ stead that their mission prefigures their later role in the church (the only journeying missionaries in Acts who reflect in any way the traveling practices of Luke 9:1–6 are not among the Twelve [Acts 13:51]). Neither for Luke, then, nor for Paul is journeying the mark of the apostle, however much journeying may have in fact been caught up in the task (1 Cor 9:4).

Luke parts company with Paul in restricting apostleship to the Twelve (in Acts 13:4, 14 Luke shows that he is familiar with another usage of the word according to which both Barnabas and Paul do qualify as apostles, but he prefers a more restricted use of the term), in his concern to locate the apostleship of the Twelve not in a postresurrection commissioning (despite the importance of Luke 24:47–49 and Acts 1:8) but rather in their choice by Jesus as a distinct group (Acts 1:2; Luke 6:12–13 [Paul is not clear about this except in his own case, but certainly he has no such restriction]), and in his emphasis on the need for an apostle to have been with Jesus all through his ministry (Acts 1:22) and on the place of the apostles in witnessing to the resurrection of Jesus (Acts 1:7–8 with v 22; 10:41, etc. [Paul’s awareness of the view that apostles are expected to witness to the resurrection of Jesus is reflected in 1 Cor 9:1; 15:7–8, but this does not significantly affect his own understanding of apostleship]).

The apostles connect together in their own persons the period of the ministry of Jesus and the time of the church, and serve to guarantee the total transfer into the life of the church of the significance of the ministry of Jesus. The apostles are in this way transitional figures, as may be seen from the way in which they are allowed to drop from sight as the Acts account unfolds, once a secure base has been established for the life of the church and for its universal mission (after the Jerusalem council of Acts 15).

The Lukan frame does not limit access to Jesus and his significance to the apostles (see notably the case of Paul in Acts 9), but it is finally the apostles (though not they alone) who discern that the risen Christ (= the Jesus whose ministry they have been uniquely privileged to observe) is in the developments that occur (Acts 8:14; 15:2, etc.).

It is not likely that Luke’s restricted use of the term “apostle” is the earliest Christian usage. In the Pauline usage, Peter’s key role among those who were apostles before Paul establishes already a central place for the Twelve in the circle of apostleship. As well, the unevenness in Paul’s use of the term indicates that there was far from being one fixed technical Christian use of the term.

Despite G. Klein (*Die zwölf Apostel*) it is clear that no demotion of Paul is intended by Luke, nor a denial of his apostleship in another sense (Acts 13:4, 14). But to express from the perspective of the transition from the ministry of Jesus to the life of the church the unique significance of the Twelve, Luke

chooses to restrict his use of the word “apostle” to those whose commissioning to apostleship can be traced back into the preresurrection ministry of Jesus.

Comment

The call of the Twelve to apostleship in this final unit of the major section 5:1–6:16 has been prefigured by the call of Peter and those with him with which the section began (5:1–11). The Twelve are to be authorized to share in Jesus’ own catching of men: they too will call not the righteous but sinners to repentance (5:32).

12 Only *εἰς τὸ ὄρος*, “to the mountain,” is from Mark. As were the wilderness locations of 5:16, the mountain is here a place of retreat to be with God. The remainder of the verse is strongly Lukan. *ἐγένετο* (“it happened”) + infinitive is again a structure marker (cf. at 6:1). *ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις*, “in those days,” also functions to designate what follows as still part of the same section of Luke’s account. For no obvious reason (Dietrich [*Petrusbild*, 83–84] suspects a source remnant) Luke uses *ἐξελθεῖν* (“to go out”) for Mark’s *ἀναβαίνειν* (“to go up”; contrast Luke 9:28). Decisive events often occur in the context of Jesus’ praying (cf. 3:21; 9:18, 28–29; 11:1; 22:41). Nowhere else is such a sustained period of prayer attributed to Jesus. Acts 1:2 establishes an equivalence between prayer here and the guidance of the Spirit. The idiom *προσευχὴ τοῦ θεοῦ* (lit., “prayer of God”) is unusual. Schürmann (313 and n. 10) notes that Jesus’ behavior here becomes normative for later Christian appointments to office (Acts 1:24; 6:6; 13:2–3; 14:23).

13 *ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡμέρα*, “when it became day,” provides a transition from the prayer to the summoning of the disciples. Luke’s change of verb from *προσκαλεῖν*, “to summon,” to *προσφωνεῖν*, “to call out to/summon,” is unmotivated unless Luke understands that only the Twelve go up the mountain to Jesus (cf. v 17). It is not clear whether Mark’s *οὓς ᾗθελεν*, “whom he wished,” is already only the Twelve or a wider group. Luke makes it clear that the Twelve are chosen from the disciples. (See on disciples at 5:30). Mark’s Semitic *ἐπαίησεν δώδεκα*, “he made twelve,” is replaced by *ἐκλεξάμενος ἀπ’ αὐτῶν δώδεκα*, “having chosen from them twelve.” The participle here is a problem. It does not seem possible to subordinate it to the main verb of the next principal clause: *ἔστη*, “he stood,” in v 17. So it must take on the force of a finite verb (cf. BDF, 368). There may be a deliberate paralleling of the choice of the Twelve and the choice of the Son (see *Form/Structure/Setting* above).

From Acts 1:7–8 with v 22 we are possibly to understand that while Luke for the sake of his Christological focus in 4:14–44 has only begun to speak of disciples of Jesus in this section (5:1–6:11), those chosen for the Twelve will in fact have been with Jesus from the time of John’s baptism (but this is hardly in sight in 5:1–11). Luke omits Mark’s brief description of what is involved in the call: he already has 5:1–11 and will in 9:2 make much clearer than his Markan source the participation by the Twelve in the ministry that belongs properly to Jesus alone. Where Mark reiterates the instatement of the Twelve, Luke writes *οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασεν*, “whom he also named apostles.” Despite Dupont’s castigation of the carelessness of Luke’s writing here (*OrSyr* 1 [1956] 435–36), it is better with Dietrich (*Petrusbild*, 89–90) to see a deliberately com-

posed parallel to the special naming of Simon (v 14): the Twelve are named apostles and Simon is named “rock” (*πέτρος*) of the apostles (cf. 22:32). Important for Luke is the role of the Twelve in connecting together in their own persons the period of the ministry of Jesus and the time of the church (see further *Form/Structure/Setting* above), and for this he uses the term *ἀπόστολος*, “apostle.” The apostles serve to guarantee the transfer into the life of the church of the full significance of the ministry of Jesus, and for this Jesus himself made provision: the apostles are his fully authorized representatives in this task.

14 Luke smooths out the difficulties of the Markan text, placing the original name in the first place (*Σίμωνα*, “Simon”) and introducing Jesus’ naming of Simon in a relative clause (for *ἐπέθηκεν ὄνομα*, “he added a name,” Luke prefers *ωνόμασεν*, “he named”). In the Lukan text only Simon is honored with such a naming. Since *Πέτρος*, “Peter,” is not used as a name in pre-Christian Greek (BAGD, 654), even without explanation (cf. Matt 16:18) something of the fundamental role of Peter would be evident from the name alone (cf. the use of the cognate *πέτρα*, “rock,” in v 48). Paul prefers the transliteration from the Aramaic *Κηφᾶς*, “Cephas.” Except in the proleptic double naming of 5:8 and in speech at 22:31; 24:34, Luke uses “Simon” consistently up to this point and “Peter” afterwards. *Σίμων*, “Simon,” is a Greek name, but is also used as an equivalent (= *Σιμεων*, “Simeon,” for *שִׁמְעוֹן*, *Šimeʿôn*).

Luke brings forward *Ἀνδρέαν*, “Andrew,” from the fourth position to be able to identify him most simply with the following addition: *τὸν ἀδελφὸν αὐτοῦ*, “his brother.” Matthew has the same alteration (10:2). Acts 1:13 restores Andrew to the Markan position. The addition compensates for the loss of Andrew and his identity as Simon’s brother in the preference of Luke 5:1–11 over Mark 1:16–20. Andrew plays no further role in Luke’s writings. His name is a Greek name known to have been used by Jews (Dio Cassius 68.32.2). James is shorn of his identity as *τὸν τοῦ Ζεβεδαίου*, “the son of Zebedee”: the information has already been provided at 5:10. *Ἰάκωβος* is Grecized out of *יַעֲקֹב*, *Yaʿāqōb* (“Jacob”). John is introduced without Mark’s *τὸν ἀδελφὸν τοῦ Ἰακώβου*, “the brother of James,” for the same reason. *Ἰωάννης* is Grecized out of *יְהוָנָן*, *Yōhānān*. The naming of the brothers as sons of thunder (*Βοανηργές*) also goes (as in Matthew) to accentuate the preeminence of Peter (cf. at 5:1–11). Peter, James, and John form an inner circle in the Twelve at 8:51; 9:28; James and John function together at 9:54; Peter and John are together at 22:8 and in Acts 3:1, 3, 4, 11; 4:13, 19; 8:14 (and cf. Gal 2:9).

From Philip to Thomas, Luke reproduces unaltered the bare list of Mark. *Φίλιππος*, “Philip,” is a Greek name frequently used by Jews (Fitzmyer, 618). *Βαρθολομαῖος*, “Bartholomew,” is a Grecized form of *בֶּר תִּלְמַי*, *bar Tolmay*.

15 *Ματθαῖος*, “Matthew,” is probably (cf. Schürmann, 317 n. 42) a short form for *Ματθαθίας*, “Mattathias,” from *מַתְתָּיָה*, *Mattēyah*. *Θωμᾶς*, “Thomas,” is a common Greek name, but the nickname “the twin” (*Δίδυμος*) given to Thomas (John 11:16, etc.) makes it possible that in this case it is Grecized from *תּוֹמָא*, *Tōmāʾ*, which means “the twin” and would already be a nickname (Klostermann, *Markus*, 35).

From *Ἰάκωβον τὸν τοῦ Ἀλφαίου*, “James the son of Alphaeus,” Luke omits the two definite articles: this is the form in which he will introduce *Ἰούδαν*

Ἰακώβου, "Judas, son of James," below. Luke drops the following Θαδδαῖος, "Thaddaeus," on which see at v 16 and in *Form/Structure/Setting* above. Mark's Καναναῖον, "Cananaean," becomes καλούμενον ζηλωτήν, "called a zealot," which correctly translates Mark's transcription of the Aramaic ܩܢܢܝܢ, *qan'ānā'*. Zealot here is not to be confused with the later zealot political movement of the period leading up to the A.D. 70 destruction of Jerusalem (cf. esp. M. Smith, "Zealots and Sicarii, Their Origin and Relation," *HTR* 64 [1971] 1–19) but is to be traced, rather, to the widespread Jewish admiration for the zeal of Phineas and Elijah (Num 25:11; 1 Kgs 18:40; 19:10).

16 To compensate for the dropped Thaddaeus Luke now adds Ἰούδαν Ἰακώβου, "Judas, son of James": to have placed the name in the vacated position would have encouraged the identification of the two adjacent "Jameses," as in a genealogy list. With the change of name Luke eliminates the isolated bare name from a section of the list where each other name has a qualifier. On the possible identity between "Thaddaeus" and "Judas, son of James" see above in *Form/Structure/Setting*. Ἰούδας is a Grecized form of the name of the patriarch Judah, יְהוּדָה, *Yēhūdā*. Luke completes the list, as does Mark, with Ἰούδαν Ἰσκαριώθ, "Judas Iscariot." The name Iscariot has provoked considerable discussion. Of the many views as to its significance the most plausible are that of Torrey (*HTR* 36 [1943] 51–62) according to which Ἰσκαριώθ is to be derived from the Aramaic ܫܩܪܝܐ, *šeqaryā*, meaning "the false one" or "liar," and the older view that the derivation is from the Hebrew קריות אש, *qēriyyōt*, and means "a man from Kerioth" (a village about twelve miles south of Hebron in Judea). Other views understand Ἰσκαριώθ as meaning "the dagger-man," "the dyer," or "the red" (i.e., with ruddy complexion or red hair).

Mark's final comment on Judas is reproduced in the form ὃς ἐγένετο προδότης, "who became a traitor." In this form "Simon called a zealot" is balanced by the opposite "Judas . . . who became a traitor" (note how in Luke's list each follows a name qualified as "son of"). Jesus' coming passion is never far from sight in the Lukan account.

Explanation

The major section 5:1–6:16 comes to an end with the report of the choosing of the apostles. Calling episodes have been in the first, the fourth, and now the seventh positions in the structure: in 5:1–11 Simon has been both "caught" (i.e., called) and designated as one who will share in catching others; 5:27–39 has clarified the nature of the call of Jesus (and thus what it will mean for others to share in the issuing of this call); and now in 6:12–16 the circle of the Twelve is established as those who as apostles will be fully authorized delegates of Jesus, acting in his stead.

As Jesus himself has been commissioned to act for God (9:35; cf. 3:21–38) so the apostles are commissioned to act for Jesus. The apostles will connect together in their own persons the period of the ministry of Jesus and the time of the church, and will serve to guarantee the total transfer into the life of the church of the significance of the ministry of Jesus.

As with other decisive events, the call of the Twelve occurs in the context of Jesus praying. In fact nowhere else is he attributed with such a sustained

season of prayer. As he prays he receives the guidance of the Spirit for the choice he is to make (cf. Acts 1:2). In the future, prayer will always be important in Christian appointments to office (Acts 1:24; 6:6; 13:2-3; 14:23).

The Lukan form of the list of names especially highlights the central place of Simon: the Twelve are named apostles and Simon is named "rock" of the apostles (cf. 6:48 and 22:32; "Peter" is not used as a name in pre-Christian times, so its relationship to the Greek word for rock would have immediately struck the reader).

There is a certain artistry in Luke's presentation of the list: at the beginning the names of Peter and Andrew receive a qualifying addition; then from James to Thomas we have a bare list; the final four are also qualified and these are matched in alternating pairs; James and (the first) Judas are parallel as "sons of . . ."; Simon and the second Judas are contrasted, the one is "called a zealot," the other "became a traitor."

A Sermon for Disciples: The Status and Demands of Being the Eschatological People of God (6:17–49)

Introduction

There is a logical progression from the sharp Christological focus of 4:14–44, through the interest in response to Jesus in 5:1–6:16, to this first occasion on which disciples are addressed as such. The disciples are the poor who have heard the good news from Jesus and are, therefore, blessed, and they are those who are called to live out Jesus' radical ethic of love for enemies and nonjudgment of others.

Disciples and People Come to Hear and Be Healed (6:17–19)

Bibliography

GENERAL FOR 6:17–49

Bacon, B. W. "The Order of the Lukan 'Interpolations.' II. The Smaller Interpolation, Lk. 6:20–8:3." *JBL* 36 (1917) 112–39. **Bartsch, H.-W.** "Feldrede und Bergpredigt: Redaktionsarbeit in Luk. 6." *TZ* 16 (1960) 5–18. ———. "Soziale Aspekt der urchristlichen Paränese von ihrem Ansatzpunkt her." *CV* 5 (1962) 255–60. **Catchpole, D. R.** "Jesus and the Community of Israel—The Inaugural Discourse in Q." *BJRL* 68 (1986) 296–316. **Diem, H.** "Predigt über Lukas 6, 20–31." *EvT* 14 (1954) 241–46. **Eichholz, G.** *Auslegung der Bergpredigt*. BibS(N) 46. 2nd ed. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1970. **Furnish, V. P.** *The Love Command in the New Testament*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1972. 54–59, 84–90. **George, A.** "Le disciple fraternel et efficace: Lc 6,39–45." *AsSeign* 39 (1972) 68–77. **Grundmann, W.** "Die Bergpredigt nach der Lukasfassung." *SE* 1 [TU 73] (1959) 180–89. **Guelich, R.** *The Sermon on the Mount: A Foundation for Understanding*. Waco, TX: Word, 1982. **Jeremias, J.** *The Sermon on the Mount*. FBBS 2. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1963. **Kahlefeld, H.** *Der Jünger: Eine Auslegung der Rede Lk 6,20–49*. Frankfurt: Knecht, 1962. **Kissinger, W. S.** *The Sermon on the Mount: A History of Interpretation and Bibliography*. American Theological Library Association, Bibliography Series 3. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1975. **Lambrecht, J.** *Ich aber sage euch: Die Bergpredigt als programmatische Rede Jesu (Mt 5–7; Lk 6,20–49)*. Tr. L. Hug. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1984. **Lang, H.** "Verschränkung von narrativer Syntax und kommunikativen Einheiten und ihre Abhängigkeit vom sozio-kulturellen Kontext, dargestellt am Beispiel der Bergpredigt." *LingBib* 37 (1976) 16–30. **Miner, P. S.** *NovT* 16 (1974) 81–109, esp. 103–9. **Mounce, R. H.** "Synoptic Self-portraits." *EvQ* 37 (1965) 212–17. **Patton, C. S.** "The Deviations of Matthew and Luke in the Sermon on the Mount." *BW* 48 (1916) 288–90. **Percy, E.** *Die Botschaft Jesu*. 40–108, 148–65. **Robbins, V. K.** "Pragmatic Relations as a Criterion for Authentic Sayings." *Forum* 1 (1985) 35–63. **Schürmann,**

H. "Die Warnung des Lukas vor der Falschlehre in der 'Predigt am Berge' Lk 6,20–49." *BZ*, n.s., 10 (1966) 57–81; repr. in *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. 290–309. **Topel, L. J.** "The Lukan Version of the Lord's Sermon." *BTB* 11 (1981) 48–53. **Windisch, H.** *The Meaning of the Sermon on the Mount*. Tr. S. M. Gilmour. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1951. **Wrege, H.-T.** *Die Überlieferungsgeschichte der Bergpredigt*. WUNT 9. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1968.

FOR 6:17–19

Bonus, A. "St. Luke VI. 19." *ExpTim* 18 (1906–7) 287–88. **Keck, L. E.** "Mark 3:7–12 and Mark's Christology." *JBL* 84 (1965) 341–58. **Kirchschläger, W.** *Jesu exorzistisches Wirken aus der Sicht des Lukas*. 173–89. **Mánek, J.** "On the Mount—On the Plain (Mt v 1–Lk vi 17)." *NovT* 9 (1967) 124–31. **May, E.** "' . . . For Power Went Forth from Him. . . .' (Luke 6,19)." *CBQ* 14 (1952) 93–103. **Nestle, E.** "Luke VI. 19." *ExpTim* 17 (1905–6) 431.

Translation

¹⁷Going down with them, he stopped at a level spot where there was a great crowd of his disciples and a great multitude of the People from all Judea and from Jerusalem^a and from the seacoast of Tyre and Sidon, ¹⁸who had come to hear him and to be healed of their diseases. Those who were troubled by unclean spirits were healed. ¹⁹All the crowd sought to touch him, because power went forth from him and healed them all.

Notes

^aThe addition of *καὶ τῆς περαίας*, "and Perea," is supported by (N*) W ff² (sy^s).

Form/Structure/Setting

In 5:1–6:16 Jesus has been making disciples. Now in 6:17–49 they are for the first time addressed *as* disciples. It has already become clear in 5:1–6:16 that a new situation of life is established for those who respond to Jesus. Now in 6:17–49 this becomes the specific focus of attention as Jesus addresses disciples as such. Where the focus of 4:14–44 was totally Christological and that of 5:1–6:16 was on making a response to Jesus, the focus of 6:17–49 is on discipleship: its status and demands. (For the beginning point for this large unit see at 5:1–11.)

6:17–19 provides the setting for the sermon to be reported in vv 20–49. The sermon has been variously sectioned, but it seems best to see a threefold development: (i) in vv 20–26 Jesus declares the blessed state of the poor, who in their poverty and need (not blinded by riches) have been open for the action of God which is now taking place in Jesus and who identify themselves with the Son of Man at the cost of hatred and exclusion (as a dark foil he also declares the miserable state of the satisfied rich who gain approval by accommodation to the world); (ii) in vv 27–38 Jesus provides directives for

those who are ready to come along with the plan of God in this time of the beginning of the fulfillment of God's eschatological purpose (Jesus calls to love of enemies [vv 27–36] and to a generous attitude of not judging [vv 37–38]); (iii) vv 39–49 underline from various angles the absolute importance of implementing these directives of Jesus (alternatives come only from the blind trying to lead the blind [vv 39–40]; it is sheer hypocrisy to seek to help others in regard to ethical minutiae while failing to attend in one's own life to these central demands of discipleship [vv 41–42]; Jesus' location of goodness in love of enemy and nonjudgment is a call to a true inner goodness of the heart, of which one's concrete acts of goodness will be the natural fruit [vv 43–45]; those who call Jesus Lord should put into practice his teaching [v 46]; those who implement this teaching of Jesus will find that the achievements of their lives will survive the scrutiny of the day of judgment [vv 47–49]).

For vv 17–19 Luke has adapted the wording of Mark 3:7–10 (Luke passed over Mark 3:7–12 prior to his account of the call of the Twelve [Luke 6:12–16]; he had already made use of Mark 3:11–12 at Luke 4:41). Matthew's similar setting for the sermon (Matt 4:24–25) makes it possible, however, that both have been influenced by some tradition concerning the setting of the sermon.

On Jesus' exorcisms see at 4:31–37. On his healings see at 4:38–39 and 8:26–39. See also the similar summary statement at 4:40–41.

Comment

This new major section 6:17–49 addresses itself to the status and demands of being disciples, i.e., of being the poor who receive the good news Jesus has to declare. For the first time an extensive reporting of teaching by Jesus is given. The focus of interest is on the teaching as such and not at all (contrast 5:1–6:16) on how those present respond. The introductory setting (vv 17–19) does no more than correctly identify the target group for such teaching.

17 Luke's insertion of the call of the Twelve (6:12–16) before the Markan crowd scene (Mark 3:7–12) produces the connecting *καὶ καταβὰς μετ' αὐτῶν* ("and having gone down with them"; cf. Mark's *μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῦ*, "with his disciples"). Schürmann's appeal (321) to Moses' descent from the mount with what he had received from God to transmit to the people is not convincing: the texts appealed to are interested only in the people's being kept off the mountain (Exod 19:12, 14, 17, 21–25; 24:2; 34:3); and the mountain setting of Luke 6:12–16 has only to do with the choice of the Twelve (cf. Acts 1:2), not with the source of Jesus' teaching in Luke 6:20–49. From vv 12–16 is carried forward, however, the henceforth close association between Jesus and the Twelve: "with them," i.e., with the Twelve. As he teaches, Jesus is with the Twelve (cf. 9:13) and addressing himself to the disciples and the crowds. *ἔστη* here is probably "he stopped" (cf. 18:40; 8:44; Fitzmyer, 623) and not "he stood." *καὶ ὄχλος πολὺς* (lit., "and a great crowd") is best taken as a parataxis for "where there was a great crowd." The crowds waiting below had allowed Jesus his privacy on the mountain. Luke normally thinks of a small number of disciples. Only in 19:37 do we again strike a large crowd of disciples. Here in Luke 6:17 Luke is probably influenced by his desire both to present a large-scale public event and to have the teaching be directed primarily to disci-

ples (v 20). "The great crowd of disciples" balances "the great multitude of the People." Mark has used here *μαθητῶν*, "of disciples." His *πολὺ πλῆθος* ("great multitude"; Luke inverts the word order) is expanded by Luke with *τοῦ λαοῦ*, "of the People": Jesus' impact upon Israel as the people of God is stressed. Mark's listing of Jewish regions of Palestine (3:7-8) is collapsed into "all Judea," which here designates all Jewish Palestine (cf. at 4:44), but Mark's separate mention of Jerusalem (cf. 5:17) is retained (with a change to the more Hebraic spelling [cf. at 2:22]), as is the separate mention of the districts of Tyre and Sidon which extends the catchment area outside Jewish Palestine (but not yet to Gentiles: the people from around Tyre and Sidon are part of "the People"). Aware of the seaboard location of Tyre and Sidon (Acts 21:3, 7; 27:3), Luke is more precise than Mark's *περί*, "around."

18 "[They] came" is from Mark (3:8). The balance "to hear and to be healed" has already been struck at 5:15 (where the verb "to be healed" is *θεραπεύεσθαι*, but *ἰᾶσθαι* is used in 5:17; 6:18 uses both verbs). Mark has "hearing" only in connection with the report about Jesus on the basis of which they have come. "Troubled by unclean spirits" is only here in the NT. Luke makes it clear that the healing envisaged embraced also exorcism. "They were being healed" corresponds to Mark's "be healed" (3:10) and "unclean spirits" is from Mark 3:11. The clause Luke generates enables him to mention exorcisms without Mark's development in vv 11-12, but the clause sits a little awkwardly with its unspecified relationship to Luke 6:19.

19. Not having used Mark 3:9, Luke has no interest in any danger to Jesus, so he can express more simply the desire to touch him. "All the crowd" here will be the sick and those with the sick in tow. Luke's explanation of the desire to touch can be understood from 5:17 and 8:43-48 (see there; the thought is that of 8:46). The healing capacity of the power that went forth from Jesus was complete. Either "power" or Jesus could be the subject of "healed." The former provides for a better transition to Jesus as subject in v 20.

Explanation

6:17-19 introduces a new major section of the Gospel in which Jesus for the first time specifically addresses disciples. The section 4:14-44 focused entirely upon Jesus. In 5:1-6:16 there is an interest in response to Jesus. Now in 6:17-49 Jesus addresses those whose response to himself has been that of becoming disciples; Jesus speaks to them about the status and demands of discipleship.

The sermon unfolds in a three-stage development. First (vv 20-23; 24-26), Jesus declares the disciples blessed as the poor who have sensed the action of God now taking place in Jesus and have at the cost of hatred and exclusion identified themselves with him. Their happy situation is contrasted with that of the self-satisfied and complacent rich who have only the approval of men. Second, Jesus calls his privileged disciples to an attitude of love for enemies and a spirit of nonjudgmental generosity (vv 27-36, 37-38). Finally Jesus reinforces from various angles the absolute necessity of that for which he has called (vv 39-40, 41-42, 43-45, 46, 47-49).

Jesus comes down from the mountain with the freshly chosen twelve: they are to be closely associated with him in all that he does (cf. 9:13). He comes down to the waiting crowds who have allowed him his privacy upon the mountain but are eager now to hear him and to benefit from his ability to heal. Waiting for Jesus is a great crowd of disciples (only here and at 19:37 do disciples appear in large numbers: the setting for the sermon is that there are many already committed to Jesus) and a great multitude of the People (i.e., the historic people of God: Luke stresses Jesus' impact upon the Jewish people broadly). Jewish people have come from "all Judea," i.e., all Jewish Palestine (cf. at 4:44) and even from neighboring Gentile regions. As in 5:15 the crowds come to hear and to be healed. Luke uses the phrase "troubled by unclean spirits" (only here in the NT) to indicate that healing here embraces also exorcism. Luke reports first how their need for healing was met and then Jesus' response to their wish to hear him teach. The desire of the sick and those bringing them to establish contact with Jesus by touch is to be understood from 5:17 and 8:43–48: they sought contact with the power present in Jesus. They were not denied: the healing capacity of the power that went forth from Jesus was complete and it reached them all.

Beatitudes and Woes (6:20–26)

Bibliography

- Agouridès, S.** "La tradition des béatitudes chez Matthieu et Luc." In *Mélanges bibliques*, FS B. Rigaux, ed. A. Descamps and A. de Halleux. Gembloux: Duculot, 1970. 9–27.
- Batsdorf, I. W.** *Interpreting the Beatitudes*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966.
- Beaucamp, E.** "La salutation inaugural du livre des Psaumes." *Eglise et Théologie* 1 (1970) 135–46.
- Black, M.** "The Beatitudes." *ExpTim* 64 (1952–53) 125–26.
- Boring, M. E.** "Criteria of Authenticity: The Lucan Beatitudes as a Test Case." *Forum* 1 (1985) 3–38.
- Bowman, J. W.** "An Exposition of the Beatitudes." *JBR* 15 (1947) 162–70.
- Braumann, G.** "Zum traditions-geschichtlichen Problem der Seligpreisungen Mt. 5,3–12." *NovT* 4 (1960) 253–60.
- Brown, R. E.** "The Beatitudes according to St. Luke." *New Testament Essays*. Milwaukee: Bruce, 1965. 265–71.
- Daniélou, J.** "Blessed Are the Poor." In *Contemporary New Testament Studies*, ed. R. Ryan. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1965.
- Daube, D.** "The Last Beatitude." *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*. 196–201.
- Degenhardt, H.-J.** *Lukas—Evangelist der Armen*. 42–57.
- Dodd, C. H.** "The Beatitudes." In *Mélanges bibliques*, FS A. Robert. Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1957. 404–10.
- Dupont, J.** *Les béatitudes*. 3 vols. Louvain: Nauwelaerts, 1958, 1969, 1973. ———. "Les *πρωτοὶ τῷ πνεύματι* de Matthieu 5,3 et les *πρωτοὶ τῷ πνεύματι* de Qumran." In *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze*, FS J. Schmid, ed. J. Blinzler, O. Kuss, F. Mussner. Regensburg: Pustet, 1963. 53–64. ———. "Béatitudes égyptiennes." *Bib* 47 (1966) 185–222. ———. "Introduction aux béatitudes." *NRT* 108 (1976) 97–108.
- Flusser, D.** "Blessed Are the Poor in Spirit. . . ." *IEJ* 10 (1960) 1–13. ———. "Some Notes to the Beatitudes (Matthew 5:3–12, Luke 6:20–26)." *Immanuel* 8 (1978) 37–47.
- Frankemölle, H.** "Die Makarismen (Mt 5,1–12; Lk 6,20–23): Motive und Umfang der redaktionellen Komposition." *BZ* 15 (1971) 52–75.
- Funk, R. W.** "The Beatitudes and Turn the Other Cheek: Recommendations and Polling." *Forum* 2 (1986) 103–28.
- George, A.** "La 'Forme' des Béatitudes jusqu' à Jésus." In *Mélanges bibliques*, FS A.

Robert. Paris: Bloud & Gay, 1957. 398–403. **Gerstenberger, E.** "The Woe-Oracles of the Prophets." *JBL* 81 (1962) 249–63. **Grimm, W.** "Die Hoffnung der Armen: Zu den Seligpreisungen Jesu." *TB* 11 (1980) 100–113. **Himmermann, D. J.** "Jesus' Eschatological Concern for Poor Folk: An Exegetical Study of Luke 6:20–21, 24–25." In *Vita Laudanda*, FS U. S. Leupold, ed. E. R. W. Schults. Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfred Laurier University, 1975. 73–83. **Hoyt, T.** "The Poor/Rich Theme in the Beatitudes." *JRT* 37 (1980) 31–41. **Jacquemin, P.-E.** "Béatitudes selon Saint Luc (Lc 6,20–26)." *AsSeign* 37 (1971) 80–91. **Kahlefeld, H.** "Selig ihr Armen." *BibLeb* 1 (1960) 55–61. **Klein, P.** "Die lukanischen Weherufe Lk 6:24–26." *ZNW* 71 (1980) 50–59. **Kloppenborg, J. S.** "Blessing and Marginality: The 'Persecution Beatitude' in Q, Thomas, and Early Christianity." *Forum* 2 (1986) 36–56. **Köhler, K.** "Die ursprüngliche Form der Seligpreisungen." *TSK* 91 (1918) 157–92. **Légasse, S.** "Un programme chrétien: les Béatitudes (Mt 5,3–12)." *Les Pauvres en Esprit: Evangile et non-violence*. LD 78. Paris: Cerf, 1974. 19–53. **Leisegang, H.** *Pneuma Hagion: Der Ursprung des Geistesbegriffs der synoptischen Evangelien aus der griechischen Mystik*. Leipzig: Hinrichs'sche, 1922. 134–40. **McCown, C. C.** "The Beatitudes in the Light of Ancient Ideals." *JBL* 46 (1927) 50–61. **McEleney, N. J.** "The Beatitudes of the Sermon on the Mount/Plain." *CBQ* 43 (1981) 1–13. **Michaelis, C.** "Die π-Alliteration der Subjektsworte der ersten 4 Seligpreisungen in Mt. v 3–6 und ihre Bedeutung für den Aufbau der Seligpreisungen bei Mt., Lk., und in Q." *NovT* 10 (1968) 148–61. **Nauck, W.** "Freude im Leiden: Zum Problem einer urchristlichen Verfolgungstradition." *ZNW* 46 (1955) 68–80. **Neuhäusler, E.** *Anspruch und Antwort: Zur Lehre von den Weisungen innerhalb der synoptischen Jesusverkündigung*. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1962. 141–69. **Phillips, C. A.** "Luke 6,24: 'Ὅτι ἀπέχετε τὴν παράκλησιν ὑμῶν.'" *Bulletin of the Bezan Club* 6 (1929) 27–29. **Rezevskis (Resewski), J.** "Die Makarismen bei Matthäus und Lukas, ihr Verhältnis zueinander und ihr historischer Hintergrund." *ST I*. Riga, 1935. 157–69. **Schottroff, L.** "Das Magnificat und die älteste Tradition über Jesus von Nazareth." *EvT* 38 (1978) 298–313, esp. 306–9. **Schulz, S. Q.** *Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten*. 76–84. **Schwarz, G.** "Lukas 6,22a. 23c. 26. Emendation, Rückübersetzung, Interpretation." *ZNW* 66 (1975) 269–74. **Schweizer, E.** "Formgeschichtliches zu den Seligpreisungen Jesu." *NTS* 19 (1972–73) 121–26. **Seccombe, D. P.** *Possessions and the Poor in Luke-Acts*. 84–93. **Sloman, S.** "'Blessed Are the Poor in Spirit,' Matt. V. 3; cf. Luke VI. 20." *JTS* 18 (1916–17) 34–35. **Steinhauser, M. G.** "The Beatitudes and Eschatology: Announcing the Kingdom." *Living Light* 19 (1982) 121–29. **Strecker, G.** "Die Makarismen der Bergpredigt." *NTS* 17 (1970–71) 255–75. **Tuckett, C. M.** "The Beatitudes: A Source-Critical Study. With a Reply by M. D. Goulder." *NovT* 25 (1983) 193–216. **Zimmerli, W.** "Die Seligpreisungen der Bergpredigt und das Alte Testament." In *Donum Gentilicium*, FS D. Daube, ed. E. Bammel et al. Oxford: Clarendon, 1978. 8–26.

Translation

²⁰Then^a he lifted up his eyes upon his disciples and said:

"Fortunate are you^b poor, because yours is the kingdom of God.

²¹Fortunate are you who hunger now, because you shall be satisfied.

Fortunate are you who weep now, because you shall laugh.

²²Fortunate you are when men hate you, and when they exclude you and revile you and cast out your name as evil on account of the Son of Man. ²³Rejoice in that day and leap for joy,^c for behold, your reward shall be great in heaven. For their fathers treated the prophets in the same way.

²⁴But, woe to you who are rich, because you have received your consolation.

²⁵Woe to you who have had your fill now, because you shall be hungry.

Woe to you^d who laugh now, because you will mourn and weep.

²⁶Woe to you^c when all men speak well of you. For their fathers treated the false prophets in the same way.”

Notes

^aLit., “and” (καί).

^bNothing corresponds to “are you” in the Greek text here or in the second and third beatitude.

^c“For joy” is supplied to complete the sense.

^dὁμῶν, “to you,” is missing here from most texts. It is supported by ^p75 A D lat etc.

^e“To you” is added here to complete the sense.

Form/Structure/Setting

After vv 17–19 have established a crowd setting of disciples and would-be disciples the address itself begins with a declamatory pronouncement of beatitude and woes. For the larger structure see at vv 17–19.

The overall parallelism between the beatitudes and woes is based on the fact that the woes have been formed by assigning to people in situations quite the opposite of those identified in the beatitudes a fate that is also quite the opposite of that assigned in the corresponding beatitude. Woes two and three (which, with their corresponding beatitudes, are most straightforwardly expressions of a coming reversal of states) are only kept from being simple inversions of the terms of the corresponding beatitudes by a change of verb (and tense) in the second woe and by a doubling of the verb in the third.

In the first three beatitudes verbless clauses identify the “fortunate” ones by means of a substantival use of an adjective or a participle, as is also the case for the first three woes. The woes have a second person indicator absent from the first three beatitudes. The second and third beatitudes and woes have an added “now.” The explanatory clauses that follow these three beatitudes and woes are not quite as uniform: in beatitudes two and three there is simply a future verb; the corresponding woes have futures as well, but two verbs are provided in the third woe; slightly more complex forms (with present verbs) serve for the opening beatitude and woe. The fourth beatitude and woe are much more elaborately developed and formally distinct from the earlier three. Both beatitude and woe provide a verb for the opening clause, use a “when” (ὅταν) clause, and use γάρ, “for,” in the explanatory clause. In the case of the beatitude but not the woe, the initial “when” clause is expanded in a second “when” clause with three coordinated verbs. Before the concluding explanatory clause, the beatitude (and again, not the woe) is glossed with a double imperative (“rejoice,” “leap [with joy]”) which carries its own explanatory clause.

There is scarcely any parallel in the OT and other Jewish materials for the listing of beatitudes and/or woes. A remote parallel is provided by the lists of blessings and cursings in, e.g., Deut 27:15–26; 28:1–6, 15–19, but beatitudes are not blessings. The series of woes in Isa 5:8–23, while much more elaborate in form than the Lukan woes, comes close to being a list toward the end (cf. also Sir 2:12–14; Hab 2:6–19). Sir 25:7–10 identifies ten situations of happiness but uses the beatitude for its expression only once or twice. Otherwise, both beatitudes and woes occur only singly or in pairs (for paired beatitudes see Pss 84:4–5; 119:1–2; 144:15; Tob 13:14 [in the S text only] has three beatitudes).

A woe and a beatitude are juxtaposed (in that order) in Eccl 10:16–17 and in the Lukan order in 2 *Apoc. Bar.* 10.6–7. (Cf. Schweizer, *NTS* 19 [1972–73] 121–22.)

Beatitudes are normally formulated in the third person, but the second person form of the Lukan beatitudes can be paralleled (Deut 33:29; Isa 32:20; Eccl 10:17; 1 *Enoch* 58.2). In the case of woes there is more of a distribution between first, second, and third person forms.

Beatitudes perform various functions in OT and other Jewish materials. In the wisdom literature they serve to commend the proposed path of goodness (e.g., Prov 14:21; 28:14; Ps 41:1; Sir 31:8; 2 *Enoch* 42.7–9). In prophetic and eschatological texts they express confidence in God's intervention to put to rights the present unhappy situation (e.g., Isa 30:18; Dan 12:12; *Pss. Sol.* 17.50; 18.7; *Sib. Or.* 3.371; Tob 13:14). In an eschatological context *As. Mos.* 10.8 speaks of a future state of happiness. In Deut 33:29 the exodus deliverance is celebrated. In 1 Kgs 10:8 the blessing of Solomon's glory and wisdom is marked. In every case what is fundamental is that those to whom the happiness belongs are singled out and their blessedness proclaimed. Tob 13:14 (B) comes closest to the Gospel beatitudes: "Fortunate [μακάριοι] are those who love you; they will rejoice over your peace. Fortunate are those who have grieved over your sufferings, because they will rejoice over you, seeing all your glory." The OT woes (generally with וי, *hōy* or וי, *ōy*) are found almost exclusively in prophetic contexts and call to mind the judgment of God (e.g., Isa 5:8; Jer 48:1; 50:27; Zech 11:17).

At the beginning of the sermon Luke leaves the Markan source he has been following fairly consistently since 4:31 (5:1–11 was inserted; Mark's 3:7–12 was used out of order for Luke 6:17–19). He makes use of materials that have already been gathered into a sermon prior to Luke, as may be seen from the essential similarity of the Matthean sermon (Matt 5–7). It does not seem possible to ascertain whether Matthew and Luke used quite the same form of the sermon, though it is clear that both evangelists have adapted the tradition that came to them in various ways.

In the case of the first three beatitudes it seems most likely that Luke's version is the more original, except for the uses of "now" and possibly the second person form. Luke may have switched the order of beatitudes two and three. Also in the fourth beatitude Luke has stayed closest to the tradition, though some Lukan alteration is evident (see details in *Comment* below). Matthew's additional beatitudes have for the most part an OT basis.

The case of the woes is altogether more difficult to evaluate. There is some evidence that either the composition of the woes reflects knowledge of material in the Sermon on the Mount not found in the present Lukan text or that the Matthean text shows acquaintance with the woes. Jas 5:1 seems to reflect an awareness of the woes. If Luke 6:21b is more original than the Matthean parallel (5:4) as argued below (*Comment*), then Matthew will have the verb he uses there ("mourn") from the corresponding Lukan woe. This makes it likely that Matthew has deleted the woes.

The fourth beatitude has not always been with the other three, but it is not necessary (with Dupont, *Béatitudes* 2:359–65) to attribute the formation of the beatitude to the later church period (see *Comment*). It is not unlikely

that the most primitive form of this beatitude (minus the second “when” statement and the gloss with its double imperative and explanatory clause) was originally joined with the fourth woe in poetic antithetical parallelism (cf. Schwarz, *ZNW* 66 [1975] 269–74; Schwarz suggests that “revile” rather than “hate” originally stood as the first verb). It may be that the addition of this fourth beatitude (which necessarily led to the splitting of the poetic unit) was also the inspiration for the generation of the first three woes (as antitheses to the beatitudes) to which the separated-off fourth woe could then be attached.

Comment

Jesus has met healing needs of the disciples and of the people who have come to hear him and to be healed; now his address with his eyes upon his disciples opens with a declaratory pronouncement of beatitudes and woes. These set in prominence the happy situation which is the lot of the disciples who in their poverty and need have recognized the action of God in Jesus and made their stand with him.

20 The crowds came “to hear and to be healed” (v 18). Their healing has been reported in vv 18b–19; now it is time for them to hear (cf. vv 27, 47 and 7:1). More precisely, Jesus addresses himself to the “great crowd of disciples” while the “great multitude of the People” overhear (7:1): the boundary between the two groups is permeable and Jesus speaks for the benefit of disciples and would-be disciples. The Matthean sermon is also in the first instance directed to disciples (5:1; cf. 7:28–29).

Jesus’ address opens with a set of beatitudes. The cryptic terms in which these are expressed have occasioned no end of controversy, as has the evidently more than verbal difference between the Lukan and Matthean beatitudes (Matt 5:3–12).

Dupont (*Béatitudes*, vol. 2) has argued at length for a major shift in meaning between the beatitudes on the lips of Jesus and the beatitudes in the text of Luke. The sense he gives to the beatitudes on the lips of Jesus is, however, vulnerable at two points. Dupont argues that in the beatitudes Jesus is announcing the nearness of the kingdom of God—which, because God exercises his royal justice in favor of the poor, is a message of good news to the poor. According to Dupont, it is not that the kingdom of God is not also for others, but since a particular function of the ideal king in Israelite as other ancient Oriental royal ideology was to be protector and defender of the poor, it was for the poor especially that the coming of the kingdom was good news. Dupont’s case is impressive in many respects. It does not, however, account for the beatitude form (see *Form/Structure/Setting* above) in which Jesus’ affirmations here are made. Those in relation to whom beatitudes are spoken are people who for whatever reason find that they are in a privileged situation, and there is always an implied or explicit contrast with others who do not share the happy state. Dupont’s setting can provide no adequate account of the beatitudes’ affirmation that the poor are privileged by contrast to others. The best he can give is that the poor should be happiest about the news of the coming kingdom: they stand to gain the most because currently their situation is the worst. The second difficulty confronting Dupont is presented by the emphatic

“yours” of v 20 (“theirs” in Matt 5:3). Here once again we have the language of implied contrast: the kingdom is for the poor, whose poverty distinguishes them from others who will not enter the kingdom. On Dupont’s rendering the kingdom can be in no sense especially for the poor. The most he can say is that they specially benefit from it.

While no doubt the change of setting from the ministry of Jesus to that of the Gospel of Luke will necessarily have produced some modification in the thrust of the beatitudes (see further below), it seems unlikely that there is such a fundamental shift as that proposed by Dupont.

In the Lukan text the best starting point for the identification of the “poor” is in v 24 with its reference to the “rich” to whom the poor are the antithesis. There can be little doubt that the rich in v 24 are the literal rich, who are, however, addressed not simply in relation to their material prosperity, but rather in view of the personal orientation that almost inevitably accompanies such material prosperity (see at v 24 below). In v 20 the “poor” will be the literally poor who presently have a hard life (thus the hunger and weeping of v 21), but the context of their poverty, if not its cause, is that they are disciples of Jesus (v 19) who are likely to suffer because of their identification with Jesus (vv 22–23). And their advantage over the rich will be their freedom from that state of mind which ensnares the rich in the limited perspectives of this world, lulls them into a foolish self-confidence, and beguiles them into thinking that their material prosperity has its goal simply in their own rich enjoyment of the good things of life. Matthew narrows the beatitude, but does not falsify it, when he focuses attention on the attitudinal with his “poor in spirit” (Matt 5:3).

Nothing in the OT background goes as far as this beatitude in identifying the poor as the recipients of the kingdom of God. The weak and the afflicted are certainly seen to be objects of God’s special care (Deut 10:17–18; Pss 10:17–18; 68:5–6; 76:9; 146:7–10), and the hope for a future intervention of God has as a component part the meeting of needs of the disadvantaged and the destitute (Ps 132:15; Ezek 34:15–16, 28; Isa 35:5–6; 61:1–2). The sixth-century exile setting for the formulation of much of the OT eschatological hope takes us a little further. The catastrophe of the exile reduced the whole of God’s people to the status of the afflicted. Because of their sin they had become the prey of the nations. In such a context of national disaster God’s promise to champion the cause of the poor and afflicted addressed the situation of all (Isa 49:13; 42:7; Ezek 34:28; Mic 4:6–7; Isa 61:1–4). Despite the sixth-century restoration there was an important strand of Jewish thought that continued in later centuries to wait for a greater restoration (Dan 9:24; CD 1.5–8; *1 Enoch* 93.1–14; 91.12–17; Sir 36; cf. Neh 9:32–37; Ezra 9:6–9). Indeed, the OT promises with an exile setting became an expression of Jewish eschatological hope only by being separated from the sixth-century restoration. Along these lines, the members of the Qumran community identified themselves as the poor to whom the eschatological promises apply (1QH 18.12–15). They were those who continued patiently to bear until the day of the final battle the affliction and poverty of the exile period, the period of God’s wrath (1QM 11.8–15; CD 1.5, 8–9), continued and heightened in their own experience of persecution (4QpPs37 1.9; 1QH 5.16–19, 20–22). Those at Qumran felt they

had learned the lesson of the exile and gloried in their powerlessness apart from God. This matrix of Qumran thought offers the best point of comparison for the Gospel beatitude.

There is no glorifying of poverty involved in the beatitudes. To be poor, hungry, and weeping is not at all the situation that Luke envisages in the ideal state of Christian existence (Acts 2:43–47; 4:34). While renunciation is a very important theme in the Gospel of Luke, this is never thought of as making oneself poor (against Minear, *NovT* 16 [1974] 104). The beatitude of the poor connects naturally in the Gospel not with the renunciation material but rather with the reversal motif (cf. at 1:52–53; 16:25; note also the “afflicted state” of 1:48) and more particularly with the announcement of good news to the poor (4:18; 7:22).

It is not unlikely that an eschatological immediacy which originally characterized Jesus’ utterance of the beatitudes has been softened down in the Lukan text (see discussion at vv 21, 23). Nevertheless, the eschatological note has not disappeared completely. The fulfillment language (4:21) connected with 4:18 must be kept in mind. The reversal of 1:52–53 is presented there as at least potentially already effected in the provision of the messiah by miraculous conception. The ministry of Jesus already begins to bring that which he announces.

The good fortune of the poor is that theirs is the kingdom of God. Luke has the second person form, “yours,” for Matthew’s third person, “theirs.” An awkward construction is created by the lack of a corresponding second person indication in the first half of the beatitude. This suggests that Luke may be secondary. The possessive is placed in the emphatic first position. The Matthean text has the more Semitic “kingdom of heaven.” The kingdom of God is also spoken of as something that may be possessed in Luke 12:31–32 and 18:16–17 (cf. Jas 2:5, which is probably dependent on the Lukan form of the beatitude). In these contexts the expression serves as a comprehensive designation for all the blessings that are brought by the eschatological rule of God (cf. Schürmann, 330–31). Here the emphasis is on the contrast between such a rich inheritance and the deprivations of present poverty. Possession of the kingdom is primarily future, but perhaps not exclusively so (cf. 10:9, 11, 21–24).

21 Hunger and weeping are not to be considered as separate conditions from poverty but as characteristic manifestations of poverty. The second Lukan beatitude corresponds to the fourth in Matthew’s list (5:6). The Lukan connection between poverty and lack of food, as between riches and the pleasures of the table, suggests that Luke may have reordered the beatitudes (Dupont, *Béatitudes* 1:271–72; 3:47–55). Matthew has “hunger and thirst for righteousness.” The “for righteousness” corresponds to Matthean interests and is likely to be his addition: after his narrowing to the attitudinal of the beatitude of the poor he uses the beatitude of the hungry to develop an aspect of the poor’s openness to God. “Hunger” and “thirst” are found together in Isa 49:10 and 65:13, and it is possible that the former of these has influenced the Matthean text. As in v 20 the second person form is probably Lukan, as is the “now” (which Luke uses frequently: Luke fourteen times; Acts twenty-five times). Luke’s third beatitude corresponds to Matthew’s second (5:4). The arguments

for the identification of the more original form are finely balanced. The Matthean form is more original if Luke is responsible for the formation of the woes (vv 24–26; as Dupont, *Béatitudes* 1:266–71). If the pairing of beatitudes and woes predates Luke, then the Lukan form is more original (as Schürmann, 331–32). The language of the beatitude seems to tip the scale in favor of the latter (see below). In any case the “now” will again be Lukan.

Poverty and hunger appear together in Isa 32:6–7; 58:7; Job 24:4–10; etc. The assurance that the needs of the hungry will be satisfied echoes OT promise (Isa 49:10; 65:13; Jer 31:12, 25; Ezek 34:29; 36:29; Ps 107:36–41 cf. 1 Sam 2:5; Isa 55:1–2) and may link especially to Ps 22:27 [ET 26] or Ps 107:9. Despite its appropriateness there is no good reason to link here the motif of the eschatological banquet (as does Fitzmyer, 634; Isa 25:6–8; cf. Luke 12:37; 13:29; 14:14–15, 16–24). Luke’s “now” tends to separate from the time of announcement the time for satisfaction of hunger. But Luke will not restrict the fulfillment to the remote eschatological future (cf. 9:17; Acts 2:45–46; 4:34–35).

The use of *κλαίοντες*, “weeping,” here in connection with the afflictions of the poor is somewhat different from Luke’s other uses of the word. Pss 125 [126]:6; 136 [137]:1 connect weeping with the affliction of the exile. Weeping and laughing are paired as opposites in Eccl 3:4 and more remotely in Ps 126:1–6. *γέλᾱν*, “to laugh,” does not have here (or in v 25) the negative thrust of the LXX use of the word (with Dupont, *Béatitudes* 3:65–69). Laughter is the release of joy as tears are the release of sorrow. The thought is close to that of Ps 126, but the LXX there does not speak of laughing.

22 The fourth beatitude is not at all of a piece with the previous three. Where they contemplate a *state* this beatitude addresses itself to the prospect of certain *events*. As is not the case with the earlier beatitudes, where causal factors in the affliction are quite out of sight, here there is interest both in the relational nature of the affliction and in the basis for the affliction in loyalty to Jesus. The beatitude is also formally different in its grammatical shape and its extended development. Coming at the end of the list and expanded in form, it invites treatment as the climax and clearest expression of the total thrust of the set of beatitudes.

The fourth Lukan beatitude corresponds to the ninth in Matthew’s list (5:11–12). Working from general redactional tendencies, Dupont (*Béatitudes* 1:228–43, 248) has argued convincingly that the Lukan form is more original in its reference to “hate,” “exclude” (Matthew has generalized this into “persecute”), and “Son of Man,” and that the impersonal form of the Matthean text is more original. Matthew will have added “falsely.” The situation is more complex with “cast out your name as evil,” but this difficult Greek (*ἐκβάλλωσιν τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρὸν*) will not have been formulated by Luke.

Hatred against the disciples of Christ as such is also anticipated in 21:17 in a broadly eschatological context. The hatred of 6:27 is probably that experienced by Christians in a hostile environment. Isa 66:5 speaks of those who “hate you and exclude you for my name’s sake,” and is likely to be echoed in the present text (Isa 66:5 also mentions “joy” in connection with those hated). The “exilic” (see at v 20) afflictions of the poor are climaxed in suffering borne for the sake of the Son of Man. Though Luke’s “people” (*ἄνθρωποι*) is

quite general, it is clear from v 23 with its “their fathers” that he has in mind hatred by fellow Jews.

The “hate” of the first “when” clause expands in a second “when” clause into the coordinated set “exclude,” “revile,” and “cast out your name as evil.” It is unlikely that we are dealing here with formal excommunication of Christians as such from the synagogue, although the ostracism, abuse, and slander of Jewish Christians by their fellow Jews did ultimately lead to that. For exclusion from the community cf. Isa 66:5; Ezra 10:8; 1QS 6.25; 7.1, 3, 5; 8.24; CD 9.23. The use of “revile” in the beatitude finds an echo in 1 Pet 4:14. That he has been reviled, derided, abused, etc., is a frequent complaint of the psalmist (cf. esp. Pss 69:7; 44:23). Jeremiah also received reproach and derision because of his identification with God and his word (Jer 15:15; 20:8). ἐκβάλλωσω τὸ ὄνομα ὑμῶν ὡς πονηρόν, “cast out your name as evil,” seems to reflect an underlying Semitic idiom. Deut 22:14, 19 offers the best point of comparison with its ער שם רע, *hōšēp šēm rāʿ* (lit., “cast out an evil name” or “cast out a name [as] evil”). Luke may have obscured the idiom with his ὑμῶν ὡς (“your,” “as”; this is the view of Black, *Aramaic Approach*, 97–98), or more likely we have reflected a slightly different idiom not otherwise attested. The “name” is here the good name, the reputation. Fitzmyer’s suggestion (635; cf. Dupont, *Béatitudes* 3:81–82) that the name is that of “Christian” makes the following “for the sake of the Son of Man” redundant. Matthew’s paraphrase “say every kind of evil against you” is accurate enough.

Blessedness attaches not to these unhappy experiences as such. They are the occasion of blessedness because at their base lies one’s identification with the Son of Man. The value of suffering for the sake of Jesus also surfaces at 9:24; 21:17–19 and cf. 12:8–9; 18:29. It has been questioned whether this manner of speaking can be confidently traced back to Jesus. In some cases there is a second form which lacks the “for my sake” (e.g., Luke 17:33 cf. 9:24), and in these cases the shorter form has best claim to originality. However, despite Dupont’s arguments (*Béatitudes* 2:359–65) Luke 12:11 should not be read as a variant form lacking the “for my sake” of the tradition in Mark 13:9 (Luke 12:11 can hardly begin an independently transmitted logion), and the equation of Mark 13:12–13 and Matt 10:35–36 by connecting both with Mic 7:2b, 6 is too speculative to place in question the “for my sake” of Mark 13:13. Beyond the issue of precise linguistic form, Mark 8:35 establishes with greatest confidence that Jesus did see people’s eschatological future as determined by their readiness to be identified with himself (see Dupont, 368–77). Whether Jesus used “Son of Man” quite as in Luke 6:22 is open to question. On Luke’s use of “Son of Man” see *Form/Structure/Setting* for 6:1–5; on the background see the excursus following 9:21–22.

23 Luke improves his text by switching to the more appropriate aorist imperative (χάπητε, “rejoice”), accommodates to Greek idiom with the singular for “heaven,” and removes the ambiguity of the Matthean text’s τοὺς πρὸ ὑμῶν (“who were before you”; are Jesus’ addressees, therefore, prophets?). “In that day” will be his own touch: he uses the expression a number of times, and it corresponds to his addition of “now” in vv 21 and 22. ἰδοὺ γάρ, “for behold,” is also Lukan idiom (cf. at 1:44), as is most likely κατὰ τὰ αὐτά (“in the same way”; 6:26; 17:30; cf. Acts 14:1). Matthew will have changed the general “did”

to his favored term “persecuted.” (Cf. Dupont, *Béatitudes* 1:244–49.) “Leap for joy” is more difficult. Probably Matthew conformed the text to the established pairing (Tob 13:13; Rev 19:7; cf. 1 Pet 4:13; also the pairing in Hebrew of the equivalent *נחלץ*, *šāmah*, and *גיל*, *gīl*) of *χαίρειν*, “to rejoice,” and *ἀγαλλιάσθαι*, “to exult,” but Dupont argues that 1 Pet 1:6–8; 4:13 echo an early form of the beatitude that used *ἀγαλλιάσθαι*, and that Luke’s use of *σκιρτᾶν*, “to leap for joy,” is in line with his taste for more precise psychological terminology (245–46).

The development here in v 23 heightens further the already paradoxical nature of the Lukan beatitudes. The distinctive voice of Jesus seems to be reflected in this uncompromisingly extreme demand (cf. Schürmann, 334). There is already in pre-Christian Judaism a readiness to suffer gladly for the faith (2 Macc 6:30; 4 Macc 10:20; cf. Jdt 8:25–27; etc.; 2 *Apoc. Bar.* 52.5–7 goes further but does not fit its present context and may betray Christian influence), much as a loyal subject might gladly give his life for his king. But here there is something more. Jesus calls for suffering to be faced with that exultant joy which is appropriate to the time of eschatological fulfillment (rejoicing in suffering does, however, appear in later rabbinic tradition: *b. Šabb.* 886). Rejoicing in suffering becomes a distinctive Christian motif (Acts 5:41; Rom 5:3–4; Heb 10:34; Jas 1:2, 12; 1 Pet 4:13). Luke’s “in that day” makes the paradox yet starker. Suffering for the sake of the Son of Man is a privilege accorded by God in this climactic period of the working of his saving purposes.

The sufferings accorded to the disciples of Jesus are anything but the reward of their wickedness, as no doubt they seemed to many onlookers and Jewish opponents of Christianity in the first century. On the contrary, suffering borne for the Son of Man has a great reward. Rejection may be one’s lot with one’s fellow Jews, but God’s approval is of much greater import. Similar imagery is used concerning treasure in heaven in 12:33; 18:22 and cf. 10:20. The image of reward or treasure already with God makes concrete the certainty with which the day of final judgment may be anticipated (cf. Dupont, *Béatitudes* 2:349). Far from being a mark of wickedness, rejection by the Jewish people was the classic fate of the true prophet of God (cf. 4:24; 13:33–34; 11:47–51; Acts 7:52). This motif is already present in the OT (1 Kgs 19:10, 14; Jer 2:30; Neh 9:26; 2 Chr 36:15–16) and stands behind 1 Thess 2:15. Luke’s “their fathers” corresponds to his use of “people” in v 22; it establishes no particular antithesis between church and synagogue (against Dupont, *Béatitudes* 3:38–39). Nor does the comparison with prophets necessarily suggest a prophetic role for disciples (as Fitzmyer, 636): prophets and disciples have in common a conformity to the divine will that does not find favor with those among whom they are placed.

24 Four woes balance the four beatitudes. Matthew’s sermon does not contain the woes. There are, however, a number of links between the woes and the Matthean sermon which have suggested to scholars either that Matthew knew the woes but chose not to use them (e.g., Bartsch, *TZ* 16 [1960] 10–11; Schürmann, 335–36), or that Luke is responsible for the woes but in producing them has been influenced in part by other Sermon on the Mount materials used by Matthew but not reproduced in Luke’s own sermon (e.g., Dupont, *Béatitudes* 1:299–342). Possible links include: (i) the emphatic “theirs”/“they”

of Matthew's beatitudes may echo the contrasting woes; (ii) the use of "consolation" in Luke 6:24 may not be independent of the use of the cognate verb in Matt 5:4; (iii) ἀπέχew, "to have received payment," is found in Luke 6:24 and Matt 6:2, 5, 16; (iv) πενθεῖw, "to mourn," is found in Luke 6:25 and Matt 5:4; (v) the "rich," "full," and "laughing" of the woes could correspond to the almsgiving, fasting, and prayer of Matt 6:2–18; (vi) Matthew has eight beatitudes (or nine?) while Luke has four beatitudes plus four woes. The case for linkage is suggestive but not overwhelming, and if there is dependence, the dependence could go either way. If, as argued above, the language of Luke 6:21b is more original than that of the Matthean counterpart, then it is most likely that the woes predate Luke and were present also in Matthew's source. Jas 5:1 seems to reflect an awareness of the woes.

In general the woes closely follow the form of the corresponding beatitudes and provide an inverse formulation for the sentiment of the beatitudes. The second person indicator ("you"), the absence of which in the opening clause of the first three beatitudes made for awkwardness, is supplied for the first three woes (in the third the textual witness is divided). The explanation given for the first woe is unrelated to that for the opening beatitude. As with the fourth beatitude, the fourth woe has a distinctive form, but the woe lacks the elaboration provided for the beatitude by vv 22b–23a.

Despite the second person address, those against whom the woes are directed are presumed absent (v 27 cf. v 18). The opening πλὴν, "but," may be a Lukan touch. οὐαί, "woe," is used in the LXX to translate various Hebrew interjections, but is rare in secular Greek and may ultimately be a Latinism (Dupont, *Béatitudes* 3:28–29). When beatitudes are spoken over those who are in a particularly advantageous situation, woes are for those whose situation is a miserable one (though they may not realize it). The Gospel of Luke provides a rich supply of comparative materials for clarifying how it is that the rich are seen to be in such an unfortunate situation (cf. esp. Luke 11:41; 12:13–34; 16:1–13, 19–31; 18:18–30; 19:1–10). Riches almost inescapably (18:25) ensnare those who possess them in a false set of values and loyalties which involve a foreshortened perspective in which love for the things of this world proves to be greater than desire for the kingdom of God (18:23). One cannot serve God and mammon (16:13). Whether one has little or much, the only proper attitude to mammon is an openhanded generosity which is rich in relation to the compassionate concerns of God (12:32–34; 16:9–12) and lays up treasure in heaven and not for oneself on earth (12:21). This is most difficult for those who have the greatest stake in, and find themselves most secure in relation to, material well-being in this world (cf. Dupont, *Béatitudes* 3:149–203; Seccombe, *Possessions*, 97–196). The Lukan woe is addressed to the rich whose loyalty is to their riches and who find contentment in the good life these are able to provide (12:15–21). Such people have little in common with afflicted Israel for whom salvation can come from God alone and who wait for the day of his favor with its good news for the poor (Isa 61:1–2) which will herald the long-awaited consolation of Israel (Luke 2:25). Such people have settled for the consolations that may be had from riches but will find that they have been shortchanged by this their choice (cf. 16:25).

25 As did the corresponding beatitudes, the second and third woes express

simple reversals. The second woe, however, does not use the verb provided by the corresponding beatitude. Instead the perfect participle *ἐμπεπλησμένοι* continues the theme of consolation already drawn in full: the woe is pronounced upon those who have had their fill now (Luke provides a “now” for the woes that correspond to the beatitudes of v 21). There is no thought of excess (cf. 1:53; Acts 14:17), but only of the contentment and satisfaction of the rich in the foreshortened perspective of their lives. Their coming hunger will be as real as the present hunger of the poor.

The third woe is kept from being a simple inverse of the corresponding beatitude only by the doubling of the verb in the second clause (the verbs form a conventional pair [2 Sam 19:2; 2 Esdr 18:9 [Neh 8:9]; Mark 16:10; Jas 4:9; Rev 18:11, 15, 19]), which allows for an identification of the inner state that stands behind the tears. Again, the laughter is that of those who feel quite happy with their present lot in life. Theirs is a fool’s paradise.

26 As with the beatitudes, the fourth woe is distinctive in form. The woes are not, however, as heavily end-weighted as were the beatitudes, since there is nothing corresponding to the development in vv 22b–23a. Not being spoken well of but being spoken well of by *all* is the danger signal. False prophets gained general approval (Isa 30:9–11; Mic 2:11; Jer 5:31; 23:16–17) because they represented nothing that would unsettle the status quo. Though Luke in general sets great store upon good public reputation (cf. Dupont, *Béatitudes* 3:89–94), he must ultimately limit its validity as a test of truth: truth lies with the persecuted rather than with those who gain public recognition (Schürmann, 338). Schürmann (*BZ*, n.s., 10 [1966] 57–81) sees the woes as directed primarily at false teachers in the church who offer a spurious way of salvation, but this is to make altogether too much of the comparison with false prophets: the beatitudes are not only or primarily for the true Christian teachers! Dupont (*Béatitudes* 3:38–40, 55–64, 78–97) makes a better case for seeing reflected the dispute between church and synagogue. But even he recognizes that the rich should not be identified with the unbelieving Jews *simpliciter*. And it is better to say that Luke is concerned (elsewhere) to explain in part the unbelief of Jews (esp. the Pharisees) by suggesting that they were implicated in that state of mind which troubled the rich and kept them from the kingdom of God (see esp. 16:14–15).

Explanation

The crowds came to hear and to be healed (v 18). Having met the healing needs of the crowds, Jesus now addresses his disciples, but in the hearing of all the gathered people: the boundary line between the two groups is permeable and Jesus speaks for the benefit of disciples and would-be disciples.

Jesus’ opening words are a commendation of the good fortune of the poor, in a cryptic sentence that has occasioned much controversy. How are we to understand the poverty of these poor? It seems best neither to spiritualize away the reference to actual poverty, nor to make the whole thing a matter of economic justice for the proletariat.

Luke provides an important clue as to how the poor are here to be understood by setting over against them as their opposite the rich of the first woe (v 24) and by incorporating into his Gospel a variety of material on the rich. It is clear (see below) that the rich who are castigated are the literal rich but that they are addressed not merely in relation to their material prosperity but more pointedly as those whose material prosperity has warped their personal orientation to God and their fellows (as it almost always does). The literal poor have freedom from that state of mind which ensnares the rich in the limited perspectives of this world, lulls them into a foolish self-confidence, and insinuates to them that their material prosperity has its goal simply in their own rich enjoyment of the good things of life.

The Jewish background can also be helpful. In the OT the weak and the afflicted are objects of God's special care (e.g., Deut 10:17–18; Pss 19:17–18; 68:5–6), and part of the hope for a future intervention of God involved the meeting of the needs of the disadvantaged and the destitute (e.g., Ps 132:15; Ezek 34:15–16; Isa 35:5–6). The exile of the sixth century B.C. reduced all of God's people to the status of the afflicted, and in such a context of national disaster God's promise to champion the cause of the poor and afflicted addressed the situation of all (e.g., Isa 49:13; Ezek 34:29; Mic 4:6–7). Despite the sixth-century restoration an important strand of Jewish thought regarded the situation in subsequent centuries as still that of exile (e.g., Dan 9:24, Sir 36; cf. Neh 9:32–37), and the people involved saw themselves as the poor to whom God's promises applied (esp. the Qumran community: 1QH 18.12–15). Patiently bearing the affliction and poverty that God had decreed for the exiles, those at Qumran felt that they had learned the lesson of the exile, and they gloried in their powerlessness apart from God. It is in something like this context of thought that Jesus speaks of the good fortune of the poor. Jesus' preaching is good news for these poor (Luke 4:18; 7:22), because it inaugurates the time for the fulfillment of God's promises. (We should note that there is no glorifying of poverty as such involved in the beatitudes. To be poor, hungry, and weeping is not at all the ideal Christian state [cf. Acts 2:43–47; 4:34].)

The prospect for these poor is the possession of the kingdom of God. When the kingdom of God is spoken of as something that may be possessed (as also in 12:31–32 and 18:16–17), it serves as a comprehensive designation for all the blessings to be brought by the end-time rule of God. Such a rich inheritance contrasts sharply with the deprivations of present poverty.

The hunger and weeping of the second and third beatitudes are to be seen as characteristic manifestations of poverty. The assurance that the needs of the hungry will be met echoes OT promises and may link especially to Ps 22:26 or 107:9. Despite Luke's "now," which tends to separate the time of satisfaction of hunger from the time of announcement, Luke will not restrict the fulfillment to the remote end-time future (9:17; Acts 2:45–46; 4:34–35). Weeping turned to laughter is like Ps 126. Laughter is the release of joy as tears are the release of sorrow.

The form and content of the fourth beatitude are rather different. Coming at the end of the list and being much longer, it attracts to itself greater impor-

tance. Part of this beatitude seems to be based on Isa 66:5. The “exile” afflictions of the poor are climaxed in suffering borne for the sake of the Son of Man (cf. 9:24; 21:17–19). Jesus anticipated ostracism, abuse, and slander of Jewish Christians by their fellow Jews. “Cast out your name as evil” seems to reflect a Semitic idiom and has in mind the spreading abroad of a bad report defaming the name of a person.

The call to rejoice in such affliction (v 23) heightens the paradoxical nature of Jesus’ teaching in these beatitudes. Though there is some Jewish parallel, rejoicing in suffering is to become a distinctively Christian motif (e.g., Acts 5:41; Rom 5:3–4; Heb 10:34). Suffering for the sake of the Son of Man is a privilege accorded by God in this climactic period of the working of his saving purposes. Such suffering may look to a bystander like a reward for wickedness, but the situation is quite the opposite: suffering borne for the sake of the Son of Man has a great reward. The image of a reward or treasure already with God (cf. 12:33; 18:22) makes concrete the certainty with which the final judgment may be anticipated. Rejection may be one’s lot with one’s fellow Jews, but God’s approval is of much greater importance. The great prophets had a similar experience (e.g., 1 Kgs 19:10, 14; Jer 2:30; Neh 9:26).

The beatitudes addressed to present disciples are balanced by woes addressed to absent Jews who have disregarded the ministry of Jesus (despite the second person address they are absent [cf. v 27]). In general the woes closely follow the form of the corresponding beatitudes and provide an inverse formulation for the sentiment of the beatitudes. Where beatitudes are spoken over those who are in a particularly advantageous situation, woes are for those whose situation is a miserable one (though they may not know it).

The woes are declared upon the rich. Riches almost inescapably (18:25) ensnare those who possess them in a false set of values and loyalties which involve a foreshortened perspective in which love for the things of this world proves to be greater than the desire for the kingdom of God (18:23). One cannot serve God and mammon (16:13). The only proper attitude to mammon is an openhanded generosity which is rich in relation to the compassionate concerns of God (12:32–34; 16:9–12) and lays up treasure in heaven and not for oneself on earth (12:21). This for the most part is beyond those who have the greatest stake in, and find themselves most secure in relation to, material well-being in this world. Such people have settled for the consolations that may be had from riches, but they will find that they have been shortchanged by their choice (cf. 16:25). Now the rich are well filled, but their coming hunger will be as real as that of the poor all around them. Now laughter expresses their happiness with their present lot in life, but they live in a fool’s paradise and laughter will give way to tears.

As with the beatitudes the fourth woe is distinctive in form and content. Though Luke in general sets great store upon good public recognition, its validity as a test of truth must ultimately be limited: truth lies with the persecuted rather than with those who gain broad public recognition. False prophets gained general approval (e.g., Isa 30:9–11; Mic 2:11; Jer 5:31) because they represented nothing that would unsettle the status quo. The successful rich are much the same.

The Call to Love of Enemies and Nonjudgmental Generosity (6:27–38)

Bibliography

- Bartsch, H.-W.** "Traditionsgeschichtliches zur 'goldenen Regel' und zum Aposteldekret." *ZNW* 75 (1984) 128–32. **Bauer, W.** "Das Gebot des Feindesliebe und die alten Christen." *Aufsätze und kleine Schriften*. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck) 1967. 235–52. **Benisch, M.** "The Golden Rule as an Expression of Jesus' Preaching." *BangTF* 17 (1985) 83–97. **Couroyer, B.** "De la mesure dont vous mesurez il vous sera mesuré." *RB* 77 (1970) 366–70. **Derrett, J. D. M.** "Christ and Reproof (Matthew 7.1–5/Luke 6.37–42)." *NTS* 34 (1988) 271–81. **Dihle, A.** *Die goldene Regel: Eine Einführung in die Geschichte der antiken und frühchristlichen Vulgärethik*. Studienhefte zur Altertumswissenschaft 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1962. **Dupont, J.** "Soyez parfaits' (Mt., V., 48) 'Soyez miséricordieux' (Lc., VI., 36)." In *Sacra Pagina II*, ed. J. Coppens et al. BETL 13. Paris/Gembloux: Gebalda/Duculot, 1959. 150–62. ———. "L'appel à imiter Dieu en Matthieu 5,48 et Luc 6,36." *RivB* 14 (1966) 137–58. **Fiebig, P.** "Jesu Worte über die Feindesliebe." *TSK* 91 (1918) 30–64, 305–6. **Funk, R. W.** "The Beatitudes and Turn the Other Cheek: Recommendations and Polling." *Forum* 2 (1986) 103–28. **Lambrecht, J.** "The Sayings of Jesus on Nonviolence." *LouvStud* 12 (1987) 291–305. **Linskens, J.** "A Pacifist Interpretation of Peace in the Sermon on the Mount?" *Conc* 164 (1983) 16–25. **Lührmann, D.** "Liebet eure Feinde (Lk 6,27–36/Mt 5,39–48)." *ZTK* 69 (1972) 412–38. **Moulder, J.** "Who Are My Enemies? An Exploration of the Semantic Background of Christ's Command." *JTSA* 25 (1978) 41–49. **Neugebauer, F.** "Die dargebotene Wange und Jesu Gebot der Feindesliebe: Erwägungen zu Lk 6,27–36/Mt 5,38–48." *TLZ* 110 (1985) 865–76. **Nissen, A.** *Gott und der Nächste im antiken Judentum: Untersuchungen zum Doppelgebot der Liebe*. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1974. 304–29. **Pernot, H.** "Une correction à Luc VI,35." *CRAIBL* (1929) 277–80. **Piper, J.** "Love Your Enemies": Jesus' Love Command in the Synoptic Gospels and in the Early Christian Paraenesis. A History of the Tradition and Interpretation of Its Uses. SNTSMS 38. Cambridge: University Press, 1979. **Rausch, J.** "The Principle of Non-resistance and Love of Enemy in Mt. 5,38–48." *CBQ* 28 (1966) 31–41. **Rüger, H. P.** "Mit welchem Mass ihr messt, wird euch gemessen werden (Mt 7:2, Gen 38:25–26)." *ZNW* 60 (1969) 174–82. **Sahlin, H.** "Traditionskritische Bemerkungen zu zwei Evangelienperikopen." *ST* 33 (1979) 69–84, esp. 69–77. **Sauer, J.** "Traditionsgeschichtliche Erwägungen zu den synoptischen und paulinischen Aussagen über Feindesliebe und Wiedervergeltungsverzicht." *ZNW* 76 (1985) 1–28. **Schneider, G.** "Die Neuheit der christlichen Nächstenliebe." *TTZ* 82 (1973) 257–75. **Schottroff, L.** "Non-violence and the Love of One's Enemies." In *Essays on the Love Commandment*, ed. L. Schottroff et al. Tr. R. H. and I. Fuller. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978. 9–39. **Schulz, S. Q.** *Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten*. 120–41. **Schwarz, G.** "μηδὲν ἀπελπιζοντες." *ZNW* 71 (1980) 133–35. **Seitz, O. J. F.** "Love Your Enemies: The Historical Setting of Matthew v. 43 f.; Luke vi. 27 f." *NTS* 16 (1969–70) 39–54. **Spicq, C.** *Agapè dans le Nouveau Testament*. 1:120–37. **Tannehill, R. C.** *The Sword of His Mouth*. 107–14. **Unnik, W. C. van.** "Die Motivierung der Feindesliebe in Lukas vi 32–35." *NovT* 8 (1966) 284–300. **Wolpert, W.** "Die Liebe zum Nächsten, zum Feind und zum Sünder." *TGl* 74 (1984) 262–82.

Translation

²⁷ “But to you I say, to those who hear, ‘Love your enemies; do good to those who hate you; ²⁸ bless those who curse you; pray for those who threaten you. ²⁹ To him who strikes you on the cheek, offer also the other; and from him who takes your cloak, do not refuse your tunic, as well; ³⁰ to all who ask of you give; and from him who takes what is yours, do not ask for it back. ³¹ Just as you wish that people should treat you,^a treat them in the same way.

³² ‘If you love those who love you, what credit is it to you? For even sinners love those who love them. ³³ And if you do good to those who do good to you, what credit is it to you? Even sinners do the same. ³⁴ And if you lend to those from whom you hope to receive, what credit is^b it to you? Even sinners lend to sinners that they might receive in return the same favor.^c ³⁵ Rather, love your enemies and do good and lend, expecting nothing^d in return; and your reward will be great, and you will be sons of the Most High, for he is kind to the ungrateful and evil. ³⁶ Be compassionate, just as your Father is compassionate.

³⁷ ‘Do not judge, and you will not be judged; do not condemn,^e and you will not be condemned; forgive, and you will be forgiven; ³⁸ give and it shall be given to you—good measure, pressed down, shaken together, running over will be poured into your lap. For ^fby means of the measure with which^f you measure shall you receive measure in return.’”

Notes

^a \aleph A D K L P etc. conform the text to Matthew at this point with an added *καὶ ὑμῖς*, “also you.”

^b The verb is probably not expressed in the Greek (as $\text{P}^{45,75}$ B 700 c).

^c “Favor” is added for the sense.

^d *μηδέν* is read by \aleph W X* Ξ Π * etc. to allow the more normal sense for *ἀπελπίζοντες* (see *Comment*).

^e *δικάζετε*, “judge” “condemn,” is read by P^{75} B 579 and may be original. The corresponding form *δικασθήτε* is read by $\text{P}^{75\text{vid}}$ B later in the verse.

^f There are several variants for this phrase. Some texts omit the *γάρ*, “for”: $\text{P}^{45\text{vid}}$ Θ syr^s etc. Some add *τῷ αὐτῷ*, “the same”: $\text{P}^{45\text{vid}}$ Θ A C K P etc. f^1 adds an additional ψ , “by which.” X 1216 etc. make this a *τῷ*, “the.”

Form/Structure/Setting

Where vv 20–23 proclaim the good fortune of the disciples gathered before Jesus, who in their poverty have recognized in him the working of God and have taken their stand with him, and vv 24–26 as the dark side of the good news to the poor declare woes upon the indifferent rich, vv 27–38 provide directions for the disciples in coming along with the plan of God in this time when the fulfillment of God’s eschatological purposes begins. On the larger structure of the sermon see at vv 17–19.

For vv 27–36 Luke combines material from two of the Matthean antitheses (Matt 5:43–48, 38–42) with the golden rule (v 31), which Matthew uses much later in the sermon (Matt 7:12). The synonymous parallelism of Luke 6:27–28 will be more original than Matthew’s abbreviated form in Matt 5:44. However, Matthew seems to be more original with his agricultural imagery in 5:45 than

Luke with his more abstract statement in 6:35. The antithesis format of Matthew's text is probably secondary, but not this separate presentation of the love-of-enemies material and the turning-the-other-cheek material. In Luke's source the material on being sons of God (v 35) will have followed vv 27–28 (cf. Matt 5:44–45). The introduction of vv 29–31 as an expansion of vv 27–28 has disturbed this order. In relocating this dislocated motif Luke has been guided by the additional reference to being like God found at the end of the traditional unit Luke is following (cf. Matt 5:48). To this end, he has formulated the list of demands in v 35 (modeled after vv 27–28 but in light of vv 32–34) as a connective to which he can attach the dislocated material. The introduction of vv 29–30 is also responsible for v 34 whose reference to lending has come from the tradition behind v 30 (cf. Matt 5:42). Luke will also have been responsible for inserting v 30 into the section on love of enemies. It is not clear whether Matthew has added or Luke deleted the law-court setting for Luke 6:29–30 (Matt 5:39–42); probably the latter.

The connection of vv 37–38 to the love-of-enemy material appears to be pre-Lukan and to have been disturbed in Matthew by the introduction of other material. Matthew has also abbreviated the material. For more detailed source judgments see below in *Comment*.

The whole section is marked by an extensive use of parallelism. In vv 27–28 there is a fourfold parallelism which subdivides into two paralleled pairs. The same is found in vv 29–30 (the generalizing “all” in v 30 goes beyond the parallelism). There is a threefold parallelism in vv 32–34, though in this case the formal equivalence is not strictly maintained in the wording: (i) in the first case the conditional clause uses *ei* (“if”) + indicative (contrast Matt 5:46); in the other instances *ἐάν* (“if”) + subjunctive is used; (ii) the second, but not the third, example is introduced by *καὶ γάρ* (“for even”); by contrast, in the explanatory clauses *καὶ γάρ* is found only in the first example; (iii) the first explanatory clause spells out the reciprocal behavior of sinners where the second is content with “even sinners do the same,” and the third, while it spells out the reciprocal behavior, breaks the parallelism by speaking of sinners lending to sinners; (iv) the third example stands a little to one side with its consideration of the quite specific activity of lending, but also because it does not speak of lending to those from whom one has been able to borrow.

Structurally the section breaks into a larger section on love of enemies (vv 27–36) and a briefer section on being nonjudgmental (vv 37–38). The love-of-enemies part consists in its first half of an opening statement of the principle (vv 27–28), followed by concrete illustrations of its implementation (v 29), broadening out in the generalizing v 30, and given its widest scope in the golden rule's practical definition of love in v 31. In its second half, love of enemies is contrasted with a reciprocity ethic by means of three rhetorical questions with appended explanatory comments (vv 32–34), which give way to a restatement (v 35a) of the principle (in a form now colored by the questions in vv 32–34), which is in turn supported by a promise of reward (v 35b) and further by the example of God, whose nobility one should imitate and thus behave like his sons (v 35cd). This last point is reiterated in a call to imitate the mercy of God (v 36).

The section on being nonjudgmental consists of a fourfold parallelism enjoined

ing a generosity of spirit toward others as necessary for those who wish God to deal in a generous spirit of mercy toward them (vv 37–38a). The last of the parallel statements is expanded to make the point that God is yet more generous again than anything he calls us to (v 38b). The section comes to an end (v 38c) with the statement of the principle that mercy and generosity to others (or their lack) will be treated by God as a declaration that such is the coinage we wish to have used in God's dealings with us as well.

Comment

Identified in vv 20–26 as people of great good fortune through their poverty and identification with the Son of Man, the disciples are in vv 27–38 directed to that love of enemy and nonjudgmental generosity by means of which they may come along with the plan of God in this time when the fulfillment of God's eschatological purposes begins.

27–28 After addressing the absent rich, the sermon returns its attention to those who have come to hear. The transition is marked by the opening “but,” the emphatic position of the “to you,” and the echoing of v 18 in the “to those who hear.” Luke is responsible for this opening clause: *ὑμῖν λέγω*, “to you I say,” is Lukan (11:9; 16:9; 12:22 [?]); v 18, which is here referred back to, is Lukan; the *πλὴν/ἀλλὰ* (“but”/“but”) pattern (vv 24, 27) is Lukan redaction in 11:41, 42. Luke has in vv 27–36 combined materials found in two of the Matthean antitheses (Matt 5:43–48, 38–42). The behavior called for by Jesus is not so much a set of conditions as it is a set of directions for discipleship.

Consisting of four lines of synonymous parallelism (lines grouped in pairs), the statement with which the Lukan directives open is more original than the abbreviated Matthean form in Matt 5:44 and is likely to reflect a Semitic original (cf. v 22). The love commanded by Jesus is no sentiment but rather the active pursuance of the enemies' good, and that not grudgingly or only in an exterior manner but from the heart. For the pairing of “enemies” and “those who hate” cf. at 1:71. In view are those who stand opposed to the ones who are cleaving to God (cf. at v 22). “Do good” indicates the active tenor of the love called for. The calls to “bless” and “pray for” intensify the demand for love of the enemy, since these activities are deeply personal expressions of the orientation of the inner person (cf. Schürmann, 344). *ἐπηρεάζειν* can mean “threaten,” “mistreat” or “abuse” (BAGD, 285). Perhaps the best antithesis to “pray” is provided by “threaten.”

The call for love of enemy is in itself not as uniquely Christian as is sometimes maintained. In the OT in the context of individual personal enmity there is Exod 23:4–5 and Prov 25:21–22. Already the love of neighbor enjoined in Lev 19:18 stands over against the taking of vengeance and the bearing of a grudge. An early Babylonian wisdom text enjoins: “Do not return evil to the man who disputes with you; requite with kindness your evil-doer . . . smile on your adversary. If your ill-wisher is [] nurture him.” (*Counsels of Wisdom*, lines 41–45; cited from the translation of W. G. Lambert, *Babylonian Wisdom Literature* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1960] 101; cf. Schneider, *TTZ* 82 [1973] 263). At Qumran it was said: “To no man will I render the reward of evil, with goodness will I pursue each one” (1QS 10.17–18). Seneca, a near contemporary

of Jesus (c. 5 B.C. to A.D. 65), wrote, "If you wish to imitate the gods, do good deeds also to the ungrateful; for the sun also goes up upon the evil, and the sea stands open even to pirates" (*Ben.* 4.26.1; and cf. *Otio* 1.4; *Vita* 20.5). Somewhat later than Jesus, the Stoic philosopher Epictetus (A.D. 55 to c. 135) wrote, "For this too is a very pleasant strand woven into the Cynic's pattern of life; he must needs be flogged like an ass, and while he is being flogged he must love the men who flog him, as though he were the father and brother of them all" (*Discourses* 3.22.54). For additional texts see Schottroff, "Non-violence," 32 n. 34, and the literature cited there.

Schottroff has demonstrated the importance of the socio-historical context for determining the meaning of love for enemies (and the related nonresistance of evil). To love one's enemy can be to rise above (the pettiness of) one's own personal animosities in the interest of the community of the People of God (thus Lev 19:18; Exod 23:4-5). Somewhat similar is the more abstractly conceived humanitarian basis for doing good to all and absorbing hurt rather than returning it in kind (e.g., Seneca, *Ep.* 95.52-53). To return kindness to one's opponent can also be a strategy to seek to contain the damage a powerful antagonist may inflict (*Counsels of Wisdom*, lines 41-45, is a strategy to avoid entanglement in legal disputes with all their pitfalls). Again, such actions can express the magnanimity of the emperor, who by refraining from vengeance and through active kindness to his (defeated) foes demonstrates a concern for the well-being of his subjects that gains their allegiance and loyalty (cf. Schottroff, "Non-violence," 18-20; in a more general context the principle is stated well by Cicero, *Off.* 2.22-24, "The most suitable means to win and maintain power is love, the most unsuitable is fear. . . . For fear is a terrible guardian for lasting certainty; but upon love one can firmly rely, even for ever"). Sometimes interest is focused on the enemies' moment of vulnerability which becomes the occasion for the demonstration of moral superiority or greater nobility (cf. 1 Sam 24:18; Prov 24:21-22; Philo, *Virtues* 117; Seneca, *Ira* 2.33.2). The contrary example may be directed toward the enemy's reformation (the tenth to sixth century B.C. Egyptian wisdom text *Instruction of Amen-em-opet* 4.20-5.6 is quite clear: "So steer that we may bring the wicked man across. . . . Fill his belly with bread of thine, so that he may be sated and may be ashamed" [*ANET*, 422]). Somewhat similar but coming from a position of weakness rather than of strength is the action of the philosopher who, in line with a tradition going back to Plato's interpretation of Socrates' death, when rejected as a disconcerting teacher by society and its leaders, "accepts their blows without resisting in order to proclaim the rottenness of society, not only in words but also in his body" (Schottroff, "Non-violence," 22). The moral superiority of the philosopher to his accusers is manifest in his readiness to suffer wrong rather than act shamefully (Plato, *Gorgias* 508c-509c). The context for Epictetus' Cynic's love of those who flog him is the Cynic's strong sense of providential appropriateness about everything that happens to him: there is nothing to resent. At Qumran the concern is to leave God to do the judging: one should not presumptuously preempt what it is God's to decide about and act upon. Finally, though the list is by no means complete, the impartial dispensing of goodness without regard to the merit of the recipient can be to imitate the nobility of God or the gods (Seneca, *Ben.* 4.26.1; *Exod. Rab.* 26:2 to 17:8).

The command of Jesus in its Lukan context exhibits a certain kinship to more than one of the above possibilities but is not identical with any of them. What Jesus enjoins is in no way a virtue for the powerful. Nor is it a manifestation of community solidarity (or solidarity with humankind). Nor is it a counsel of self-interest. Nor is it based on the Cynic's assessment that no real evil has been done to one. It is certainly an imitation of God (Luke 6:35). It is also clearly an exercise in moral superiority, yet more dramatic than that of the philosophers. Jesus calls for an aggressive pitting of good against evil. This is a thoroughly evangelistic strategy which denies the social reality of two mutually exclusive groups (the Christians and those who persecute them); it takes up and radicalizes the highest demands group solidarity might impose and asks for these to be practiced in relation to the enemy. There is a kinship with Jesus' fellowship with sinners in this aggressive attempt to establish community with those who are alienated from the community of God's People (cf. Schottroff, "Non-violence," 22–27). The directive of Jesus stands in sharpest contrast to the most common view of enmity in the ancient world: "I considered it established that one should do harm to one's enemies and be of service to one's friends" (Lysias, *Pro Milite* 20). It is also to be contrasted with the ethic of Qumran that calls for love of the sons of light and hatred for the sons of darkness (e.g., 1QS 1.9–10).

29–30 The change from second person plural to singular here betrays Luke's conflation of sources. Material from Matthew's fifth antithesis (Matt 5:38–42) is here subordinated to the principle of love of enemy. The use of *τύπτειν* for "to strike" rather than Matthew's *ῥαπίζειν* is probably Lukan (Luke-Acts has nine of thirteen NT occurrences), as is the participial construction (cf. Jeremias, *Sprache*, 142, 116) which helps to conform v 29 to v 28. Matthew's clarifying "right" will not have been in Luke's source: he would not have deleted it (cf. 6:6; 22:50). *παρέχειν*, "to offer/give," for Matthew's *στρέφειν*, "to turn," will also be Luke's alteration (nine of sixteen occurrences). It is difficult to be sure whether Matthew added or Luke deleted the law-court setting for the loss of "tunic" and "cloak": good redactional reasons can be offered in both directions.

Offering the other cheek and giving up one's garments are for Luke no more than concrete examples of love for enemy put into practice. These are dramatic illustrations of an attitude that remains totally open to the action of the other, despite the provocations of hurt, insult, and material loss. Again we have an aggressive attempt to establish community: provocative acts are to be responded to as though they were instances of neighborly interaction. Standing as it does in parallel with "offer," Luke's "do not refuse" is probably an example of a figure of speech in which the negation of the opposite action stands for the positive urging of a course of action. So "do not refuse" means "offer." If we may draw the distinction, what is envisaged is the behavior of an enemy, not of a criminal: the mistreatment is religious persecution. The setting presupposes the Christian community as a disapproved-of minority, more or less socially disenfranchised, the mistreatment of whom will have to a large degree at least the tacit approval of the wider community.

V 30 serves to generalize the injunctions of v 29. Luke's added "all" and present form for the imperative "give" (repeated actions) achieve this generalization, as does the repetition in a generalized form of the idea of having things

taken from you (this replaces Matthew's final clause in 5:42, which will have stood in Luke's source, as is evidenced by his use of its verb in vv 34 and 35). In the context as thus modified by Luke, the "asking" is no longer the request of a beggar, but rather the request made by one who has the upper hand, which if not acceded to leads easily to "taking." When cynically taken advantage of by the enemies of the faith, the Christian disciple is to treat the requests made to him as though they were springing from genuine need, and the goods taken from him as though they had all along been the property of the one who despoils him.

This teaching raises questions to which it does not necessarily offer answers. Clearly it has little relationship to a policy of nonretaliation as recommended in enlightened Roman court circles (e.g., Seneca, *Ira* 2.32.1; cf. *Ep. Arist.* 227). There we are dealing with no more than a policy of clemency, strongly colored by the desire to appear noble and to be successful. It is also to be distinguished from teaching about leaving vengeance and the vindication of God's People to God alone (e.g., Rom 12:19; *b. Gitt.* 7a; *Joseph and Asenath* 28.4). Jesus' words here also go far beyond calling for a spirit of forgiveness and nonretaliation, especially in light of one's own need for God's forgiveness (see Sir 27:30–28:7; Str-B, 1:425–26; Luke 11:4; Matt 6:14–15; 18:21–22, 35). The Lukan text stops short of the Matthean text's more general: "Do not resist [him who is] evil" (Matt 5:39), the echoes of which we may see in Jas 5:6 and 1 Cor 6:7 (does the law-court setting there favor the originality of Matthew's legal setting for these injunctions?). The (presumably exemplary) response to insult and persecution in Acts discourages a fully literal application of Jesus' words (persecution was fled from, not welcomed: Acts 8:2; 9:25; 14:5–6; etc.; the other cheek was not exactly turned: Acts 23:2–3; cf. John 18:22–23; Paul protected himself through the Roman legal system: Acts 22:25; 25:10–12). No doubt it is helpful in a broader ethical discussion to speak of the enjoined behavior as a breaking of the chain of evil action and reaction. But the Lukan context is more focused than that, and in any case questions remain about the relationship between evil born as religious persecution and evil born from what is simply criminal action, about the place of self-defense where there is danger to life and limb, about the constraint of evil in society (cf. Rom 13:4), about the place for some kind of pursuit of equity (cf. 1 Cor 6:1–5; but contrast Luke 12:13–15), and about the relationship of the Christian to society in a context not dominantly determined by persecution. The appeal for an attitude of aggressive openness to one's opponent despite the cost is clear enough. Defining the boundaries of applicability and the relationship of this concern to other (perhaps equally valid) concerns is not.

31 It is doubtful whether v 31 formed an original unity with either the preceding or the following materials. A return to the second person plural marks a break between vv 28–30 and v 31. The denial of any reciprocity ethic in vv 32–35 makes it difficult (see below) to connect v 31 with what follows. Matthew locates the golden rule as a separate item much later in his sermon and appends, "for this is the Law and the Prophets" (Matt 7:12; cf. 22:40). The minor verbal differences between the Matthean and Lukan form are all well accounted for as Lukan stylistic alterations (cf. Dupont, *Béatitudes* 1:173 n. 1; against Jeremias, *Sprache*, 144). It is probably Luke who has repositioned the saying.

The Lukan context produces a sense of the golden rule dramatically different from what is intended by the use of similar sayings in earlier ethical discussion. Various forms (both positive and negative) of the golden rule predate the Gospel usage in both the Jewish and the Greco-Roman world, and they are almost without exception concerned with moral consistency or with an ethic of reciprocity. There are various nuances: one should act as to establish a moral claim to appropriate behavior toward oneself from one's superiors/inferiors by oneself behaving appropriately to one's own inferiors/superiors (Isocrates, *To Nicocles* 49, *To Demonicus* 14); one's moral claim on another depends upon the standard one sets in one's own behavior to the other (Publius Syrus, *Sententiae* 2; Ovid, *Ex Ponto* 3.1.71; Seneca, *Ep.* 94.43; cf. Xenophon, *Cyropaedia* 6.1.47); one should measure one's moral obligations to others by what one would wish for from others (Isocrates, *Aegineticus* 51; Demosthenes, *Prooemia* 22.3; Pseudo-Menander 39–40; Tob 4:15; *Ep. Arist.* 207); one should transfer consistently to where one is in the position of the superior/inferior the moral perceptions one has of mutual duties when one is occupying the opposite position (Isocrates, *To Nicocles* 24, 62; *Panegyricus* 81; Seneca, *Ep.* 47.11; cf. 2 *Enoch* 61.1); what seems bad when others do it (to oneself) should not be countenanced for one's own actions (Herodotus 3.142; Isocrates, *To Nicocles* 61; Pseudo-Philip of Macedonia, *Epistle* 2.4; Philo, *Hypothetica* [Eusebius, *Praep. evang.* 8.7.6]; *T. Napht.* [Hebrew] 1.6; *b. Šabb.* 31a); one should be directed by the fact that the effect on others of one's actions will be not unlike the effect that similar action would have on oneself (Seneca, *Ben.* 2.1.1.). In the Lukan context the sense becomes: one's actions to the other should be determined not at all by the actual behavior of the other, but only by what one would recognize as the good if one were on the receiving end. In this sense it defines a more general content for the love of enemy for which vv 27–30 have been calling. (This is better than Dihle's treatment [*Goldene Regel*, 113–18] of the verse as a statement of what is the normal secular norm [the verb is read as indicative and not imperative], which is then to be criticized in vv 32–35.)

32 In vv 32–36 the theme of love of enemy is pursued in its contrast to the reciprocal ethic which in most people's lives determines the scope of love and practical kindness. The section is based on the traditional material reflected by Matt 5:45–48, but shows marks of a considerable Lukan development (see *Form/Structure/Setting* above). *ποία ὑμῶν χάρις ἐστίν*, "what kind of credit to you is that," is probably Lukan (Matt 5:46 has "what reward do you have"). For the idiom cf. 1 Cor 9:16 (variant reading). Van Unnik's attempt (*NovT* 8 [1966] 284–300, esp. 295–97) to understand *χάρις* (lit., "grace") here directly from the concepts and language of the current Greco-Roman reciprocity ethic (a favor in response to one is called a favor [*χάρις*] still, but does not deserve the name) is finally not persuasive because of the *ὑμῶν*, "to you," and the lack of precise parallels. Rather, by a kind of metonymy *χάρις* in its meaning of "thanks" (cf. BAGD, 878) stands for that which is the cause for thanks. Van Unnik documents helpfully (mostly following H. Bollcestein, *Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege im vorchristlichen Altertum* [Utrecht: Oosthoek, 1939]) the pervasiveness in the Greco-Roman world of the principle of reciprocity as the basis for social interaction: one acts in a generous way in order to make friends so

that in the future one may get return from these friends; one makes return to those from whom one has received proof of friendship. Only exceptionally were moralists critical of this self-serving approach (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1167b.31; Seneca, *Ben.* 2.31.2; Cicero, *De officiis* 1.48–49). Luke saw the teaching of Jesus as radically critical of such a self-serving ethic (cf. 14:12–14).

Matthew uses for his explanatory clause the rhetorical question: “Do not the tax collectors do the same?” Luke has a *καὶ γάρ* (“for even”) clause, uses the more general “sinners” (which he also uses in the following examples; Matthew has “Gentiles” in his second example), and repetitiously spells out the content of “the same” (this is true also of the third example, but not of the second where “do the same” suffices). More likely than not the changes are Luke’s, except for the *καὶ γάρ* clause which may be traditional (*καὶ γάρ* has an intensifying force elsewhere in Luke-Acts only at 7:8 and 11:4 where it is traditional; *οὐχί* [(“is it) not”] is introduced by Matthew [6:25?; 13:56; 18:12?]). Wrege (*Bergpredigt*, 90–91) may be right that the use of “sinners” here is not Lukan, in which case we have here an instance of divergence between the forms of the sermon tradition used by Matthew and Luke.

33 The Semitic interest in greeting (cf. Matt 10:12; Luke 10:4) suggests that Matthew’s “greet” is earlier than Luke’s “do good.” *ἀγαθοποιεῖν*, “to do good,” is a quite rare word in pre-Christian Greek. For Luke’s use cf. 1 Macc 11:33; Tob 12:13; *Ep. Arist.* 242. Its use here is inspired by Luke 6:27 (cf. 6:9) with its juxtaposition of loving and doing good. The reference is to any kind of practical benefit.

34 Beyond Matthew’s two examples Luke has a third, inspired by the tradition behind v 30 (cf. Matt 5:42). In the NT *δανείζειν*, “to lend,” is found only here (with v 35) and in Matt 5:42. Where vv 32 and 33 contemplate a response to those who love or do good to one, here there is initiative with a view to future return. Since the charging of interest (to fellow Jews) is forbidden in the OT (Exod 22:25; Lev 25:35–37; Deut 23:20; Str-B, 1:346–53), lending is not investment but kindness and crisis relief (cf. Ps 112:5; Sir 29:1–2). What is it that the lender hopes to receive? Is it the recovery of principal (one lends only to good risks), interest, or similar treatment when one wishes to borrow? Only the last makes good sense in the context. Luke makes it quite clear with his “even sinners lend to sinners” that he has in mind throughout the section the practice of a closed community of common interest to which the community-transcending behavior of Christians is to form an antithesis (cf. at vv 27–28).

35 Dislocated from its position after vv 27–28 (see *Form/Structure/Setting* above), the material on sonship is now provided with an introduction by means of a positive summarizing reiteration of the point of vv 32–34. Luke takes the opportunity to make clear that love of enemy is still the theme and begins to round off his section with the mention again of love of enemies. *ἀπελπίζειν* normally means “to despair” but here the etymologically possible but otherwise unattested sense “to hope for something back” is required. The oddness of this sense has produced the textual variant *μηδένα*, “no one,” for *μηδέν*, “nothing,” which allows the sense “disappointing no one.” The reward language suppressed in vv 32–34 surfaces now in a form reminiscent of v 23 (see there): Luke is quite emphatic that goodness has its reward from God, but in vv 32–

34 he is careful to avoid any suggestion of an alternative self-serving ethic based upon a reckoning into the equation of the divine recompense. Reward is not payment: it is the concrete form of God's approval.

Matthew has (5:46) "that you may be[come] sons of your Father in heaven." For "your Father," he has probably been influenced by the following verse, so Luke's "sons of the Most High" may be original (cf. Ps 82:6; Luke 1:32). To be a son of God here is not a verdict of the future judgment (against Bartsch, *TZ* 16 [1960] 12; Schürmann, 355; etc). It is rather the present manifestation in the believer through love of enemy of a nobility like that of God who is kind even to the ungrateful.

Matthew's description of God's behavior (Matt 5:45) is more concrete, Luke's more abstract. It is the Matthean form with its agricultural perspective which is readily paralleled (*Exod. Rab.* 26:2 to 17:8; Seneca, *Ben.* 4.26.1; Str-B, 1:374–76). *χρηστός ἐπὶ* (lit., "kind upon") is unusual and the *ἐπὶ* may be a relic of something closer to the Matthean form (Schürmann, 356 n. 95). The use of the same root in *χάρις* ("thanks"; vv 32–34), *χρηστός* ("kind") and *ἀχάριστος* ("ungrateful") may betray a Lukan stylistic touch (Guelich, *Sermon*, 230; and cf. Schürmann, 356 n. 101). As was the case with the behavior of the believer (cf. at vv 27, 29), this kindness of God is a standing appeal to the ungrateful for a change of heart (cf. Rom 2:4).

36 Some link this verse with what follows and others with what precedes. The latter is to be preferred for the following reasons: (i) being like God is the theme of both vv 35 and 36; (ii) the interest of v 36 in the imitation of God does not mesh well with the theme in vv 37–38 of being treated by God as one treats other people; (iii) the equivalent material in Matthew (5:48) is oriented to what comes before; (iv) the universal compassion of God (cf. Sir 18:13; Ps 145:8–9) models well the kindness not based on reciprocity to which the disciple is called. Dupont ("Soyez parfaits," *RivB* 14 [1966] 137–58) has argued convincingly that the Lukan form is more original than the Matthean and reflects Jesus' own characteristic starting point in the action and character of God. In the OT *οἰκτίρων*, "compassionate," and behind that the Hebrew *רחום*, *rahûm*, are used dominantly of a divine attribute. The call to imitate God's compassion is not to be found directly in the OT (but cf. Deut 10:18–19) but is well rooted in Jewish tradition (e.g., *Mek. Exod.* 15:2; *Sipre Deut.* 11:22). Where in v 35 to be a son of God is a goal for one's actions, in v 36 having God as Father is the starting point from which imitation proceeds. At a literary level, the Lukan reordering which brings the related statements in vv 35 and 36 into immediate juxtaposition is less successful than the earlier format which allowed v 36 to take up in a climactic way the thought of v 35 (end) after an intervening development (i.e., roughly the materials of vv 32–34; see the order of Matt 5:44–48).

37 In the unit vv 37–38 we move beyond what is strictly the theme of love of enemies. These verses have, however, been introduced at this point because the starting point for their exhortations is a recognition of the merciful ways of God. There is thus an easy transition from vv 35–36. The location is probably pre-Lukan but has been disturbed in the Matthean sermon (7:1–2) by the introduction of extra materials. Two negative prohibitions (v 37ab) in identical form are balanced by two positive directives (vv 37c, 38a) in near-

identical form (the last is provided with a development in the remainder of v 38). Matthew's shorter form would seem to be an abbreviation (cf. Schürmann, 362), but difficulties in relating the requirements to one another places a question mark over the original unity of the section (was the section on giving added from another tradition for the sake of the note of plentifulness in God's dealings which it adds?). God prefers to act in mercy, but he who wants to put another on trial invites God to put him on trial; he who condemns another for his failings invites God to condemn him for his own failings. *b. Roš. Haš.* 16b is similar: "Three things call a man's iniquities to mind, namely . . . and calling for judgment on one's fellow man" (cf. *b. Meg.* 28a). The assumption is that none of us can survive God's scrutiny according to strict justice. Expressed in positive form the call is for the practice of forgiveness.

38 Forgiveness involves setting a person free from the past and the obligations of recompense that attach to his actions. But Jesus' demand is yet more radical. One is not only to forgo the right to recompense but beyond that to extend openhanded generosity to the other person (cf. Acts 20:35). And he who extends such generosity may do so in confident expectation that he will be the beneficiary of God's superabundant generosity (cf. Luke 18:29–30). The "good measure" here is a generous measure. The imagery is that of the measuring out of grain by volume. The giver presses down and shakes the grain to fit in as much as possible, and not content with even this full measure, he piles it above the rim of the measure to the point where it cannot be contained by the measure and spills out. The *κόλπος* may be the fold of the garment at the girdle which served as a kind of large pocket (cf. Exod 4:6–7; Ps 74:11; Isa 65:6; etc.). Alternatively, where a large quantity is stressed (as here), the meaning may be the lap, in which case the skirt of the garment becomes the receptacle (cf. 2 Sam 12:8; Ruth 3:15).

The concluding statement of the verse has its ultimate origin in the terms of grain contracts in which it was frequently specified that grain delivery and payment therefor would be measured with the same instrument—that of the purchaser (see Couroyer, *RB* 77 [1970] 366–70). Similar statements are used proverbially in a variety of Jewish sources (see Rüger, *ZNW* 60 [1969] 174–82). Despite the verbal link with the instruction on giving (with the word "measure") it is best to apply the concluding statement to the whole of the fourfold unit. If we place others on trial, condemn them, withhold forgiveness, and lack generosity, we must expect God to respond in the coinage of strict justice. Mercy and generosity to others is a declaration to God that such is the coinage we wish to have used in his dealings with us as well. Here Matthew's wording is probably more original (7:2), but the difference is slight. Mark 4:24 has the Matthean wording in quite a different context.

Explanation

Vv 20–26 have identified the disciples as people of great good fortune through their poverty and identification with the Son of Man. Now in vv 27–38 the disciples are directed to love of enemies and nonjudgmental generosity. Only by these means can they live out their lives in that sphere in which they have heard from Jesus the good news to the poor.

After addressing the absent rich, the sermon returns its attention in vv 27-28 to those who have come to hear (cf. v 18). Jesus calls to a practical love of enemies that is no mere sentiment but the active pursuance of the enemies' good, and that not grudgingly or only in an exterior manner but from the heart. The enemies who hate are most pointedly those who oppose the Christian disciples in relation to their loyalty to God in Jesus. Blessing and praying for are not to be viewed as formal acts but as deeply personal expressions of the orientation of the inner person.

Jesus was not the only person in antiquity to press for love of enemies in some shape or other. Others have called for the rising above one's personal animosities in the interests of the community or of humanity. Others have recognized that kindness to a powerful antagonist may contain the damage his hostility is likely to inflict. So also the wisdom of love for (defeated) enemies has been commended as an imperial tactic, calculated to inculcate allegiance and loyalty. Kindness to one's enemy in his moment of weakness has been seen as a demonstration of moral superiority or greater nobility, and may even serve to win over the enemy. The philosophers made eloquent protest against the rottenness of their society by submitting with good grace to its miscarriage of justice. The Cynic philosophers loved those who flogged them in view of the providential appropriateness of all that came their way. The Qumran community returned good for evil secure in the knowledge that God would inflict vengeance. Both pagan and Jewish thinkers could commend the impartial dispensing of goodness as an imitation of God or the gods.

Jesus' directive shares common ground with some of these but goes beyond. It is certainly in imitation of God (cf. 6:35) and is clearly an exercise in moral superiority, yet more dramatic than that of the philosophers. Jesus calls for an aggressive pitting of good against evil. Here is a thoroughly evangelistic strategy that deliberately overlooks the social reality of two mutually exclusive groups (the Christians and those who persecute them). It takes up and pushes to an extreme the highest demands love might impose in a situation of close community and asks for this to be practiced in relation to the enemy. There is a kinship with Jesus' fellowship with sinners in this aggressive attempt to establish community with those who are alienated from and hostile to the community of God's People.

For Luke, offering the other cheek and giving up one's garments are no more than concrete examples of love for enemy put into practice. These are dramatic illustrations of an attitude that remains totally open to the actions of the other, despite the provocations of hurt, insult, and material loss: provocative acts are to be responded to as though they were instances of neighborly interaction. (By a figure of speech "do not refuse" should be understood to imply positively "offer.") The situation envisaged is one of religious persecution in an environment where the Christian community is a disapproved-of minority, more or less socially disenfranchised, the mistreatment of whom will have to a large degree at least the tacit approval of the wider society. V 30 serves to generalize the injunctions of v 29 and the asking and taking there belong in the same hostile context. When cynically taken advantage of by the enemies of the faith, the Christian disciple is to treat the requests made to him as

though they sprang from genuine need, and the goods taken from him as though they had all along been the property of the one who despoils him.

This teaching raises questions to which it does not necessarily offer answers. The presumably exemplary response to insult and persecution in Acts discourages a fully literal application of Jesus' words in every case (e.g., Acts 8:2; 9:25; 22:25; 23:2–3; cf. John 18:22–23). The enjoined behavior certainly breaks the chain of evil action and reaction. But how do we handle criminal action as opposed to religious persecution? Is there a place for self-defense in cases of danger to life and limb? And what about the constraint of evil in society (cf. Rom 13:4) and the redress of inequity (cf. 1 Cor 6:1–5; but contrast Luke 12:13–15)? The appeal for an attitude of aggressive openness to one's opponents despite the cost is clear enough, but defining the boundaries of applicability and the relationship of this concern to other (perhaps equally valid) concerns is not so clear.

The golden rule has quite a history of usage prior to Jesus in various forms in both the Jewish and Greco-Roman worlds. These uses are almost without exception concerned with moral consistency or an ethic of reciprocity. Here in Luke, however, at the conclusion of the first unit on love of enemies, the meaning is: one's action to the other should be determined not at all by the actual behavior of the other, but only by what one would recognize as the good if one were on the receiving end.

In a second unit (vv 32–36), the theme of love of enemies is pursued in its contrast to the reciprocal ethic which in most people's lives determines the scope of love and practical kindness. In the main stream of Greco-Roman ethical thought one acts in a generous way in order to make friends so that in the future one may get return from these friends; one makes return to those from whom one has received proof of friendship. Only exceptionally were moralists critical of this self-serving approach.

Loving and doing good link back to v 27. Lending is here not investment (the OT forbade the charging of interest to fellow Jews [Exod 22:25; Lev 25:35–37; Deut 23:20]) but kindness and crisis relief (cf. Ps 112:5; Sir 29:1–2). In a closed community of common interest, even sinners lend to sinners from whom they might expect the return favor at the time of their own need. Christians are called to behavior that transcends the community of common interest.

The call to love of enemies is supported by the promise of God's reward (cf. v 23). In this context of ethical reciprocity it is important to note that reward is not payment: it is the concrete form of God's approval. The call is further supported by the example of God, whose nobility we should imitate and thus behave like his sons. As is the case with the behavior of the believer the universal kindness of God is a standing appeal to the ungrateful for a change of heart (cf. Rom 2:4). V 36 reiterates the call to imitate God from a slightly different perspective. Where in v 35 to be a son of God is the goal for one's actions, in v 36 having God as Father is the starting point from which imitation proceeds.

In vv 37–38 we move from love of enemies to the related theme of nonjudgmental generosity, which is linked here because the starting point for this

exhortation is a recognition of the merciful ways of God. God prefers to act in mercy, but one who wants to put another on trial invites God to put that person on trial; one who condemns another for his or her failings invites God to condemn that person for those failings. Jewish sources express a similar sentiment. The assumption is that none of us can survive God's scrutiny according to strict justice.

When one is nonjudgmental (forgiving) one sets the other person free from the past and from the obligations of recompense that attach to his actions. But Jesus calls for a step more: as we forgo the right to recompense we are to extend openhanded generosity to the other person. He who extends such generosity may do so in confident expectation that he will be the beneficiary of God's superabundant generosity (cf. 18:29–30). His good measure is a generous measure, packed full and overflowing.

The section ends with a proverbial statement stemming ultimately from the terms of grain contracts but here establishing the principle that God will deal with us in the coinage with which we have chosen to deal with others. Mercy and generosity to others (or their lack) will be taken by God as an indication that such is the coinage we prefer to have used in God's dealings with us as well.

The Importance of What Jesus Teaches and the Need to Act upon It (6:39–49)

Bibliography

Abou-Chaar, K. "The Two Builders: A Study of the Parable in Luke: 6:47–49." *Theological Review (Beirut)* 5 (1982) 44–58. **Bretscher, P. M.** "Log in Your Own Eye (Matt. 7: 1–5)." *CTM* 43 (1972) 645–86. **Duplacy, J.** "Le véritable disciple. Un essai d'analyse sémantique de Luc 6, 43–49." *RSR* 69 (1981) 71–86. **George, A.** "Le disciple fraternel et efficace. Lc 6, 39–45." *AsSeign* 39 (1972) 68–77. **Hedley, P. L.** "'The Mote and the Beam' and 'The Gates of Hades.'" *ExpTim* 39 (1927–28) 427–28. **King, G. B.** "The Mote and the Beam." *HTR* 17 (1924) 80–81. ———. "A Further Note on the Mote and the Beam (Matt. VII. 3–5; Luke VI. 41–42)." *HTR* 26 (1933) 73–76. **Krämer, M.** "Hütet euch von den falschen Propheten: Eine überlieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Mt 7, 15–23/Lk 6, 43–46/Mt 12, 33–37." *Bib* 57 (1976) 349–77. **Mattill, A. J., Jr.** *NovT* 17 (1975) 15–46, esp. 40–46. **Mees, M.** "Ausserkanonische Parallelstellen zu den Gerichtsworten Mt. 7,21–23; Lk 6,46; 13,26–28 und ihre Bedeutung für die Formung der Jesusworte." *VetC* 10 (1973) 79–102. **Sahlin, H.** *Zwei Lukas-Stellen: Lk 6:43–45; 18:17.* SymBU 4. Uppsala: Wretmans, 1945. 3–9. **Schneider, G.** "Christusbekenntnis und christliches Handeln: Lk 6,46 und Mt 7,21 im Kontext der Evangelien." In *Die Kirche des Anfangs*, FS H. Schürmann, ed. R. Schnackenburg et al. Freiburg/Basel/Vienna: Herder, 1978. 9–24. **Schulz, S. Q.** *Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten.* 312–20. **Tannehill, R. C.** *The Sword of His Mouth.* 114–18. **Webster, C. A.** "The Mote and the Beam (Luke VI. 41, 42 = Matt. VII. 3–5)." *ExpTim* 39 (1927–28) 91–92.

Translation

³⁹He spoke to them also^a a parable: “Can a blind person lead a blind person? Will they not both fall into a ditch? ⁴⁰A disciple is not above the teacher. Rather, everyone when he is fully prepared will be as his teacher.

⁴¹“Why do you see the speck that is your brother’s eye, but do not notice the beam which is in your own eye? ⁴²How can you say to your brother, ‘Brother, allow me: I will cast out the speck which is in your eye,’ yourself not seeing the beam which is in your own eye? Hypocrite! First cast the beam out of your own eye, and then you will see clearly to cast out the speck which is in your brother’s eye.

⁴³“It^b is not a good tree which produces bad fruit, nor again a bad tree which produces good fruit. ⁴⁴For both kinds of^c tree are known from their own fruit. For ‘they do not gather figs from thornbushes, nor do they pick grapes from brambles.’

⁴⁵The good man out of the good treasure of the heart brings forth good, and the evil out of evil brings forth evil. For ‘the^d mouth speaks out of the abundance of the heart.’

⁴⁶“Why do you call me ‘Lord, Lord,’ and do not do what I say? ⁴⁷Everyone who comes to me and hears my words and acts on them—I will show you whom he is like. ⁴⁸He is like a man building a house, who dug and went deep and placed his foundation on the rock; when a flood came, the river burst upon that house, but could not shake it ^ebecause it had been well built. ^e ⁴⁹The one who hears and does not act is like a man building a house on the ground without a foundation; upon which the river burst and immediately it collapsed and great was the ruin of that house.”

Notes

^aOmitted by P⁴⁵ A E F G etc.

^bGreek has an untranslated γάρ, “for.”

^cἑκάστων (lit., “each”).

^dLit., “his” (αὐτοῦ).

^eThese words are omitted by P⁴⁵vid 700* sy³, and replaced by the Matthean τεθεμελίωτο γὰρ ἐπὶ τῇν πέτρῳ, “for it had been founded upon the rock,” in A C D K X etc.

Form/Structure/Setting

The final section of the sermon (vv 39–49) with its various parabolic pieces seems concerned to underscore in various ways the importance of following through on Jesus’ teaching about love of enemies and nonjudgmental generosity. For the larger structure of the sermon see at vv 17–19.

Vv 39–40 are absent from the Matthean parallel at this point, but Schürmann (“Warnung,” 276) argues persuasively that the context in which Matthew reports his equivalent to v 39 (Matt 15:14) shows that he has drawn the verse out of the sermon setting (Matt 15:13 depends on Matt 7:16–21 = Luke 6:43–44), and it does not seem likely that v 40 will have been intruded into an original unity between v 39 and vv 41–42. Matthew has his equivalent for v 40 in Matt 10:24–25 in a context where materials seem to have been gathered from a number of places. In form v 39 is a simple parable and v 40 has the form of a wisdom saying.

Vv 41–42 are paralleled quite closely in Matt 7:3–5. Here the teaching makes use of a secular proverb in what is an extended metaphor.

Vv 43–44 are represented in Matthew by 7:16–19. The Lukan form is clearly more original (see *Comment*). Matt 12:33–35 with its relationship to Luke 6:43, 44a, 45 indicates that v 45 was attached already to vv 43–44 in the tradition prior to Luke. Matthean addition seems more likely than Lukan deletion for the material Matthew has between his equivalents for vv 42 and 43, but on any reckoning it is difficult to account for the positioning of Matt 7:7–11, 12. In Luke 6:43–44a we have an extended illustration whose point is underlined in v 44b by the citation of a contemporary proverb. V 45ab then applies the illustration to the deeds of people and this sentence of application is given its own independent buttressing in v 45c by means of what is once again a contemporary proverb.

V 46 has its parallel in Matt 7:21. The Lukan form is closer to the original. As well as leaving his own distinctive redactional marks upon the text, Matthew has developed it in vv 22–23 with material that, in its Lukan form in 13:26–27, is linked to the tradition Matthew has used in 7:13–14 (cf. Luke 13:23–24). The link between Luke 6:46 and vv 47–49 may be original if the sense of “Lord” here was initially “teacher”: identifying Jesus as teacher is much the same as coming to hear his word. In vv 47–49 we have a pair of antithetical similitudes designed to illustrate the decisive difference between the one who does and the one who only hears. The Lukan form of the similitudes seems secondary to the parallel in Matt 7:24–27.

Comment

In vv 39–49 the central importance of Jesus’ call to love of enemies and nonjudgmental generosity is examined from various angles. One should not be led by blind teachers who suggest another way: since a disciple is constrained by the limitations of his teacher, those who suggest another way leave their disciples in their blindness (vv 39–40). It is sheer hypocrisy to seek to help others with ethical minutiae while failing to attend to these central demands of discipleship (vv 41–42). Jesus’ location of his central ethical demand in love of enemy and nonjudgmental generosity is a call to a true inner goodness of the heart, of which one’s concrete acts of goodness will be the natural fruit (vv 43–45). V 46 accuses those who profess discipleship but settle for a less demanding way than that proposed by Jesus. Vv 47–49 contrast the different fate in the judgment of God of those who have and those who have not implemented this teaching of Jesus.

39 “He spoke to them a parable as well” appears to be a Lukan transition (cf. 5:36; 12:16; 13:6; 14:7; 15:3 etc.). The role of vv 39–40 (absent in the Matthean parallel, but probably also in Matthew’s tradition at this point [Schürmann, “Warnung,” 296]) has proved baffling, as may be seen from the many viewpoints represented in the scholarship. Does Luke at this point have Jesus turn his attention to the apostles as teachers of the church (as Grundmann, *SE* 1 [1959] 180–89)? Are these verses loosely linked here, since being blind and trying to lead is rather like having a beam in one’s eye and trying to correct another (vv 41–43), and leading and being led is rather like (cf. Acts

8:31) a disciple/master relationship such as v 40 speaks of (as Dupont, *Béatitudes* 1:53–58)? Is the target those who teach hate rather than love (as Agouridès, “Béatitudes,” 19 [see *Bibliography* for 6:20–26]) or those who as teachers judge and show no mercy (as Bartsch, *TZ* 16 [1960] 14–15) or false teachers in the church (Schürmann, “Warnung,” 294–98) or Jewish teachers who have popular standing with the church’s Jewish persecutors (cf. Dupont, *Béatitudes* 3:78–79 [but Dupont is concerned only with the woes])? Or is the point that disciples are blind until enlightened by their teacher (Marshall, 267)?

There can be little doubt that v 39 is addressed to those being led rather than to leaders (cf. the Matthean setting of the tradition [Matt 15:14]), and that the directive is: “Do not be led by blind leaders.” It seems foolish to attempt to specify more closely who such blind leaders might be. Since the remainder of the sermon (see below) is directed toward underlining the fundamental importance of the sermon’s teaching on love of enemies and not judging, a blind leader must be anybody who does not recognize the fundamental importance of these directives. The idea of the blind leading the blind is proverbial (see Schrage, *TDNT* 8:275, 286).

40 This verse is best read closely with v 39. The Lukan form is more original than the Matthean parallel in 10:24–25 (cf. Zimmermann, *Lehrer*, 189–92). One should not accept inadequate teachers because as a disciple one is constrained by the limitations of one’s teacher. A teacher who does not call for love of enemies and not judging leaves his disciples in their blindness. Matthew makes use of this tradition in 10:24–25 in a manner that assumes that Jesus is the true teacher. This may already be implicit in the Lukan form. While it receives no emphasis, the teacher/disciple relationship is assumed to be one in which the teacher does not merely impart a body of information but rather teaches the disciple to be as a person what the teacher already is.

41–42 The wording of vv 41–42 is very similar to that of the Matthean parallel in Matt 7:3–5. Word order and syntax changes make the Lukan form a little less Semitic. The teaching here makes use of a secular proverb reflected in both Jewish and Greco-Roman sources (*b. ‘Arak.* 16b; cf. *b. Hor.* 3b; Plutarch, *De curios.* 515d; Horace, *Satires* 1.3.25). Though the imagery is graphic to the point of being grotesque, there is considerable disagreement about the precise point being made in the Lukan setting. Several common interpretations can be ruled out because they provide no account of the disproportion between the beam and the speck (e.g., self-improvement must accompany the desire to help others [Fitzmyer, 642]; if we feel called upon to judge others we should remember that there is much that God could judge us for [Bartsch, *TZ* 16 [1960] 15]; one must help others without accusation or threat, recognizing our solidarity in sin with those we seek to help [Grundmann, *SE* 1 (1959) 187]) We have already rejected for vv 40–41 an address to teachers that would allow us to find here a reference to the errors of false teachers wishing to correct others (Schürmann, “Warnung,” 297–98: Christian teachers who go beyond the demands of Jesus; Agouridès, “Béatitudes,” 19: the Jewish sectarians and others who teach hatred of the rich). In the context it seems best to see here an exhortation to attend in one’s life to the deep matters proposed by Jesus in his teaching on nonjudgment and love of enemy: it is sheer hypocrisy to seek to help others with ethical minutiae while failing to attend to those

central demands of discipleship. We may compare 11:42 (= Matt 23:23–24). The emphasis here on doing the teaching of Jesus would, then, anticipate the note of v 46. In the synoptic tradition “hypocrite” occurs only on the lips of Jesus. On the basis that no equivalent word seems to exist in Hebrew or Aramaic, A. W. Argyle (*ExpTim* 75 [1963–64] 113–14) has argued that Jesus must have at times spoken Greek; but more general terms for falseness or insincerity are certainly at hand in Aramaic and Hebrew חָנָפִי, *hānēp*; שָׁוִי, *šāw*⁹; גִּזְלִי, *šēger*; etc.). Only the imagery of play-acting implicit in the Greek term needs to have been added at the stage of translation.

43–45 Vv 43–44 find a close equivalent in Matt 7:16–19 where the material is applied to false prophets (cf. v 15) and given a judgment twist in v 19 with words from the John the Baptist tradition (cf. Matt 3:10). The more enigmatic Lukan form has better claim to being original. The use in Matt 12:33–35 of material related to Luke 6:43, 44a, 45 indicates that v 45 was already linked to vv 43–44 in the earlier tradition. Schürmann’s case for a yet earlier independence of v 45 (“Warnung,” 302) is based on a not-at-all obvious claimed original imagery in v 45a.

σαπρός originally meant “decayed” or “rotten” but comes to have a more general meaning: “unfit”/“unusable”/“bad”/“evil” (BAGD, 742). Good and bad exemplars of a particular kind of fruit tree are being contrasted. Since the role of a fruit tree is to produce fruit, its adequacy as a tree is seen from the fruit that it bears. One knows what kind of tree one is dealing with when one can inspect the fruit. ἑκάστων in v 44a serves for ἐκάτερον and means “each of two.” V 44b underlines the point by pushing it to an absurd extreme: just as one does not get figs from a thornbush, neither does one get good fruit from a poor tree (cf. Duplacy, “Véritable disciple,” 74–75); fruit can only be as good as the tree that produces it. It is likely that in v 44b a contemporary proverb is being quoted. V 45ab makes the obvious connection to the deeds of people: a good person does good; a bad person does evil. The sentence of application does, however, add the precision that the goodness of the good person comes “out of the good treasure of the heart” (and contrariwise for the evil person). This sentence of application is provided in v 45c with an independent buttressing by means of what is once again probably a contemporary proverb (cf. *Gen. Rab.* 84:9 [to 37:4]; *Midr. Pss.* 9:2 [to 9:1]). By way of supporting the more general principle, this proverb illustrates one of the ways (i.e., speech) in which the true inner person is revealed in one’s actions (cf. Duplacy, “Véritable disciple,” 75–76).

The nature of the logic that links vv 43–45 into the sermon and, therefore, the actual point being made through these observations are disputed. For Agouridès (“Béatitudes,” 19) the point is that the teaching of hate, rather than of love and not judging, is a bad fruit of a bad tree. For Grundmann (*SE* 1 [1959] 188) it is that the leader’s work is to preach a word that comes out of his heart. Bartsch (*TZ* 16 [1960] 16) thinks that Luke’s point is that those who have experienced the mercy of God (in their hearts) will show the fruit of mercy to others (in their deeds). Fitzmyer (643) suggests that Luke is saying: if you want to correct others (vv 41–42), you must first demonstrate your own goodness by good deeds. Schürmann (“Warnung,” 298–303) sees an attack on false teachers: one can expect no good teaching from such bad

people. The understanding of vv 41–42 proposed above may encourage us to look in a somewhat different direction. There we were dealing with a confused idea about how true goodness is revealed, and here we seem to be as well. Where the “beam” and the “speck” focused attention on the difference between ethical minutiae and the central demands of discipleship, the “fruit” and the “tree” focus attention on the necessary correlation between works of true goodness and the inner disposition: whether one likes it or not, what one produces is finally a product of what one is. One can attempt to distort nature with an external veneer, such as tacked-on conformity to certain requirements of piety or respectability, but no one will be finally fooled (cf. Matt 12:33–35). Jesus’ location of goodness in love of enemy and nonjudgment is a call to a true inner goodness of the heart, of which one’s concrete acts of goodness will be the natural fruit. He thus cuts through the hypocrisy, shallowness, and self-deceit of every paraded goodness of externality.

46 This verse addresses itself pointedly to all who profess discipleship but settle for a less demanding way than that proposed by Jesus in his call to love of enemy and nonjudgment. Only in the use of the verb λέγειν, “to say,” will the Matthean form (7:21) be more original (cf. Black, *Aramaic Approach*, 193). Luke often avoids the question form (Schürmann, 381) and is not responsible for it here. The Matthean phrase “the will of my Father in heaven” is redactional (Matt 12:50 cf. Mark 3:35; concern for the will of God also surfaces in the Matthean sermon at 6:10), while his “will enter into the kingdom of heaven” picks up on the redactional use of the same phrase in 5:20. As in Luke 5:8 (see there), “Lord” and not “Sir” is clearly the correct translation for Κύριε. It is tempting to see here a call for consistency addressed to those who make the full Christian confession of Jesus as Lord (so, e.g., Schürmann, 380–81, with reference to 1 Cor 12:3; Rom 10:9; etc.). But the context does not take us beyond the issue of the recognition of Jesus’ authority as teacher (but cf. the wider view of authority to be expressed by Κύριε in 7:6, after which Luke will begin to refer to Jesus as “the Lord” in his narration [7:13, 19; 10:1, 39; etc.]). Perhaps Κύριε stands here for an original רַבִּי, *rabbī*, whose rendering as “Lord” rather than “teacher” (for this possibility cf. Hahn, *Titles*, 78) has been influenced by later parenetic application of these words of Jesus to those in the church who do in fact confess Jesus as Lord (cf. Krämer, *Bib* 57 [1976] 361).

47 The intervening Matthean material (7:22–23) represents a Matthean development on the basis of other tradition (cf. Luke 13:25–27). Luke’s sermon comes to an end with a final call to living out the teaching of Jesus: by means of a pair of antithetical similitudes the decisive difference between the one who does and the one who only hears is indicated. To link with v 18, Luke adds “who comes to me and” to his source and at the same time probably introduces the participial forms (cf. at v 29) in place of the finite verbs of his source (cf. Matt 7:24; but Matthew’s ὁ ποιῶν [“the one doing”] in v 21 could suggest the opposite change). Matthew’s qualification of the words as “these words” will be redactional. “I will show you” looks like a Lukan expansion (cf. 12:5; Luke-Acts has five of the six NT uses of this verb). The continuing “whom he is like” probably reflects an original question (cf. 7:31; 13:18, 20; Schürmann, 382 n. 19) which Matthew has deleted. The crowds have come

to Jesus and have heard his words (cf. v 18); the point of decision and division is over the *doing* of what he teaches.

48–49 There is a considerable difference between the form of the similitudes as formulated in Luke and in Matthew (7:24–27). Because of the change of imagery between the two forms (see below), it is difficult to make confident source statements. Neither form is strongly marked by an evangelist's style or concerns. The Matthean form is more memorable, and, therefore, probably closer to an oral form, while the Lukan form is more circumstantial (Bartsch, *TZ* 16 [1960] 15–16). In the Matthean form the imagery is of the torrential autumn rains accompanied by a storm, which test the security of a house (Jeremias, *Parables*, 194). The imagery may be influenced by Ezek 13:10–16. The Lucan text envisages, rather, the simpler but less Palestinian phenomenon of a river overflowing its banks in flood time and bursting upon a nearby house. In the Matthean telling, the central feature is the experience of the storm; in the Lukan, it is the preparation of good foundations. Extensive foundation work would not normally have been a feature of Palestinian domestic building procedures. In the Lukan form, the negative counterpart is no longer spelled out in detail as in the Matthean.

The crisis anticipated will be that of the judgment of God and not that of times of difficulty and danger (against Rengstorf, 93; cf. Duplacy, "Véritable disciple," 84). He who is careful to carry through to action the teachings of Jesus will find that built upon such a foundation the achievements of his life will stand scrutiny. The one who is not careful in this way will have at that time a ruin upon his hands.

A great deal of self-confident authority is implicit in these words of Jesus. As Schürmann (383) has it: "Jesus knows himself to be the one who decisively reveals the will of God."

Explanation

The directness of Jesus' teachings on love of enemies and nonjudgmental generosity gives way in vv 39–49 to much more enigmatic material of a parabolic, proverbial, or metaphorical nature. It is difficult to follow the thread of thought, but it seems likely that each of the items underscores in some way or other the decisive importance of Jesus' teaching on love of enemies and nonjudgment and the need to carry it through into practice.

The blind leading the blind is an image for those who are content to offer a less demanding path. One should not accept such blind teachers, because as a disciple one is constrained by the limitations of one's teacher. The teacher does not merely impart a body of information but rather teaches the disciple to be as a person what the teacher already is. Only Jesus himself is finally adequate as teacher.

Vv 41–42 makes use of a secular proverb to provide us with imagery that is graphic to the point of being grotesque. We seem to have here a call to the central and weighty matters identified by Jesus in vv 27–38. The point will be that it is sheer hypocrisy to seek to help others with regard to ethical minutiae (cf. 11:42 = Matt 23:23–24) while failing to attend to these central demands of discipleship.

In vv 43–44 (first part) the point is that a good exemplar of a fruit tree is known from its fruit. This observation is supported in the remainder of v 44 by a proverb whose point is that one's fruit can only be as good as the trees one has. In v 45 the obvious connection is made to the deeds of a person: a good person does good; a bad person does evil. The sentence of application adds the precision that the goodness of the good person comes "out of the good treasure of the heart" (and contrariwise for the evil person). This is in turn supported by yet another proverb which illustrates one of the ways (i.e., speech) in which the true inner person is revealed in one's actions. The point of it all seems to be that Jesus' teaching on love and not judging is a call to a true inner goodness of the heart. One can attempt to distort nature with an external veneer of goodness, but no one will be finally fooled (cf. Matt 12:33–35). Jesus' call to love of enemies exposes the hypocrisy, shallowness, and self-deceit of every externally paraded goodness. The only goodness that is finally of any account is that which springs from the deep motivations of the heart and that has been the point of address in vv 27–38.

V 46 addresses itself pointedly to all who profess discipleship but settle for a less demanding way than that proposed here by Jesus. Linked to v 46 is the final unit in which by means of a pair of antithetical similitudes the point is made that in the final judgment of God there will be a decisive difference between a person who does the teaching of Jesus and a person who only listens to it. The one who is careful to carry through to action the teaching of Jesus is like the man who has carefully prepared the foundations of his house, carrying them down to bedrock. If the river overflows its banks in flood time and engulfs the house, the careful construction will save the house. The one who only hears is like a man who builds without foundations. Come flood time, he will have a ruin on his hands.

Jesus knows the absolute importance of his own teaching because he knows himself to be the one who decisively reveals the will of God.

Something Greater than John Is Here (7:1–50)

Introduction

With Jesus comes the complement and completion of what had begun with John. Now in Jesus' ministry the kingdom of God is seen to be present as the power of God that in compassion raises the dead (7:11–17; cf. vv 1–10) and brings to its culmination in the response of grateful love (vv 36–50) the eschatological bestowal of forgiveness inaugurated by John (3:3).

The Authority of Jesus over Life and Death (7:1–10)

Bibliography

Boismard, M.-É. "Saint Luc et la rédaction du Quatrième Évangile (Jn, IV,46–54)." *RB* 69 (1962) 185–211. **Cadoux, C. J.** "S. Matthew viii.9." *ExpTim* 32 (1920–21) 474. **Dauer, A.** *Johannes und Lukas: Untersuchungen zu den johanneisch-lukanischen Parallelperikopen Joh 4,46–54/Lk 7,1–10—Joh 12,1–8/Lk 7,36–50; 10,38–42—Joh 20,19–29/Lk 24,36–49.* Forschung zur Bibel 50. Würzburg: Echter, 1984. **Derrett, J. D. M.** "Law in the New Testament: The Syro-Phoenician Woman and the Centurion of Capernaum." *NovT* 15 (1973) 161–86, esp. 174–83. **France, R. T.** "Exegesis in Practice: Two Samples." In *New Testament Interpretation*, ed. I. H. Marshall. 251–81, esp. 253–64, 278–79. **Frost, M.** "I Also Am a Man under Authority." *ExpTim* 45 (1933–34) 477–78. **George, A.** "Guérison de l'esclave d'un centurion: Lc 7,1–10." *AsSeign* 40 (1972) 66–77. **Haenchen, E.** "Faith and Miracle." *SE* 1 [TU 73] (1959) 495–98. ———. "Johanneische Probleme." *ZTK* 56 (1959) 18–54, esp. 23–31. **Haslam, J. A. G.** "The Centurion at Capernaum: Luke 7:1–10." *ExpTim* 96 (1985) 109–10. **Hodges, Z. C.** "The Centurion's Faith in Matthew and Luke." *BibSac* 121 (1964) 321–32. **Hogg, C. F.** "Luke vii.2" *ExpTim* 29 (1917–18) 475. **Hooke, S. H.** "Jesus and the Centurion: Matthew viii.5–10." *ExpTim* 69 (1957–58) 79–80. **Jeremias, J.** *Jesus' Promise to the Nations.* 28–35. **Loos, H. van der.** *The Miracles of Jesus.* 530–50. **Martin, R. P.** "The Pericope of the Healing of the 'Centurion's' Servant/Son (Matt 8:5–13 par. Luke 7:1–10): Some Exegetical Notes." In *Unity and Diversity in New Testament Theology*, FS G. E. Ladd, ed. R. A. Guelich. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978. 14–22. **Schnackenburg, R.** "Zur Traditionsgeschichte von Joh 4,46–54." *BZ* 8 (1964) 58–88. **Schulz, S. Q.** *Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten.* 236–46. **Siegmán, E. F.** "St. John's Use of the Synoptic Material." *CBQ* 30 (1968) 182–98. **Sparks, H. F. D.** "The Centurion's *παῖς*." *JTS* 42 (1941) 179–80. **Wegner, U.** *Der Hauptmann von Kafarnaum (Mt 7,28a; 8,5–10.13 par Lk 7,1–10): Ein Beitrag zur Q-Forschung.* WUNT 2/14. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1985. **Wendling, E.** "Synoptische Studien: II. Der Hauptmann von Kapernaum." *ZNW* 9 (1908) 96–109. **Zuntz, G.** "The 'Centurion' of Capernaum and His Authority (Matth. VIII.5–13)." *JTS* 46 (1945) 183–90.

Translation

¹After he had finished speaking^a all his words into the ears of the People, he entered Capernaum. ²The slave of a certain centurion who was precious to him

was ill and was about to die. ³Hearing about Jesus, the centurion^b sent elders of the Jews to him, asking him to come and save his slave. ⁴Coming to Jesus, they urged him strongly, saying, "He is worthy that you should grant this." ⁵For he loves our nation and he built the synagogue for us." ⁶Jesus went with them. When he was not far from the house, the centurion sent friends and said to him, "Lord, do not go to any further trouble. For I am not worthy that you should come under my roof. ⁷For that reason I did not even consider myself worthy to come to you. But speak a word^c and let my servant be healed."^d ⁸For I also am a man under authority, having soldiers under myself, and I say to this one, 'Go,' and he goes, and to another, 'Come,' and he comes, and to my slave, 'Do this,' and he does." ⁹When Jesus heard these things he admired him. He turned and said to the crowd that followed him, "I say to you: not even in Israel have I found this kind of faith." ¹⁰Returning to the house, those who had been sent found the^e slave in good health.

Notes

^a"Speaking" added in translation for sense.

^bGreek: "he."

^cLit., "with a word."

^d*ιαθήσεται*, "he will be healed," is read by \aleph C E F G etc., as in Matthew.

^e*ἀσθενοῦντα*, "sick," is added by A C K X etc. For D it^d this replaces *δοῦλος*, "slave."

Form/Structure/Setting

The continuity between 6:17–49 and the new section, 7:1–50, is provided by the eschatological coloration of both, but now discipleship and disciples retreat from sight and the concern is to portray Jesus' ministry as the eschatological visitation of God that complements and completes, but also takes up onto an entirely new level, what had been inaugurated by the ministry of John. This portrayal is achieved partly through direct statement by Jesus, but it gains its dramatic vividness through accounts of people's recognition in Jesus of the presence of the powers of the kingdom of God.

The three closely linked units 7:18–23, 24–28, 29–35 form the center of this section. In vv 18–23 Jesus is appraised in relation to expectations generated by John. Vv 24–28 look in the other direction and define John's status in connection with the new state of affairs inaugurated by Jesus. Vv 29–35 treat John and Jesus together as the representatives of God's wise plan of salvation over against a largely unresponsive public.

7:1–10 and 11–17 (the raising of the widow's son at Nain) have an evident parallelism (to the centurion corresponds the widow; to the precious slave, the son; at the point of death corresponds to having died; with the centurion's recognition of the authority of Jesus is to be compared the crowd's recognition of a visitation of God; in both incidents there is an attendant crowd), and both are offered by Luke as illustrations of the assertion to follow in v 22: "the dead are raised up."

Some of the items on the list in v 22 are provided for in v 21 by means of a general statement about healings performed right then and there. For other items in the list Luke is content for his reader to reach back into earlier sections (for "the lame walk" cf. 5:17–26; for "lepers are cleansed" cf. 5:12–16; for

good news to the poor cf. 4:18-21 and 6:20-23), and even in one case (the deaf hearing) he overlooks the fact that he has provided no account of the healing of a deaf person (closest is the restoration of Zechariah [cf. at 1:20] in the John the Baptist infancy account; in 11:14 it is just possible that κωφός means both deaf and mute).

Where 7:1-10, 11-17 look ahead to vv 18-23, vv 36-50 look back to vv 29-35. With the Pharisee and the sinful woman, Luke illustrates by way of an extreme case the way in which the People and the tax collectors, having received John's baptism, recognized its culmination in Jesus' ministry, while the Pharisees and lawyers, having felt no need of the baptism of John, failed to see that anything of significance could come to them from the ministry of Jesus (vv 29-30).

The episode 7:1-10 is reported as a pronouncement story rather than as a miracle story but has a development that is much too complicated to be a simple instance of that form. The centurion's (i) impeccable credentials in the eyes of the Jews (vv 3-5), contrasted with his (ii) personal sense of unworthiness (v 6), as well as his (iii) comparison of Jesus' authority to his own in another sphere (vv 7-8), along with (iv) Jesus' elevation of his faith above any to be found in Israel (v 9), all seem to be important motifs in the account. This profusion of motifs and the presence of certain difficulties in the narrative (the two separate delegations [vv 3, 6] with the entailed change in the request made of Jesus; the centurion's words in vv 6-8, which seem too personal for a relayed message and suit better the Matthean immediate exchange between the centurion and Jesus [8:5-9]) have convinced most scholars that the simpler Matthean form of the story is more original (except for 8:11-12 and some of the wording). The extra elements in the Lukan account certainly correspond with Lukan concerns, and a certain logic in the account becomes apparent when the statement at the end of v 6 is read in relation to the much stronger statement in Acts 10:28a and when it is realized that the double delegation protects the uniqueness of the centurion's faith (against Martin, "Centurion's Servant/Son," 16), which would not be the case if the Jewish elders were responsible for the combined message. On the other hand, Matthew frequently abbreviates and simplifies the tradition that he uses and may have omitted the delegation of Jewish elders. It is more difficult to attribute to him the omission of the delegation of the friends, where along with the considerations already adduced above we should note the similarity to Luke 8:49 (note in each case the use of *μη σκῶλλειν*, "not to trouble").

John 4:46-54 is generally considered to be based upon the same episode, but it is certainly from a quite different line of transmission and could have its basis in a separate episode. Bultmann's suggestion (*Synoptic Tradition*, 28) that the account of the centurion and his slave is a variation on that of the healing of the Syrophoenician woman's daughter (Mark 7:24-30) is quite unbelievable, but it is possible that the stories with their similar motifs were at some stage transmitted as a pair. If this were so, it would favor an original form for the centurion episode which included Luke 7:3-5.

In the Lukan form, the perspective of the episode is thoroughly Jewish and there is no trace of any antipathy between church and synagogue: an exceptional Gentile, already recognized as such by the Jewish community, exhib-

its a clarity of perception about the power of Jesus that puts to shame the Jewish followers of Jesus and, therefore, is reported in order to spur on the faith of Jewish disciples in the Messiah. The perspective is that faith is to be expected of Israel as God's people, but not of the Gentiles (George, *AsSeign* 40 [1972] 68, is wrong to insist that v 9 assumes the preaching of the gospel to the Gentiles). This is exactly the perspective Luke attributes to the earliest church (cf. Acts 10 and 11, esp. 11:18). The report has a strong claim to being part of the oldest tradition of the ministry of Jesus.

In relation to the question of the nature of the non-Markan source materials common to Matthew and Luke, it is suggestive that both Matthew and Luke report this episode after the great sermon (Matthew has the Markan healing of the leper in between), but the identity of order could be fortuitous if Matthew has (as suggested by Wendling, *ZNW* 9 [1908] 102) substituted another healing of a paralytic in Capernaum for that in his Markan source at this point (i.e., Mark 2:1–12; note Matthew's use of "paralytic" in 8:6). The following crowds in Matt 8:1 and 10 (the latter echoed in Luke 7:9) favor the former explanation.

Luke 7:1 provides a transition from the sermon and relocates Jesus to Capernaum. V 2 introduces the centurion and his need. Jesus and the centurion are linked by report in v 3 and the delegation of Jewish elders sent off to Jesus. In v 4 the delegation reaches Jesus, and after the delivery of their message (v 5) the scene moves with Jesus toward the centurion's home (v 6). Progress is stopped in v 6 by a second delegation, whose message (vv 6b–8) evokes Jesus' admiration (v 9). The account is rounded off by the return of those sent by the centurion, who find the slave healed (v 10).

On Jesus' healing ministry see further at 4:38–39 and 8:26–39.

Comment

Jesus' ministry is portrayed in 7:1–50 as the eschatological visitation of God heralded by John and complementing and completing, but also taking up on an entirely new level, what had been inaugurated by the ministry of John. The gentile centurion shows extraordinary perception in recognizing much more clearly than Jesus' fellow countrymen that here in Jesus is the one to whom all authority has been entrusted by God. The very one who recognizes that as a Gentile he has no claim upon the God of Israel gains benefit as a humble suppliant from the power entrusted to Jesus.

1 The similarity (but not verbal) of the opening clause to Matt 7:28a suggests that Luke is here reflecting a traditional termination for the great sermon. Luke has reformulated in his own language (*πληροῦν* means "to finish" in Acts 12:35; 14:26; 19:21; for *εἰς τὰς ἀκοάς* [lit., "into the ears"] see Acts 17:20 and cf. at Luke 1:44; for *πάντα τὰ ῥήματα*, "all the words," cf. at Luke 1:65). The final clause is closely paralleled by Matt 8:5a. Capernaum has been mentioned earlier in Luke 4:23, 31 and will recur in 10:15. It was clearly an important center for the ministry of Jesus, though in 7:1 Jesus' presence in Capernaum is to be understood as part of a pattern of itineration (cf. v 11; 8:1).

2 In Matthew the centurion explains his own situation to Jesus. In Luke the situation is made known in the narrative. Either evangelist could be responsi-

ble for the change, but the frequency of Matthew's redactional introduction of *Kύριε* ("Lord"; cf. Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 237 n. 406), Luke's double deletion of *κακῶς ἔχειν*, "to be ill," from his Markan source at 4:40, and perhaps also the similarity between Luke's "he was about to die" and John's phrase in 4:47 (the English equivalent is identical but the Greek varies slightly), and even Matthew's possible borrowing of the word "paralytic" from Mark 2:3, favor the originality of Luke's form. The use of *δοῦλος*, "slave," rather than Matthew's *παῖς*, "servant"/"slave"/"son"/"child," will be Lukan, as possibly is the final clause "who was precious to him."

Herod Antipas would have made use of predominantly non-Jewish soldiers in the manner of his father (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 17.198). With his troop of men this centurion would have been engaged in police or more likely customs service (cf. at 3:14). The clause "who was precious to him" motivates what is to be seen as a quite unusual degree of concern shown by this centurion for his slave.

3-5 Matthew, who has the centurion speak directly to Jesus, has nothing corresponding to vv 3-6a. Despite the degree of Lukan language in these verses (Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 238, n. 410) it is not unlikely that the Jewish delegation already had a role in the tradition prior to Luke (see *Form/Structure/Setting*) and that this has disappeared in the Matthean abbreviation. For Luke, the role of the elders signals the acceptability within a Jewish framework of Jesus' deed on behalf of a Gentile. In his dealings with Gentiles, Jesus stays within the limits of Jewish propriety. By contrast, what is to happen in the case of the centurion Cornelius in Acts 10-11 clearly transgresses the bounds of traditional Jewish acceptability. The implicit paralleling of the two centurions is a quiet apologetic for the later gentile mission: as prompted by God, Peter was only following through to its consistent end what was already a Jewish recognition that not all Gentiles were without value and entirely beyond the reach of God's grace.

"Elders of the Jews" here are leaders of the local Jewish community. They are the body of reference to whose judgment the Jewish community would naturally defer. Since early sources are few, the precise limits of their function remain unclear (cf. B. J. Broton, *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue* [BJS 36; Chico, CA; Scholars, 1982] 46-55; Bornkamm, *TDNT* 6:651-80; the inscription *CII* 1404 [J.-B. Frey, *Corpus inscriptionum iudaicarum*, II], which predates the destruction of the temple, offers the most interesting comparison with vv 3-5: it speaks of a certain Theodotus who built a synagogue founded by his fathers and the elders). The lack of a definite article suggests that the whole group does not come as a body. The worthiness (*ἀξιὸς ἔστω*) attributed to the centurion has its basis in his support of the Jewish People and of their religious practice. Luke probably thinks of him as a "God-fearer" (cf. Cornelius in Acts 10). We should not miss the contrasting self-evaluation in v 7a, using the cognate verb (*ἡξιῶσα*, "I considered worthy"). The unusual construction *ὃν παρέξη* (lit., "to whom you will grant") is normally considered a Latinism (BDF 5[3b], 379). There is inscriptional evidence for the erection of Jewish synagogues by Gentiles (OGIS, 96 and 129). The inscriptions reported by B. Lifshitz (*Donateurs et fondateurs dans les synagogues juives* [Paris: Gabalda, 1967]) indicate the high level of esteem that the provision of a synagogue would

have brought to the centurion. For a centurion to have sufficient wealth for such benevolence is surprising.

6 The second delegation (of friends) also has no counterpart in Matthew. The awkwardness of the construction (although the friends are the messengers, the centurion does the speaking), the links with Luke 8:49 (message while journeying; use of *σκόλλειν*), and the way in which the alteration keeps Jesus from any suspicion of "associating with or visiting anyone of another nation" (Acts 10:38; the evidence is mixed concerning how consistently such a hard line was ever in practice sustained) combine to suggest Lukan responsibility for the introduction of the second delegation. The use of litotes ("not far," i.e., "quite near") is characteristic of Luke (Haenchen [*Acts*, 70] notes eleven instances in Acts). It is difficult to know how to translate *Κύριε* here. No more than a secular greeting need be intended by the term ("Sir"). But the linking of such a profound recognition of Jesus' authority with the centurion's own sense of unworthiness (cf. at 5:8) suggests that more is intended (so, "Lord"). See further at 6:46. In the first instance the centurion's unworthiness is as a Gentile (according to *m. Ohol.* 18:7, the houses of Gentiles are unclean), but after 5:8 we cannot avoid seeing a connection between this sense of unworthiness and his insight into the person of Jesus (cf. 3:16). The Lukan word order throws extra emphasis onto the "not worthy."

7 The opening clause of v 7 has no counterpart in Matthew. It explains the role of the delegation of friends and so is probably Lukan. The thought reflects that of the end of v 6, but the language is chosen to emphasize the personal humility of the centurion in the face of the generous evaluation by the Jewish elders in v 4. The clause is parenthetical and interrupts the development from v 6 to v 7b. The centurion is convinced that an authoritative word from Jesus will restore the health of his dying slave. Only here in Luke's account is the term *παῖς*, "servant," used for the slave. In the words of the centurion, the change of terms distinguishes between the dying slave who was precious and the slave referred to in illustration of the centurion's authority. For healing by a word cf. Ps 107:20.

8 The centurion's words here are reported identically in Matthew and Luke, except that Luke adds the participle "set." Among others, Jeremias (*Jesus' Promise*, 30 n. 4) has argued on the basis of the Syriac versions of Matt 8:9 that originally the tradition spoke of the centurion not as "under authority" but as "in authority." Almost certainly, however, these variant readings reflect either difficulty in seeing how a statement about subordination could illustrate the centurion's point about Jesus' authority, or more likely an unwillingness to let stand a statement taken to imply the subordination of Jesus. It is the centurion's position in a chain of command that gives his own word power. Organized along Roman lines, the army of Antipas would have known the same devolution of power that pertained in the Roman army and magistracy (cf. Derrett, *NovT* 15 [1973] 177). Similarly, Jesus bears in virtue of his relationship to God the (much more comprehensive) authority that is God's (cf. 5:17). This is better than the tortuous attempt to try to find here a contrast along the lines: the centurion is only a subordinate and yet his word has authority; how much more the one whose authority is not derivative (as, e.g., George, *AsSeign* 40 [1972] 68). For the thought of commanding sickness cf. at 4:39.

9 The Lukan text differs from the Matthean in a number of minor details. Most look like Lukan additions (“these things,” “at him,” “having turned,” “crowd” [Luke has the singular form for “following” rather than Matthew’s plural form]). The “amen” in Matthew’s text is probably Matthean redaction (cf. Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 239 and n. 424). Matthew’s stronger and negatively slanted “with no one” (Luke: “not even”) prepares for the extra material he inserts in Matt 8:11–12 and is therefore to be seen as Matthean redaction. Since in Luke’s Gospel nothing seems to take Jesus by surprise we should probably translate *ἐθαύμασεν αὐτόν* as “he admired him” (cf. George, *AsSeign* 40 [1972] 68, 71). The presence of a following crowd is unmotivated in Luke’s account (contrast Matt 8:1, 10) except to provide an audience for Jesus’ words. In Israel Jesus has found faith; but this is something extraordinary, and it comes from a Gentile! There is no implied criticism of Israel’s faith (against e.g., Fitzmyer, 653). In the later church the existence of such a Gentile who had manifested such an outstanding spiritual perception and responsiveness would have served as a strong argument against the exclusion of Gentiles on principle from the Christian fellowship. Luke is not insensitive to such an argument (cf. Acts 10 and 11).

10 Presumably in the tradition the conclusion of the account mentioned the healing, but both Matthew’s and Luke’s conclusions are strongly marked by the evangelists’ activity (for Matthew compare 9:22; 15:28; 17:18; Luke’s conclusion depends upon the second embassy material). The healing is no more than mentioned, because the interest in the telling has already reached its climax in vv 8–9. “Those sent” probably covers both embassies, but the language echoes that of v 6. In *b. Ber.* 34b there is an account of a Jewish healing at a distance, but the issue in the Gospel text is centrally that of divine authority rather than that of healing from a distance.

Explanation

The concern of the great sermon (6:17–49) with disciples and discipleship gives way in the next major section (7:1–50) to a concern to portray Jesus’ ministry as the eschatological visitation of God heralded by John. This eschatological visitation complements and completes—but also takes up onto an entirely new level—what had been inaugurated by the ministry of John.

The opening episodes of the section (vv 1–10, 11–17) form a parallel pair as examples of the raising of the dead or nearly dead (cf. v 22). Interest in the first episode is focused on the recognition that all authority has been entrusted to Jesus.

Jesus travels to Capernaum, clearly an important center for his ministry (4:23, 31; 10:15), but here introduced as part of a pattern of itineration (cf. v 11 and 8:1). The gentile centurion who hears about Jesus is probably not a Roman soldier, but part of the army of Herod Antipas, posted in all likelihood to customs service in connection with goods coming in and out of Galilee. This centurion has an unusual attachment to a slave who is ill and near death.

Sensitive to Jewish sentiment, he does not himself approach Jesus. The elders of the local Jewish community go on his behalf. These elders are the body of reference to whose judgment the Jewish community would naturally

defer, and for Luke their role signals the acceptability within a Jewish frame of reference of the healing which Jesus will perform for this Gentile. There are other examples of Gentiles building Jewish synagogues, though it is surprising that a centurion would be rich enough. This centurion is probably to be thought of as a God-fearer like Cornelius (cf. Acts 10:2).

Whereas Jesus in his dealing with this Gentile stays within the limits of Jewish propriety, in dealing with another centurion later Peter does not (Acts 10 and 11). The Jewish statement here is a quiet apologetic for the later gentile mission: as prompted by God, Peter was only following through to its consistent end the existing Jewish recognition that not all Gentiles were without value and entirely beyond the reach of God's grace.

When Jesus is quite near the centurion's home, he is met by a second delegation. Jesus has no personal contact with the centurion and is thus free from any suspicion that contrary to Jewish propriety he had associated with or visited anyone of another nation (Acts 10:28). The second delegation voices the words of the centurion (the translation cannot capture this: the "saying" is that of the centurion). In the first instance the centurion's unworthiness is as a Gentile, since gentile houses are unclean. But the similarity to 5:1–11 (esp. v 8) suggests we should see more: his sense of unworthiness is also to be linked to his insight into the person of Jesus. There is a deliberate contrast between the high estimate of the Jewish elders and the centurion's own sense of personal unworthiness.

A word from Jesus will be enough to heal the dying slave. Jesus' word can heal just as God's word can (Ps 107:20). The centurion understood the transmission of power in an authority structure and considered that Jesus in virtue of his unique relationship to God would be able to act as his plenipotentiary.

Jesus' response is one of admiration. In Israel Jesus had found faith, but this was something extraordinary—and coming from a Gentile! In the later church the report of such a Gentile's faith would have found use as an argument against the exclusion of Gentiles on principle from the Christian fellowship. Luke is not unaware of the usefulness of such an argument (cf. Acts 10 and 11).

After this dramatic interchange of the centurion's confession and Jesus' declaration the report of the actual healing is anticlimactic. There is no report of the actual healing word. Luke is content to relate that the returning delegations found the slave to be restored to full health.

God Has Visited His People (7:11–17)

Bibliography

Brodie, T. L. "Towards Unraveling Luke's Use of the Old Testament: Luke 7:11–17 as an *Imitatio* of 1 Kings 17:24." *NTS* 32 (1986) 247–67. **Gils, F.** *Jésus prophète d'après les évangiles synoptiques*. 26–27. **Loos, H. van der.** *The Miracles of Jesus*. 573–76. **Pearce, K.** "The Lukan Origins of the Raising of Lazarus." *ExpTim* 96 (1985) 359–61. **Petzke,**

G. "Historizität und Bedeutsamkeit von Wunderberichten." In *Neues Testament und christliche Existenz*, FS H. Braun, ed. H. D. Betz and L. Schottroff. Tübingen: Mohr, 1973. 367–85, esp. 371–78. **Richardson, A.** *The Miracle Stories of the Gospels*. London: SCM, 1959. 113–14. **Schneider, F.** *Jesus der Prophet*. 108–15. **Ternant, P.** "La résurrection du fils de la veuve de Nain (Lc 7,11–16)." *AsSeign* 69 (1964) 29–40. **Vogels, W.** "A Semiotic Study of Luke 7:11–17." *EglT* 14 (1983) 273–92.

Translation

¹¹It happened soon afterwards^a that Jesus went to a city called Nain, and ^bhis disciples and a great crowd went with him. ¹²As he came near to the gate of the city, ^cone who had died was being carried out—the only son of his mother and she was a widow. Quite a crowd from the city was with her. ¹³Seeing her, the Lord had compassion on her and said to her, "Do not weep." ¹⁴He came and touched the bier; the bearers stopped; and he said, "Young man, I say to you, get up." ¹⁵The dead man sat up^d and began to speak, and he gave him to his mother. ¹⁶Fear seized them all and they glorified God, saying, "A great prophet has been raised up in our midst" and "God has visited his People." ¹⁷This talk about him spread through the whole of Judea and all the surrounding area.

Notes

^aLuke's more usual τῇ ἐξῆς, "the next day," is read here by א* C D K W etc.

^bἱκανοί, "quite a lot of," is read here by A C K X etc.

^cAn emphatic καὶ ἰδοὺ, "and behold," is here not translated.

^dἐκάθισεν, "he sat down," is read here by p75vid B.

Form/Structure/Setting

7:11–17 stands in parallel with vv 1–10 as an instance of one of the items in the list of happenings which Jesus tells the disciples of John to report to their master: "The dead are raised up" (v 22). The account of this resuscitation, in which all recognize that "a great prophet has arisen among us" and "God has visited his people," helps Luke to formulate in this section (7:1–50) the way in which the ministry of Jesus builds upon but transcends that of John. See further at 7:1–10.

The form of the material is broadly that of a miracle story, though obviously the prior death of the sufferer distinguishes somewhat the form of a resuscitation account from that of other healings.

There is a particularly close similarity in form and content between this account and Philostratus' account (*Life of Apollonius* 4.45) of Apollonius' restoring a young woman who had died soon after her wedding. In both cases the wonder-worker comes across a funeral procession of a young person whose death has been more than usually tragic. In the story of Apollonius the bridegroom has a part corresponding roughly to that of the mother in Luke's account. The wonder-worker in each case stops the bier, speaks about the cessation of tears, and addresses the dead person. In both cases the restoration to life is marked by the once dead person speaking. Whereas the son is restored to his mother in Luke, in this text the young woman returns to her father's house. Finally there is reaction from the public or the relatives.

Apollonius of Tyana was a Neopythagorean ascetic and wandering teacher who was a near contemporary of Jesus and died toward the end of the first century. His life story is chiefly known from the account by Philostratus from around a century later. Despite the striking correspondences there is no need to postulate dependence in either direction. The two stories share a similar subject matter, a common milieu in the storyteller's art, and an obvious desire to exalt a great figure. While it is the account concerning Apollonius which bears most similarity to the Lukan account, Jewish and Greco-Roman sources contain a number of accounts of the resuscitation of the dead (see Str-B, 1:560; Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 233–34).

Petzke ("Historizität," 371–78) uses the formal equivalence of (the earliest) forms of the Apollonius account and the Gospel account to press the historical question and to insist that both accounts should be set on the same level historically. His argument seems to confuse *separate* transmission of items of the gospel tradition with *isolated* transmission of those items. Taken alone, the account of the resuscitation of the widow's son in Nain has no more claim to historicity than that of the miracle said to have been performed by Apollonius of Tyana. But in Christian tradition the account never has stood alone. And once a naturalistic perspective has been transcended to allow for the historicity of any of Jesus' healings (understood as more than psychosomatic healings), there seems to be no good reason for stumbling over the resuscitation of the dead. If there is any doubt about the origin of the account of the restoration to life of the young man at Nain, there can be none about the restoration to life of Jairus' daughter (see 8:40–56).

Luke 7:11–17 has no parallel in the other Gospels. It probably comes from Luke's distinctive sources and has been positioned here on the basis of the Lukan structuring of 7:1–50.

The telling of the story has an evident relationship to the text of 1 Kgs 17:8–24 with its account of Elijah and the widow of Zarephath. The contacts between the two texts seem in the first instance to be based on the Hebrew text (in the LXX the dead son is not an only son), but close verbal identity between parts of the LXX of 1 Kgs 17:10 and Luke 7:11–12 and of 1 Kgs 17:23 and Luke 7:15 suggest that this connection has been reinforced (by Luke?) at the Greek stage of the tradition (cf. George, "Miracle," 252–53).

As an introduction vv 11–12 set the scene and bring Jesus and his company into contact with the funeral procession. The action proper of the resuscitation account is bracketed by the interaction between Jesus and the bereaved mother in vv 13 and 15. It consists of three steps: (i) the stopping of the bier, (ii) the addressing of the dead man, and (iii) the young man's sitting up and speaking. The episode concludes with a double conclusion: first, the response of the witnesses (v 16); second, the spread of the report of the impact that this deed of Jesus has produced (v 17).

Comment

Standing in parallel with 7:1–10 as an instance of the raising up of the dead (v 22), vv 11–17 demonstrate that the visitation of God heralded by John (v 27) in fact takes place in the ministry of Jesus.

11 The use of ἐγένετο ("it happened") + finite verb is a Lukan Septuagintalism (cf. Fitzmyer, 119). In the NT only Luke uses ἐξῆς, "next." Elsewhere he uses it with the feminine article (= "the next day"), but here the less precise "soon afterwards" is intended (χρόνῳ, "time," is understood). Note the similarity of 1 Kgs 17:10 LXX to vv 11-12a: καὶ ἐπορεύθη εἰς Σαρέπτα εἰς τὸν πυλῶνα τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐκεῖ γυνὴ χήρα, "and he went into Sarepta to the city gate, and behold there a widow woman. . . ." The following crowd of v 9 is retained for this episode, and disciples, who were not mentioned in vv 1-10, are also spoken of. The disciples who are with Jesus regularly are in Luke's usage more or less coextensive with the Twelve (6:13 cf. 6:17: "with them"). Nain was on the southern border of Galilee about twenty-five miles from Capernaum. No remains of gate or city wall have yet come to light in archaeological investigation.

Jesus has already been compared to Elijah (and Elisha) at 4:25-27 and motifs from 1 Kgs 17:8-24 are also probable in 8:42, 55; 9:38, 42. The procedure is reminiscent of the anthological style of much of the infancy narratives (see at 1:5). The comparison between Jesus and Elijah in Luke 7:11-17 has a counterpart in the comparison between Peter and Elisha in Acts 9:36-42 (Acts 9:39 echoes the LXX of 2 Kgs 4:30; v 40 echoes the LXX of 2 Kgs 4:33, 35; common themes may be noted by comparing Acts 9:38, 40, 41 with 2 Kgs 4:22-30, 33, 36; Acts 9:40 with 2 Kgs 4:33; Acts 9:41 with 2 Kgs 4:36—cf. George, "Miracle," 255). In Luke 9:61-62 (cf. 1 Kgs 19:19-21) and possibly also in the giving of the Spirit after the ascension (Acts 1 and 2; cf. 2 Kgs 2:9-10, 15) the link between Elijah and Elisha is paralleled in the link between Jesus and the disciples. It would, however, be quite wrong to suggest that Luke is seeking to present Jesus as the new eschatological Elijah (as, e.g., Swaeles, *AsSeign* 69 [1964] 41-66). This line of interpretation quite mistakes the anthological style—which is concerned not with the fulfillment of prophecy but with the interpretation of God's present acts in line with those of the past—and overlooks the fact that John also is likened to Elijah in 1:17 (via Elisha here) and 7:27 (John is the eschatological Elijah here) and even the disciples are (negatively) likened to Elijah in 9:54-55 (though perhaps here we are to understand that the disciples wish to act on Jesus' behalf). Is Jesus also compared to Elisha at 9:10-17 (see there)? Altogether too much has been made of Luke's deletion of Mark 9:11-13, verses whose complexity alone offers quite sufficient grounds for their deletion (note Matthew's clarifying reformulation [17:9-13]).

12 ὥς ἤγγισεν, "as he drew near," is likely to be Lukan redaction (cf. 19:29 and 41). The redactional use of μονογενής, "only," in 8:42 and 9:38 has been influenced by its use here. ἰκανός ("sufficient" = "quite a") is used here in a typically Lukan manner (cf. Schürmann, *Abschiedsrede*, 132). ἐκκομίζειν, "to carry out," is a technical term for carrying out a corpse to burial. Burial was by custom outside the walls of a Jewish town. Perhaps we are to understand that the meeting was providentially ordered. This widow was truly "left all alone" (1 Tim 5:5). The large crowd of mourners with her heightens the sense of tragedy, but also contributes to the "public staging" of Jesus' mighty deed (cf. Schürmann, 400).

13 From this point on Luke will frequently in narrative (7:19; 10:1, 39, 41;

11:39; etc.) refer to Jesus as ὁ Κύριος, "the Lord." This has been prepared for by the uses of the word in direct address in 5:8, 12; 6:46; 7:6. The use of ὁ Κύριος reflects the later Christian usage of this term for Jesus as the one exalted by God to be the Lord (Acts 2:36; Rom 1:4), but Luke thinks particularly of the authority of Jesus. Jesus responds in compassion to the needs of the mother. She, not the son, is the beneficiary of the miracle (cf. the end of v 15). The note of Jesus' compassion is hardly a Lukan addition (as Dibelius claims, *Tradition*, 75), since Luke retains none of Mark's instances of this verb. The command to stop weeping creates in the narrative a sense of anticipation to add to that already engendered by the echoes of 1 Kgs 17:8–24.

14 σορός is used of a vessel for holding the remains of a dead person, or of a coffin. In Hellenistic Greek it came to be used also of the bier used for transporting the corpse/coffin to burial (attested from the third century A.D.) and may already be used so here. The touching of the bier is a silent appeal for the funeral procession to be stopped and is responded to accordingly. Jesus ignores the ritual uncleanness of the dead body (Num 19:11, 16). The young man (we have had no earlier indication of his age) is addressed as such (cf. 8:54; Acts 9:40). There is a note of personal authority in the "I say to you" (cf. Mark 5:41 where Luke's parallel lacks this expression). Despite the passive form ἐγέρθητι (lit., "be raised up") no special resurrection connotation should be discerned: the passive of this verb is often used with intransitive active (i.e., middle) force. Also, despite the generally eschatological setting for this resuscitation (cf. vv 22, 28), it should not in a Johannine sense (cf. John 11:25) be seen as an anticipation of the eschatological resurrection of the dead.

15 ἀνακαθίζειν, "to sit up," is used in the NT only here and of Tabitha in Acts 9:40. Along with the beginning to speak (which perhaps echoes the LXX but not MT of 1 Kgs 17:22), the sitting up is proof positive of the return to life. καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ, "and he gave him to his mother," agrees word for word with the LXX of 1 Kgs 17:23.

16 Vv 16–17 are quite Lukan, but the pre-Lukan form will already have had a public response at this point (against Dibelius, *Tradition*, 76). Fear is the natural reaction to the presence of the action of God (cf. 1:12, 65; 2:9; 5:26; 8:25, 37). ἔλαβεν φόβος, "fear seized," could be Lukan (cf. 5:26), as also the following "they glorified God" (cf. at 5:26). The identification of Jesus as "a great prophet" is helped by the echoes of 1 Kgs 17:8–24. The confession is Christologically imprecise but attracts no criticism from Luke (cf. at 4:24). In view is neither the "prophet like Moses" of Acts 3:22–23; 7:37–53 (cf. Deut 18:15–18) nor the eschatological appearance of Elijah (Mal 4:5). Luke may be responsible for the language about the visitation of God. It recalls the language of 1:68, 78 (see there). The ethos of the verse is entirely Jewish. The recognition in Jewish terms of Jesus' ministry as an act of God to his people is of importance to Luke.

17 The spread of a report about Jesus is a familiar Lukan note (4:14, 37; see at 4:14). Judea is used here (as in 4:44; 6:17; etc.) of the whole of Jewish Palestine. As in 6:17, Jesus' reputation goes even beyond Jewish Palestine. Though Luke works for the most part with traditions of a Galilean ministry, from 4:44 on his presentation is in terms of a ministry conducted throughout

and known about in the whole of Jewish Palestine (i.e., pertaining to the whole of the People of God). Perhaps Luke also has in mind the report reaching the disciples of John (v 18).

Explanation

7:11–17 forms a pair with vv 1–10 as an(other) instance of the raising up of the dead (v 22), and demonstrates that the visitation of God heralded by John (v 27) takes place in the ministry of Jesus. The telling of the story has an evident relationship to 1 Kgs 17:8–24 which is particularly noticeable in vv 11–12 (cf. 1 Kgs 17:10) and v 15 (cf. 1 Kgs 17:23).

Jesus continues to itinerate and now comes to Nain, a border town in southern Galilee some twenty-five miles from Capernaum. The crowd of v 9 is still present. Apart from exceptional texts (6:17; 20:37), the disciples whom Jesus is regularly with are the Twelve (cf. 6:13, 17). At the gate of the city Jesus meets the funeral procession of an only son with the mourning mother. We are probably to understand that the meeting was providentially ordered. In a literary manner, which has been noted especially in the infancy narratives, Jesus is here likened by OT allusion to the prophet Elijah, who also met a widow woman at a city gate and later restored to life her only son. There is counterpart for this in Acts 9:36–42 where Elisha's restoration to life of the Shunamite woman's son (2 Kgs 4:18–37) is echoed in Peter's restoration of Tabitha to life. Such paralleling is concerned with the interpretation of God's present acts in line with those of the past. There is no attempt here to take from John the Baptist the role of the eschatological Elijah (1:17; Mal 4:5; Luke 7:27 = Mal 3:1).

The sense of tragedy is heightened by identifying the dead man as an only son (cf. 8:42; 9:38) and also by speaking of the mother as a widow. She is a widow "left all alone" (1 Tim 5:5), and Jesus has compassion on her. She, not the son, is the beneficiary of the miracle (cf. the end of v 15). For the first time in the Gospel Jesus is here called "the Lord" as in later Christian usage. Luke has prepared for this by the earlier uses of the vocative "Lord" (5:8, 12; 6:46; 7:6), and these indicate that Luke thinks particularly of the authority of Jesus when he uses this designation. The Lord's directive "Do not weep" creates in the narrative, as an implied promise of action, a sense of anticipation.

The touching of the bier involves a deliberate ignoring of the ritual uncleanness of the dead body (Num 19:11, 16). The action is a silent appeal for the funeral procession to be stopped and is responded to accordingly. Jesus' authoritative word (cf. v 8) requires the dead man to sit up. The young man's movement and speech are clear proof that life is fully restored. Jesus hands him over to his mother.

Fear is the natural reaction to the presence of the action of God, and as in 5:26 it is accompanied by the glorifying of God. What has happened is indubitably an action of God, and the People's identification of Jesus as a great prophet is helped by the echoing of Elijah's miracle. To call Jesus a prophet does not say everything about his identity, but is allowed by Luke to be an important category for thinking about Jesus (cf. at 4:24). The language about

a visitation by God echoes that of 1:68, 78, and fits well with the citation from Malachi at v 27. The terms here are thoroughly Jewish. This kind of Jewish recognition of Jesus is important as part of Luke's defense of the truth of the Christian gospel.

The episode, like most of the materials of Luke 4–9, has its setting in Galilee. Nevertheless, Luke is concerned to signal a whole-of-Palestine setting for Jesus' ministry. This he does largely by generalizing statements (as 4:44) and statements about the spread of Jesus' reputation (as here).

Are You the Coming One? (7:18–23)

Bibliography

Becker, J. *Johannes der Täufer und Jesus von Nazareth*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1972. 83–85. **Craghan, J. F.** "A Redactional Study of Lk 7,21 in the Light of Dt 19,15." *CBQ* 29 (1967) 353–67. **Dibelius, M.** *Die urchristliche Überlieferung von Johannes dem Täufer*. 6–15, 33–39. **Dupont, J.** "L'Ambassade de Jean-Baptiste (Matthieu 11,2–6; Luc 7,18–23)." *NRT* 83 (1961) 805–21, 943–59. **Hahn, F.** *The Titles of Jesus in Christology*. 366–69, 380. **Hirsch, S.** "Studien zu Matthäus 11,2–26: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte Jesu und zur Frage seines selbstbewusstseins." *TZ* 6 (1950) 241–60. **Hoffmann, P.** *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle*. 192–93, 198–215. **Kümmel, W. G.** *Promise and Fulfilment: The Eschatological Message of Jesus*. SBT 23. Naperville: Allenson, 1957. 109–13. ———. *Jesu Antwort an Johannes den Täufer: Ein Beispiel zum Methodenproblem in der Jesusforschung*. Sitzungsberichte der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt/Main. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1974. 129–59. **Lambrecht, J.** "Are You the One Who Is to Come, or Shall We Look for Another?" *The Gospel Message of Jesus Today*. *LouvStud* 8 (1980) 115–28. **Mattill, A. J., Jr.** *Luke and the Last Things*. 159–64. **Schulz, S. Q.** *Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten*. 190–203. **Strobel, A.** *Untersuchungen zum eschatologischen Verzögerungsproblem*. NovTSup 2. Leiden: Brill, 1961. 265–98. **Stuhlmacher, P.** *Das paulinische Evangelium*. 1:218–25. **Vögtle, A.** "Wunder und Wort in urchristlicher Glaubenswerbung (Mt 11,2–5/Lk 7, 18–22)." In *Das Evangelium und die Evangelien: Beiträge zur Evangelienforschung*. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1971. 219–42. **Völkel, M.** "Anmerkungen zur lukanischen Fassung der Täuferanfrage Luk 7,18–23." In *Festgabe für Karl Heinrich Rengstorf*, ed. W. Dietrich and H. Schreckenberg. Theokratia 2. Leiden: Brill, 1973. 166–73.

Translation

¹⁸John's disciples told him about all these things. Calling a certain two of his disciples, John ¹⁹sent to the Lord,^a saying, "Are you the Coming One, or should we wait for another?"^b ²⁰Coming to him the men said, "John the Baptist sent us to you, saying, 'Are you the Coming One, or should we wait for another?'" ²¹In that^c hour he healed many of diseases and afflictions and evil spirits; and granted to many blind people the ability^d to see. ²²Then^e he answered them, "Go and tell John what you have seen and heard:^f Blind people see; lame people walk; lepers are cleansed; and deaf people hear; the dead are raised; the poor are evangelized. ²³And fortunate is whoever is not scandalized at me."

Notes

^a Ἰησοῦν, “Jesus,” is read by ⱼ A K W X etc. and could be original. But if so, it would more likely have led to “the Lord Jesus” as the alternate reading (as only syr^{pal}).

^b Many of the best texts including ⱼ B L R W etc. conform the text here to Matthew’s *ἐτέρον*, “a different one,” but in the corresponding part of v 20 the chosen text has the support of p⁷⁵ B A Θ etc.

^c The more usual Lukan *ἐν αὐτῇ δὲ τῇ ὥρᾳ*, “in the same hour,” is read by A D Θ etc.

^d “The ability” added to complete the sense.

^e Greek *καί* (lit., “and”).

^f D (e) supports the rather Semitic-sounding *εἶπατε Ἰωάννη ἃ εἶδον ὑμῶν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ καὶ ἃ ἤκουσαν ὑμῶν τὰ ὦτα*, “tell John what your eyes saw and your ears heard.”

Form/Structure/Setting

The relationship between the ministries of Jesus and John is the controlling motif of the section 7:1–50. 7:1–10 and 11–17 have by way of illustration shown how in the ministry of Jesus God has visited his people in compassion. Now in three closely linked units (vv 18–23, 24–30, 31–35) the juxtaposition of John and Jesus comes sharply into focus. The first concerns itself with the relationship between Jesus and the figure heralded by John (3:15–17). On the structure of the section see further at 7:1–10.

The episode has in the underlying tradition (cf. Matt 11:2–6) the form of a pronouncement story with its minimal narrative setting for the pronouncement of Jesus in vv 22–23. (Luke appears to have expanded the account with the rather repetitive v 20 and the account of healings right there and then in v 21.) The telling of the story for the sake of Jesus’ pronouncement means that the account provides no resolution of John’s initial uncertainty (vv 18–19).

The series of linked units, vv 18–23, 24–30, 31–35, are also to be found linked in the same sequence in Matthew (Matt 11:2–19), except that in the Matthean sequence Matt 11:11–15 is intruded between the second and third unit (Luke has parallel material in 16:16), and nothing in the Matthean sequence corresponds to Luke 7:29–30 (cf. Matt 21:31–32). (These variations are discussed at 7:29–35.) So the linkage is evidently pre-Lukan.

Scholarly opinion is divided as to the historicity of the episode. Strauss (*Life of Jesus*, 229) questioned whether a politically dangerous John would be allowed the freedom in prison (Matt 11:2) to send or receive messengers. (For this view Strauss is dependent upon the account of Josephus [*Ant.* 18.116–19], whose statement, however, that Herod feared that some sort of sedition might arise from John’s influence, fits Josephus’ own profile of John no better than it does the Gospel portrayal.) It has been quite popular to locate the origin of the pericope in the conflict between Christians and disciples of the Baptist over whether Jesus or John was in fact the Christ (Fridrichsen, *Miracle*, 64–69; Stuhlmacher, *Paulinische Evangelium* 1:218–20; cf. Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 23–24). Against this option, however, P. Hoffmann (*Logienquelle*, 214, cf. Strobel, *Verzögerungsproblem*, 268) has rightly noted that the text offers no point of connection for a situation of conflict between Christians and disciples of the Baptist. The most persuasive of the explanations of the text as nonhistori-

cal speak in terms of evangelistic contact with Baptist disciples—Baptist disciples for the sake of salvation must not take offense that the “coming one” heralded by John comes before judgment as the bringer of salvation (Vögtle, “Wunder,” 241)—or in terms of an internal Christian discussion, possibly involving former disciples of the Baptist, which seeks to resolve the tension between the Baptist’s messianism and the Christian understanding of Jesus (C. H. Kraeling, *John the Baptist*, New York: Scribner, 1951, 130; and cf. P. Hoffman, *Logienquelle*, 215). But these concerns already have a rightful place in the time of the ministry of Jesus, and it seems best to follow those who have argued for the historicity of the episode (see esp. Kümmel, *Jesu Antwort*, 153–57; Strobel, *Verzögerungsproblem*, 268–72; Dunn, *Jesus*, 56–60). No doubt there is a tension between the confident witness of the Johannine Baptist to Jesus, and even the conviction of Matt 3:13–14, and the questioning attitude here. But whatever explanation is to be given for those texts, they can certainly cast no doubt upon the historicity of the present pericope.

There has been some attempt to divide the pericope. P. Hoffmann (*Logienquelle*, 210) notes that it would have been possible for v 23 to be transmitted as an isolated logion. Bultmann (*Synoptic Tradition*, 23) saw vv 22–23 as originally independent, and used by Jesus to paint a picture of the final blessedness which he believed to be beginning. But in this case the framework has hardly been spun out of the pronouncement, as is normally maintained for pronouncement stories. Both these options are possible for the materials they embrace, but the whole pericope remains best accounted for on the basis of a unified origin.

V 18a links the episode into the context and provides the motivation for the action to come. In vv 18b–20 Luke continues to present in a twofold manner the putting of John’s question to Jesus by first reporting the scene of John’s briefing of his disciples (vv 18b–19) and by then recounting the meeting of those disciples with Jesus (v 20). Jesus’ answer likewise gains a bipartite form which balances upon the fulcrum of Jesus’ words: “Go and tell John what you have seen and heard.” First Jesus gives them something to see (v 21); then he furnishes them with something to hear (vv 22–23). Vv 22–23 divide into a sixfold list, in two pairs of three items, and a final challenge in the form of a conditional beatitude.

Comment

The juxtaposition of Jesus and John which is the controlling motif of 7:1–50 now becomes apparent. The concern of vv 18–23, the first of three sections in which the Baptist is featured, is with the relationship between Jesus and the figure heralded by John (3:15–17). Jesus is that figure but in a manner not anticipated by John. Grace has priority in the purposes of God to a degree not foreseen by the stern prophet of repentance. Also, the eschatological fulfillment which came with Jesus lacked the comprehensiveness which was indispensable to any standard apocalyptic conceptualization.

18 V 18a links the episode to its context in language that is quite Lukan (cf. Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 190 n. 117). The scope intended by Luke for “all these things” is not clear, but the focus is likely to be on Jesus’ mighty works.

It is not certain whether Matthew has added or Luke deleted the reference to John being in prison (Matt 11:2). In any case the use of messengers implies that John was not free to come to Jesus. Luke mentions John's imprisonment already in 3:20. "And calling a certain two of," for which Matthew has no counterpart, occurs in identical wording in Acts 23:23, except for the inversion of the order of "two" and "a certain." Nevertheless, the fact that Luke takes over none of Mark's nine uses of *προσκαλεῖσθαι*, "to call," raises doubts about whether the phrase is entirely a Lukan insertion (cf. Marshall, 289). *τις τῶν*, "a certain of," is frequent in Lukan redaction (Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 190 n. 117) and the number "two" is probably a Lukan pointer to the sufficiency in law (Deut 19:15) of the witness to Jesus' words and deeds (so Craghan, *CBQ* 29 [1967] 362–63; cf. J. Jeremias, "Paarweise Sendung im Neuen Testament," in *New Testament Essays*, FS T. W. Manson, ed. A. J. B. Higgins [Manchester: University Press, 1959] 136–43).

19 Matthew's "through the disciples" has already been used for v 18 and is not repeated. Between Matthew and Luke the role of participle and finite verb is interchanged (Matthew: "having sent he said"; Luke: "he sent saying"). Comparison with 7:6 suggests that the change is Luke's. Luke's *ἄλλον* ("another") for Matthew's *ἕτερον* (lit., "a different one") accords better with classical norms.

John's expectations (3:16–17) are often considered to have been so utterly alien to what Jesus set himself to accomplish that John could never have been prompted to ask this question. But surely this is an extreme position. There must be something in Luke's claim that those who had responded to John were open to Jesus' ministry (vv 29–30; see there). The present account gives full weight to the possibility that John might be scandalized by Jesus (v 23). But a tension between prophetic announcement and prophetic fulfillment would be no new thing in Israelite history and, in any case, prophetic announcements cannot in any straightforward manner be treated as unequivocal descriptions of what is to transpire. John announced a visitation of God and people were in Jesus experiencing a visitation of God (v 16). No matter how much this is unlike his expectations, John can not unreasonably be expected to ask whether there might be a connection. John clearly expected God to act in judgment through an intermediary (see at 3:16), and Jesus just could be that intermediary. As Dunn (*Jesus*, 59) rightly maintains, the question put by John is no later church construction; rather, the most natural setting for question and answer is: "As soon as the note of imminence characteristic of John's preaching was supplanted or at least supplemented by the note of fulfillment characteristic of Jesus' preaching."

"The coming one" has been variously claimed as a reference to the eschatological prophet (Stuhlmacher, *Paulinische Evangelium* 1:218–19; Hahn, *Titles*, 380) of Jewish expectation (the one eschatological figure of whom wonders are to be expected), to the coming of an eschatological Elijah figure (Fitzmyer, 666–67; J. A. T. Robinson, *NTS* 4 [1957–58] 263–81), to the Son of Man who comes in judgment (P. Hoffmann, *Logienquelle*, 200), or to the messiah in a secretive manner (Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 157 n. 3). The basis for the identification is in each case tenuous. A "coming" with possible or definite eschatological connections is to be found in Dan 7:13; Zech 9:9; Ps 118:26 (cf. Luke 13:35; 19:38); Gen 49:10; Hab 2:3. Dupont notes (*NRT* 83 [1961]

816) that unlike the MT all the versions of Gen 49:10 speak of the waiting of the peoples for him (*προσδοκία* in the LXX), which provides an extra link with Luke 7:19. He seems to overlook the fact that Hab 2:3 also speaks of waiting for a coming thing/one (cf. Heb 10:36). Strobel (*Verzögerungsproblem*, esp. 265–66) has argued the claims of Hab 2:3 as the background to Luke 7:19, and it is this text which seems to have the best claim to stand behind the form of John's questions—though perhaps there is no need to choose. It is rather more doubtful whether the motif of eschatological delay, which Strobel (276–77) brings in via the Habakkuk text, plays any part in Luke 7:19. “The coming one” identifies no figure of a specific strand of eschatological expectation. Rather, the use of the term is a means of bringing to expression in a nonspecific manner the essence of all Jewish eschatological hope. The specifically Baptist form of this hope finds expression at 3:16 and at a literary level “the coming one” probably echoes “the one who is mightier than I is coming” of that verse.

In the Gospel of Luke, the Baptist's questioning is not a move from certainty to doubt about Jesus, but rather a tentative exploration of the possibility that the one whom he had heralded as eschatological judge and deliverer may be present in Jesus in a quite unexpected form.

On Luke's use of “the Lord” for Jesus see at 7:13.

20 This verse appears to be a Lukan expansion. In 19:34 Luke, unlike his Markan source, repeats the words supplied to Jesus' messengers (cf. also 15:18–19, 21). Here in Luke 7:20 the immediate pattern will be vv 3–4 (note the shared use of *παραγνόμενοι πρὸς*, “coming to”). The introduction of *οἱ ἄνδρες*, “the men,” is typically Lukan (Schulz, *Spruchquelle*, 192 n. 127). John is called “the Baptist” for the first time here in Luke, a name which bears witness to the central role that John's baptizing activity played in the public perception of his ministry (cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 18.116–18). For the reader John is naturally John the Baptist (so v 18), but here on the story line the disciples of John must identify themselves with a more precise indication of who their master is (cf. Schürmann, 410 n. 17).

21 V 21 is also best attributed to Luke. He supplies the eyewitness experience of Jesus' mighty works which seemed to be implied by the “you see” of his source (cf. Matt 11:4). The verse fits rather awkwardly into the context and has clear marks of Lukan style (*θεραπεύειν ἀπό*, “to heal from”; *χαρίζω*, “to grant”; *πνεύματα πονηρά*, “evil spirits”). As a summary statement of mass healing the verse may be compared with 4:40–41; 5:15; 6:18–19. Healing here includes exorcism, but this does not mean that no distinction is drawn between disease and demon possession (against Fitzmyer, 667; cf. at 4:39). For discussion of healing and exorcism see at 4:38–39; 4:31–37. Neither exorcism nor indeed healing of illness (as distinct from disability), except in the specific case of leprosy, is represented in v 22. They are here because they are characteristic of Jesus' ministry. *μάστιξ* (lit., “whip”/“lash”) is used metaphorically for severe illness. Not until 18:35–43 does Luke have a pericope narrating the healing of a blind person; the present general statement supplies that lack in readiness for v 22 (Matthew has a healing of two blind men already in 9:27–31). Craghan (*CBQ* 29 [1967] 357–58) exaggerates the role of v 21 by identifying it as the center of the episode's structure. Nevertheless, because of the “what you have seen and heard” in v 22, the verse does share with the

statements of v 22 (with its echoes of Isaianic eschatological texts) the place of climax in the episode.

22 The wording of vv 22–23 is exactly as Matt 11:4–6 except that Matthew specifies that Jesus is the speaker, the linking *καί*'s are distributed differently, and Luke makes specific the immediate connection of the seeing and hearing to the contents respectively of vv 21 and 22–23 by replacing Matthew's present tenses with aorists and reversing the order of the terms to correlate with the sequence of vv 21 and 22–23: "what you saw and heard" (the past tense for the hearing anticipates the time of reporting to John, at which time the hearing will be a past event).

Without quoting, Jesus' words echo the terms of Isa 61:1 ("to evangelize the poor"; "sight to the blind" [LXX only]); 29:18–19 ("the deaf shall hear"; "the eyes of the blind will see"; "the poor will find joy"); 35:5–6 ("the eyes of the blind will be opened"; "the ears of the deaf will hear [MT: be unstopped]"; "the lame shall leap"). Isa 26:19 ("the dead shall rise [MT: your dead shall live]") is also probably alluded to. Septuagintal influence on the present form of the text is possible but not certain. Kümmel notes (*Jesu Antwort*, 155–56) that the un-Greek use of the passive of *εὐαγγελίζεω*, "to evangelize," favors an Aramaic original. There is no Isaianic background for "lepers are cleansed." Only Elisha's cure of Naaman's leprosy (2 Kgs 5) offers any possible OT background, but it is probably better to see reflected here no more than the special impact made in the first century by Jesus' healing of leprosy (cf. at 5:12–16). If Isa 26:19 is not being echoed by "dead are raised," then the explanation of its presence will be similar (cf. 7:1–10, 11–17). No healing of the deaf by Jesus is actually reported by Luke (but cf. at 1:20 and 11:14). Luke has broken the six-item list into two triplets by means of a single *καί*, "and." With "the dead are raised" in the fifth position we are probably to understand "the poor are evangelized" as occupying the climactic position in the list. In the Lukan text this final item echoes 4:18 where evangelizing the poor summarizes the whole of Jesus' ministry (see there; cf. also 6:20). The climax is not that of word versus deed (as, e.g., Schürmann, 411). Rather, with Dupont (*NRT* 83 [1961] 948 n. 84), we should find the climax in the generalization implied: God's intervention is not restricted to certain categories of sufferers, but is for all the afflicted.

Jesus' words are no direct answer to John's question (this indirectness fits the usual veiledness of the self-disclosure of Jesus) and interpreters differ over the precise force of the response. Is the response primarily Christological or eschatological/soteriological? Does it affirm only or also negate? The Isaianic echoes are insufficient to make a precise Christological statement (cf. at 4:18). The point is rather that in Jesus' deeds the time of salvation heralded by Isaiah has dawned. Without the Scriptural anchoring, the point is similar in 10:23–24. It has often been noted that the echoed Isaianic texts are closely linked with vengeance statements which receive no echo in the words of Jesus (Isa 19:20; 35:5; 61:2; cf. Jeremias, *Jesus' Promise*, 46). This is sometimes construed as a rejection of the Baptist's expectations (e.g., Fitzmyer, 667–68). But the judgment motif is not absent from Jesus' ministry (e.g., 6:24–26; 10:13–15), and in the Lukan frame we should think rather of the Lukan two-stage eschatology (cf. at 4:19): what John anticipated will come later on (cf. Acts

10:42; 17:31), but there is more graciousness in God's purposes than John dreamed of, and on this Jesus would focus John's attention.

23 The Lukan text here is identical to the Matthean. The beatitude is unusual in a number of ways. Not one of the sixty-five LXX beatitudes is introduced with *καί*, "and" (Dupont, *NRT* 83 [1961] 952 n. 92; but Luke has beatitudes introduced with *καί* also at 1:45 and 14:14). This beatitude is also distinctive among the beatitudes of Jesus in being a challenge rather than a proclamation (but cf. 11:28). Here response to Jesus is decisive as in no other of the Gospel beatitudes (Vögtle, "Wunder," 235 [but indirectly 6:22 has the same Christological focus]). The presence of the copula (*ἐστίν*, "is") and the singular indefinite construction (*ὅς ἐάν*, "whoever") are also unusual. On the beatitude form see further at 6:20–26.

The beatitude is to be closely linked to the preceding statement, but it does not, as suggested by Dupont (*NTR* 83 [1961] 952), provide an additional item to the sixfold list ("and happy also are those. . ."). Rather, the beatitude calls us back to the original question of v 19 (v 20); it both calls for a positive answer and at the same time acknowledges that there may be difficulties impeding such a recognition. What difficulties are in view? What is happening in Jesus lacks the cosmic comprehensiveness which might be expected of eschatological fulfillment, and which certainly would be expected on the basis of Luke 3:16–17. There is surely potential for stumbling here. The shift in focus from judgment to grace may also play a part. Jonah too (4:1) was scandalized by the action of God which followed on his preaching of judgment (cf. Dupont, *NRT* 83 [1961] 957). Mercy triumphs over judgment (Jas 2:13); and beyond John's message of divine vengeance stands Jesus' message of love for enemies (6:27–36).

No response by John is reported. This is true for the tradition before Luke where the focus is already on the pronouncement of Jesus, which has clearly been seen to have a more general relevance and challenge. The lack of response, however, is convenient, since the report of a positive response (which Luke would certainly assume) would confuse the point of v 28, which can only leave John outside the kingdom because it views him in his time of heralding before the ministry of Jesus (or at least in his time of imprisonment, and not directly open to the ministry of Jesus) and, therefore, as belonging to the time before it became possible to move into the kingdom (see at v 28).

Explanation

The relationship between the ministries of John and Jesus is the controlling motif of the section 7:1–50. Here, in the first of three units in which John features, the focus is on the relationship between Jesus and the figure heralded by John (3:15–17). Jesus is not as John expected: grace has a priority in the purposes of God to a degree not foreseen by the stern prophet of repentance; and the eschatological events which mark the ministry of Jesus are dramatic enough, but do not occur on a cataclysmic scale.

Jesus' mighty works reach the ear of John in prison. They have been such that people have experienced in them a visitation from God (v 16). John had been announcing a visitation of God, and despite the dramatic difference,

John wondered about a possible connection between the two. John expected God to act in judgment through an intermediary, and Jesus just could be that intermediary. Constrained in prison, John makes his inquiry by means of his disciples. Luke, alert to the need for all things to stand the scrutiny of the OT law, makes it clear that John receives a legally adequate witness (a true witness) concerning Jesus by speaking in terms of two messengers (cf. Deut 19:15).

John asks his questions in terms of “the coming one,” an expression which in the light of Gen 49:10 and Hab 2:3 (and also Dan 7:13; Zech 9:9; Ps 118:26) has overtones of eschatological hope, but does not refer to any specific figure of Jewish eschatological thought. Hab 2:3 and the various ancient translations of Gen 49:10 (but not the Hebrew) also contain the idea of “waiting for” to be found in John’s question. At a literary level “the coming one” also links back to the use of the same verb in John’s prophecy in 3:16.

Luke manages to have the question repeated twice by reporting both its origin with John (vv 18–19) and its delivery to Jesus (v 20). This places a greater emphasis on the question, and also balances the double form which Luke gives to Jesus’ response. When John’s disciples come to Jesus, they speak about their master as John the Baptist. In their words to Jesus, this fuller form—a form which bears witness to the central role that John’s baptizing activity played in public perception—is needed. Luke has had no need to use this fuller form for his readers, who are familiar with John from his infancy.

To the repeated question corresponds a two-part answer, organized around the central statement (v 22): “Go and announce to John what you have seen and heard.” First Jesus gives the messengers some things to see (v 21). Restoring sight to the blind is included in the summary list of healings here in anticipation of v 22; Luke does not otherwise narrate the healing of a blind person until 18:35–43. The other items correspond to nothing directly in the list of v 22, but are characteristic of Jesus’ ministry.

After something to see comes something to hear. (When the messengers get to report to John they will have heard it; thus, the past tense.) Jesus’ words now echo the terms in which Isa 61:1; 29:18–19; 35:5–6, and possibly 26:19 speak of the coming time of salvation. Beyond the Isaianic echoes there is the cleansing of the leper, which we saw at 5:12–16 would have in the first century seemed an especially impressive healing; possibly the raising of the dead has been included for similar reasons. “The poor are evangelized” forms the climax of the list because it generalizes the preceding items by implying that God’s present intervention is not restricted to certain categories of sufferers, but is for all the afflicted (compare at 4:18).

How does this response provide an answer to John’s question? The implied answer is certainly yes. But the end-time events which Jesus brings find their focus in the graciousness of God and not in the vengeance of God. The vengeance statements which in Isaiah are closely linked with the texts echoed by Jesus’ words are quite passed over (Isa 29:20; 35:5; 61:2). It is not that the motif of judgment is absent from Jesus’ ministry (see 6:24–26; 10:13–15). Jesus’ role in the judgment of God will come later on (Acts 10:42; 17:31), but there is more graciousness in God’s purposes than John dreamed of, and on this Jesus would focus John’s attention.

The final beatitude (v 23) takes us back to the original question and calls on John, and on us, to answer the question for ourselves. It is a positive answer that is needed but there are difficulties. One can stumble over Jesus in the light of the expectations engendered by John (3:16–17). What is happening in Jesus is impressive enough, but it lacks the comprehensive scope which would seem to be necessary for the end-time intervention of God. The shift in focus from judgment to grace could also be a stumbling block. Jonah too was scandalized by the action of God which followed his preaching of judgment (Jonah 4:1). But mercy triumphs over judgment (Jas 2:13) and beyond John's message of divine vengeance stands Jesus' message of love for enemies (6:27–36).

The response is left open but needs to be made by each reader of the Gospel. There is no doubt, however, what is the correct answer to John's question and, therefore, the right response. All who recognize John as sent by God (and that was the most part of the Jewish People) get their answer here to their question about Jesus.

What Was in the Wilderness? (7:24–28)

Bibliography

Daniel, C. "Les Esséniens et "ceux qui sont dans les maisons des rois" (Mt 11,7–8 et Lc 7,24–27)." *RevQ* 6 (1967) 261–77. **Dibelius, M.** "Zwei Worte Jesu; II: Der Kleinere ist im Himmelreich grösser als Johannes (Mt 11,11)." *ZNW* 11 (1910) 190–92. **Dunn, J. D. G.** *Jesus and the Spirit*. 55–60. **Dupont, J.** "Le Christ et son Précurseur (Mt. 11:2–11)." *AsSeign* 7 (1969) 16–26. **Fridrichsen, A.** "La priamèle dans l'enseignement de Jésus." *ConNT* 4 (1940) 9–16. **George, A.** "Paroles de Jésus sur ses miracles (Mt 11,5.21; 12,27.28 et par.)." In *Jésus aux origines de la christologie*, ed. J. Dupont. BETL 40. Leuven: University Press, 1975. 283–301, esp. 286–92. **Hiers, R. H.** *The Kingdom of God in the Synoptic Tradition*. 57–65. **Hoffmann, P.** *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle*. 190–94, 215–24. **Kertelge, K.** "Die Überlieferung der Wunder Jesu und die Frage nach dem historischen Jesus." In *Rückfrage nach Jesus*, ed. K. Kertelge. Quaestiones disputatae 63. Freiburg/Basel/Vienna: Herder. 174–93, esp. 183–89. **Krieger, N.** "Kein Mensch in weichen Kleidern." *NovT* 1 (1956) 228–30. **Lührmann, D.** *Die Redaktion der Logienquelle*. 24–31. **Mitton, C. L.** "Uncomfortable Words; IX: Stumbling-block Characteristics in Jesus." *ExpTim* 82 (1970–71) 168–72. **Pesch, R.** *Jesus ureigene Taten?*. Freiburg/Basel/Vienna: Herder, 1970. 36–44. **Schulz, S. Q.** *Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten*. 229–36. **Spitta, F.** "Die Sendung des Täufers zu Jesus." *TSK* 83 (1910) 534–51. **Troadec, H.-G.** "Aux confins des deux alliances." *BVC* 16 (1956–57) 19–32. **Wendling, E.** "Synoptische Studien; III: Die Anfrage des Täufers und das Zeugnis über den Täufer." *ZNW* 10 (1909) 46–58.

And see at 7:18–23.

Translation

²⁴When the messengers of John had departed, Jesus began to say to the crowds about John: "What did you go out into the wilderness to look at? A reed being

shaken by the wind? ²⁵ *What, then, did you go out to see? A person in soft garments? Those^a in gorgeous clothing and living in luxury are in royal palaces.* ²⁶ *What, then, did you go out to see? A prophet? Yes, I tell you, and more than a prophet.^b* ²⁷ *This is he concerning whom it stands written,*
'I^c am sending my messenger ahead of you,
who will prepare your way before you.'
²⁸ *I tell^d you, among those born of women there is no one greater^e than John. But the littlest one, in the kingdom of God, is greater than he."*

Notes

^a ἰδοὺ (lit., "behold") is left untranslated.

^b D has curiously transposed the first half of v 28 to this point, at the same time restricting its scope to greatness as a prophet.

^c As Note a.

^d N L Ξ etc. conform the text to Matthew with a prefatory ἀμήν, "amen." A Θ f¹ etc. connect with a γάρ, "for"; D W f¹³ etc. with a δέ, "and/but."

^e προφήτης, "prophet" (so: "there is no greater prophet") is added by A (D) Θ Ψ f¹³ etc.

Form/Structure/Setting

This is the second of three closely linked units which concern the juxtaposition of John and Jesus. The first (vv 18–23) has identified Jesus' ministry with the fulfillment of the eschatological hopes of the Isaianic picture of coming salvation. This second unit for the most part exalts John: in the whole sweep of human history, from the beginning to the eschatological coming of God, John has been assigned the most exalted of roles, as the eschatological herald of Mal 3:1. But the unit has a second point: despite John's unprecedented importance, he has been quite eclipsed now by the inauguration of that which he has heralded. The relationship between vv 18–23 and 24–28 is reminiscent of the step parallelism of the infancy narratives. See further at 7:1–10 and 18–23.

While this can hardly be insisted upon because of the obviously secondary nature of most of the ordering of the Gospel material, there seems to be no good reason why the sequencing of vv 18–23 and 24–28 should not be based on historical memory (cf. Marshall, 292). The occasion of vv 18–23 would certainly be an obvious one for some such comment as vv 24–28.

Because the exaltation of John runs counter to the concerns of the developing church the essential historicity of this saying of Jesus about John is not normally questioned. V 27 and/or v 28b (and sometimes even v 28a) have, however, been suspected as secondary expansion. As a structured rhetorical unit vv 24–26 is not credible as a complete unit: there is too complex a development for a climax which says no more than "and more than a prophet." To add v 28a alone would make the unit into a personal eulogy of John (as Dibelius, *Johannes dem Täufer*, 15). This is not impossible, but there is scarcely analogy elsewhere in Jesus' sayings for such personal eulogy and it is difficult to see a basis for Christian transmission of such a statement. Only v 27 provides any identification of John that moves beyond personal greatness to functional significance. And, therefore, only v 27 provides the saying with any clear demand

upon the hearer. It may be difficult to attribute the composite quotation (see *Comment*) to Jesus, but a quotation of Mal 3:1 or, perhaps, even an allusion to the verse (replaced by an explicit quotation in later Christian transmission) would seem to be an inalienable part of the unit. The situation with v 28b is not quite so clear. The difficulties of this half verse are discussed in *Comment* below. On balance it seems best to see here a genuine saying of Jesus with its concern about the "little ones" and their connection with the present eruption of the kingdom of God.

In the Lukan form the unit here is sometimes taken as including vv 29–30 (so Fitzmyer, 670). These verses are transitional and are certainly represented as response to Jesus' saying in vv 24–28, but their role is primarily preparatory for vv 31–35 and even vv 36–50, so it seems best to link the verses more closely with the material which they directly help to interpret in the Lukan framework.

V 24a links this episode to its context by mentioning the departure of John's messengers and announces the topic of Jesus' saying as John himself. In vv 24b and 25 two to-be-rejected suggestions are made about why the crowds had trekked out to the wilderness: they did not go to see the reeds, which were there but were obviously not what drew crowds to the wilderness; they did not go out to see a gorgeously appareled regal figure, which might have been worth seeing but would not be looked for in the wilderness. These proposals act as a rhetorical counterbalance to the development which Jesus will offer beyond the agreed lowest common denominator identification of John as prophet which is Jesus' third suggestion in v 26. V 26b moves beyond this point of initial agreement with its "and more than a prophet" which is provided with specification by the use of Mal 3:1 (with Exod 23:20) in v 27. This claim of vv 26b–27 is taken up in the words of v 28a in order to set over against it the second point of the pericope, which is a statement in v 28b that despite the unsurpassed greatness of John, a new state of affairs has been inaugurated now by the in-breaking of the kingdom of God, in which the least of the little ones is greater than all John could be in the period of anticipation.

Comment

Where vv 18–23 have been concerned to establish that in Jesus what John heralded (3:15–17) is in a surprising manner beginning the course of its fulfillment, in vv 24–28 the focus is on John and his role: from the beginning of history to the eschatological denouement there has been no more exalted place assigned a human person than that assigned to John. Nevertheless, the coming of the kingdom of God produces an entirely new situation: as the kingdom transcends all human history, so the least of its little ones surpasses the greatest that human history has to offer.

24 Where Luke specifies the departing messengers of John and leaves it to be understood that Jesus is speaker, Matthew (11:7) includes the name "Jesus" (cf. Luke 7:22) and refers to the disciples of the Baptist simply as "these." The Lukan transition is stylistically better, but it is not clear which form is more original. The use of *πρός*, "to," after a verb of saying is a Lukan touch (cf. at 1:13). Otherwise the Lukan and Matthean forms are identical.

Luke reports the going out of the crowds to John in 3:7. On the connection between “wilderness” and eschatological renewal see at 3:4. The punctuation and syntax of the questions admits of more than one analysis. Luke’s repositioning of *ιδεῖν*, “to see,” in v 26 (see there) favors punctuation after the infinitive verbs, as in the given translation (cf. P. Hoffmann, *Logienquelle*, 194). Also possible, however, is punctuation before the infinitives (so: “Why did you go out into the wilderness? Was it to see a reed. . . ?”) or even, if Semitic syntax is reflected (as Beyer, *Semitische Syntax*, 100 n. 7), no intermediate punctuation (so: “could it be that you went out into the wilderness to see a reed. . . ?”). The sense remains much the same.

Swaying reeds were certainly a commonplace in John’s wilderness setting (see Dalman, *Orte und Wege*, 91), but, Jesus implies, are certainly not the reason for the pilgrimage of the crowds. It is doubtful whether the swaying reed functions here as an image for one who is frail or fickle. If it does, John is certainly to be seen as not such (as Schürmann, 416; Fitzmyer, 674; etc.) and not as being accused of having become such (as Krieger, *NovT* 1 [1956] 228).

25 The difference here between Luke and Matthew can all be reasonably attributed to Luke’s pen (see P. Hoffmann, *Logienquelle*, 194; Marshall, 294). The changes have no more than a literary function: by means of the change Luke makes it quite clear that the “soft clothing” intended is the rich apparel of the royal court.

The swaying reed would be in the wilderness, but because of its commonplace nature, would draw no crowds. In the case of a person in gorgeous apparel the terms are quite reversed: the spectacle may be worth the seeing, but it is not to be found in the sparsely populated wilderness. No definite contrast to John’s rough apparel need be intended (Luke has no mention of it).

The contrasted swaying reed and royally clad figure have a rhetorical function: they establish a certain momentum for going beyond the agreed term “prophet” in v 26 to Jesus’ more specific assessment of John.

26 Only the position of *ιδεῖν*, “to see,” is different from the Matthean wording. The change suggests that Luke wished the verb to be linked with the preceding clause, but he may have merely for the sake of consistency conformed the word order to that of the earlier questions.

This time the suggested answer is that of popular opinion concerning John (cf. 20:6). Jesus endorses this opinion (cf. 1:76) and then moves beyond it. Those who argue that vv 27 and 28 are later additions are left with a curiously truncated affirmation by Jesus. *περισσότερον* could be neuter (“something greater”) or masculine (“someone greater”). In any case the degree or kind of greatness remains undefined without vv 27 and 28.

27 The Matthean and Lukan forms of the text are identical except for an *ἐγώ*, “I,” in the Matthean text (=LXX). The introductory formula (“this is he concerning whom it stands written”) is not unlike Qumran usage (CD 1.13; cf. Fitzmyer, 674). Mark 1:2 contains an identically worded conflation of Mal 3:1 and Exod 23:20 (Mark 1:2 lacks the final “before you,” but continues with Isa 40:3). The conflation reflects in the first instance MT and not LXX (Mal 3:1 LXX has “examine” [*ἐπιβλέψεται*] and not “prepare” [*κατασκευάσει*]). For the first clause the wording of Mal 3:1 and Exod 23:20 is almost the same. The “my” is from Mal 3:1 (but Exod 23:20 LXX also has “my”). The

“your” is from Exod 23:20 (Mal 3:1 has “my”). The remainder of the quotation follows Mal 3:1, except that the twofold “your” (Mal 3:1 has nothing for the first and “my” for the second) is determined by the change already in the first clause under the influence of Exod 23:20. The two verses were also linked in Jewish usage (Str-B, 1:597). For interpretation the citation should be viewed as a quotation of Mal 3:1, slightly influenced by the wording of Exod 23:20 (so Fitzmyer, 674).

In Exod 23:20 the referent for “your” is Israel, and that would not be impossible in the Lukan text (Danker; *Jesus and the New Age*, 97). But Mal 3:1 is the controlling citation, and it is better to see that a coming of God is understood as finding its fulfillment in the coming of Jesus (cf. at 1:78; 7:16). In the text as it now is, God is, thus, speaking to the eschatological figure to be heralded by John. On John as preparer see 1:17, 76; and cf. 3:4. If the coming of Jesus is here implicitly identified as what is heralded by the messenger of Mal 3:1, then John is also identified as the Elijah figure of Malachi’s prophecy (cf. Mal 3:23 [ET 4:5]). If Jesus originally quoted Mal 3:1 without alteration, then the Christological self-reference would be uncertain or at least ambiguous. It is also possible that v 28 alone provided the original climax of the pericope and that v 27 is an early clarifying expansion. The arguments are indecisive on either side, but the text does seem to have a more logically coherent development if v 27 is retained in some form (cf. Schürmann, 417).

28 Matthew has here an opening “amen” not found in the Lukan text. Matthean addition is more likely than Lukan deletion (cf. Hasler, *Amen*, 65). Luke’s “there is none” is an improvement of the Semitic (cf. Schlatter, *Matthäus*, 364) οὐκ ἐγγήρευται, “has not arisen/been raised up.” Matthew specifies John further as “the Baptist,” and prefers “kingdom of heaven” to “kingdom of God.”

Partly on the basis of interpretative difficulties, all or part (v 28b) of the verse is often treated as a secondary expansion (Jesus too was born of woman and would be subordinated to John in v 28a; how can John be excluded from the kingdom when the patriarchs and prophets are included [13:28]? Does not v 28b negate and not simply qualify v 28a? V 28b is easily understood as a Christian attempt to tone down Jesus’ extravagant and unguarded praise of John in v 28a). The difficulties are not decisive. A Christian formulation of v 28a with its unguarded praise of John seems extremely unlikely. For v 28b the situation is not quite so clear. Not only in the later church, however, but already during the ministry of Jesus, a statement on the lips of Jesus of generous affirmation of John would pressingly raise the question of what was going on in Jesus’ own ministry. As well, the interest in “little ones” seems characteristic of Jesus (Matt 10:42; 18:10, 14; Mark 9:42; Luke 9:48), as also the language of the kingdom of God. Finally, the perceived tensions between vv 28a and 28b are largely a product of the perspective adopted by the interpreter.

In the present text the emphasis clearly falls on the second clause of Jesus’ affirmation. In the logic of the passage the first clause takes up what is already the point of vv 26b–27 only in order to set over against it, as the second point of the pericope, the statement about the new state of affairs inaugurated by the in-break of the kingdom.

The verse begins with the emphatic “I say to you,” but this emphasis belongs

properly to the second half of the verse. “Those born of women” reflects OT and other Jewish usage (Job 14:1; 15:14; 25:4; Gal 4:4; IQS 11.21; IQH 13.14; etc.). As we shall see to be the case in v 28b with the “littlest one,” John’s greatness is given to him by his place in salvation history: it is a position assigned to him by God and not the greatness of personal achievement or incredible personality. In the whole sweep of human history from the beginning to the eschatological coming of God, John has been assigned that most exalted of roles.

V 28b is meant to take nothing away from v 28a. Rather it uses the exalted terms of v 28a as a springboard from which to reach to yet greater heights (cf. the pattern of step parallelism that characterized the relationship between John and Jesus in the infancy narratives). The statement is indirectly about the kingdom, since it is the kingdom of God which lends its greatness to the “littlest one.”

ὁ μικρότερος is comparative in form (so: “the littler”) and can be understood as such if an immediate comparison with John is in view. The point would then be: littler now but greater in the kingdom. Taken this way μικρότερος is best referred to Jesus who is younger than John (Dibelius, *ZNW* 11 [1910] 190–92) or a disciple of John (Suggs, *Wisdom*, 67) or less significant as a baptizer prior to his eschatological baptizing role (3:16; Mattill, *Last Things*, 163). Each of these views, however, requires us to bring into the sense of μικρότερος by way of assumption too much for which there is no independent testimony. In Hellenistic Greek the comparative is frequently used for the superlative (e.g., Luke 9:48; cf. BDF 60, 244) and is best taken this way here (so: “the littlest one”).

Jesus’ concern for the “little ones” has already been noted. He attributes to them an exalted significance (Matt 10:42; 18:10, 14; Mark 9:42; Luke 9:48). This focus on the little ones seems to be of a piece with his concern for the misfits and outcasts of society, as also his interest in good news for the poor (4:18; 7:22) and his conviction of their special claim upon the kingdom (6:20). Here Jesus declares the least of the little ones to be, in the kingdom of God, greater than John. (“In the kingdom” is best taken as qualifying the predicate of the sentence and not as further defining the subject.) This can only make sense if a situation can be envisaged where these little ones are in some sense already in the kingdom of God while John is not. But that is exactly what we have: John is in prison and is not yet a participant in the new state of affairs inaugurated by Jesus’ ministry (cf. vv 18–23). John stood as the pinnacle of all that was possible prior to the ministry of Jesus, but now the anticipated in-breaking of the kingdom has begun. In this new situation greatness has a new meaning and comes as the gift of the kingdom of God to the little ones. As in 16:16 it is here the present face of the kingdom that is in view and not its eschatological consummation, in which there could be no question but that John would be a participant.

Explanation

If vv 18–23 define Jesus over against the expectations of John, vv 24–28 define John over against the new situation inaugurated by Jesus: John is the

greatest that all human history has to offer, but in the measure which the kingdom of God transcends all human history the least of the little ones in the kingdom of God is greater than John.

The departure of John's messengers is a natural opportunity for Jesus to speak to the crowds about John. He begins with rhetorical questions about possible reasons for these same crowds having flocked out to the wilderness to see John. Two impossible reasons give way to the third which the crowds can accept and from which Jesus can build his own statement about John. Reeds are in the wilderness but do not attract crowds. The resplendently dressed attract crowds but are not to be looked for in the wilderness. John is "a prophet": this is the popular opinion (20:6) and is not untrue (cf. 1:76), but Jesus will say more. John is more than a prophet: he is the eschatological herald of Mal 3:1. The text is quoted in a form influenced by Exod 23:20. (The two texts are very similar in the first clause and were also brought together in Jewish tradition.) In Mal 3:1 it is very directly a coming of God which is anticipated. The influence from Exod 23:20 enables the text to be read, not as God speaking to the people about his own coming, but as God speaking to a mysteriously shrouded eschatological figure about the heralding of the coming of that figure. This recasting of biblical texts into a form corresponding more closely to the terms in which Christians understood those texts to have been fulfilled occurs a number of times in the New Testament.

Through the reference to Mal 3:1 Jesus attributes to John the place of supreme dignity in human history. This supreme importance of John is however, reiterated in the first half of v 28 only to be immediately eclipsed. John is the supreme figure of human history, but the kingdom of God transcends human history—so much so, that the very least of the little ones in the kingdom of God finds himself to be on a higher level than that of John. Jesus saw the kingdom as especially for the little ones (Matt 10:42; 18:10, 14; Mark 9:42; Luke 9:48), who should be linked with the poor (4:18; 7:22). Jesus' focus on the little ones and the poor is of a piece with his mission to sinners and his concern for the misfits and outcasts of society. The kingdom bestows greatness on those who have no other claim to it.

Jesus' words envisage a situation where the little ones are already in the kingdom but John is not—not because he would not ultimately be part of the new age (cf. 13:28), but because John in prison is not yet a participant in the new state of affairs inaugurated by Jesus' ministry (cf. 7:18–23). Here as in 16:16 it is the present face of the kingdom that is in view and not its eschatological consummation.

John and Jesus, and This Generation and the Children of Wisdom (7:29–35)

Bibliography

Arens, E. *The 'HAGGON-Sayings in the Synoptic Tradition: A Historico-critical Investigation.* OBO 10. Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976. 221–

43. **Böcher, O.** "Ass Johannes der Täufer kein Brot (Luk. vii. 33)?" *NTS* 18 (1971–72) 90–92. **Christ, F.** *Jesus Sophia*. 63–80. **Dibelius, M.** *Die urchristliche Überlieferung von Johannes dem Täufer*. 15–22. **Ehrhardt, A.** *The Framework of the New Testament Stories*. 51–53. **Feuillet, A.** "Jésus et la sagesse divine d'après les évangiles synoptiques." *RB* 62 (1965) 161–96, esp. 164–68. **Ganger, G.** "Notule sur Luc 7, 29–30." *VCaro* 5 (1951) 141–44. **Grundmann, W.** "Weisheit im Horizont des Reiches Gottes: Eine Studie zur Verkündigung Jesu nach der Spruchüberlieferung Q." In *Die Kirche des Anfangs*, ed. R. Schnackenburg, 175–199. **Hoffmann, P.** *Studien zur Theologie der Logienquelle*. 96, 196–98, 224–31. **Légasse, S.** *Jésus et l'enfant*. 289–317. **Leivestad, R.** "An Interpretation of Matt 11:19." *JBL* 71 (1952) 179–81. **Linton, O.** "The Parable of the Children's Game: Baptist and Son of Man (Matt xi. 16–19=Luke vii. 31–35): A Synoptic Text-Critical, Structural, and Exegetical Investigation." *NTS* 22 (1975–76) 159–79. **Mussner, F.** "Der nicht erkannte Kairos (Matt 11,16–19=Lk 7,31–35)." *Bib* 40 (1959) 599–612. **Sahlin, H.** "Traditionskritische Bemerkungen zu zwei Evangelienperikopen." *ST* 33 (1979) 69–84, esp. 77–84. **Schulz, S. Q.** *Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten*. 379–86. **Smith, M.** "Jesus' Attitude toward the Law." In *Fourth World Congress of Jewish Studies: Papers*. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1967. 1:241–44. **Suggs, M. J.** *Wisdom, Christology, and Law in Matthew's Gospel*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1970. 33–61. **Zeller, D.** "Die Bildlogik des Gleichnisses MT 11,16 f./Lk 7,31 f." *ZNW* 68 (1977) 252–57.

And see at 7:18–23.

Translation

²⁹(When they heard, all the People and the tax collectors justified God, because they had been baptized with the baptism of John; ³⁰but the Pharisees and the lawyers set at nought God's plan, so far as it concerned themselves, not having been baptized by him.)

³¹"To what then shall I compare the people of this generation? What are they like? ³²They are like the children sitting in the marketplace and calling out to one another who say,^a

'We piped for you, but you did not dance,
We weiled for you, but you did not weep.'

³³"For John the Baptist has come not^b eating bread and not^b drinking wine, and you say, 'He has a demon.' ³⁴The Son of Man has come eating and drinking, and you say, 'Look, a gluttonous man and a drunkard, a friend of tax collectors and sinners.' ³⁵Nevertheless, Wisdom is justified by all her children."^c

Notes

^aScribes who read the previous verb as a finite verb and not a participle have "corrected" here to *καὶ λέγουσιν* (A Θ ψ etc.), *λέγοντες* (D L f¹³), *λέγοντα* (R² W Ξ). The sense is not altered.

^bThe *μή/μήτε* sequence here is extremely rare. R W prefer *μή/μήδε*. A D L Θ etc. have *μήτε/μήτε*. The sense is not altered.

^cR has from Matthew *ἔργων*, "works."

Form/Structure/Setting

This is the third of the three closely linked units which concern the juxtaposition of John and Jesus (vv 18–23, 24–28, 29–35). Vv 18–23 have defined

Jesus' role in relation to the expectations of John. Vv 24–28 have defined John's place over against the new situation inaugurated by Jesus. Now in vv 29–35, John and Jesus are identified together over against uncomprehending rejection by "this generation" as the instruments for the implementation of God's wise plan of salvation, which, nevertheless, will have its way and find its children. (Vv 29–30 actually have a transitional role, since they formally report a response to Jesus' earlier words. But v 29 has obvious links with v 35, so that the two verses function as a bracket delineating the unit. Also, as will be clear in the *Comment* below, these two verses establish the Lukan focus for understanding "this generation" and "[Wisdom's] children.")

Luke has shared a very similar source to Matthew for vv 18–23, 24–28, 31–35 and has reproduced the materials in the same sequence. Matthew has no parallel for vv 29–30, but offers in its place the quite different 11:12–13. Matthew seems to have drawn in 11:12–13 on a topical basis (material on John and Jesus) to replace something which he preferred not to use, and Luke, also considering the material at this point to be inadequate, has overwritten it to produce the quite Lukan vv 29–30 (see further in *Comment*).

Whereas the link between vv 18–23 and vv 24–28 has some claim to plausibility, the same cannot be said for the linking of vv 31–35 where the mood is much more negative and the background attitude to Jesus is manifestly hostile.

Formally vv 29–35 are made up of a set of diverse elements. Vv 29–30 provide a summarizing editorial comment. Vv 31–32 present a brief parable or similitude. Vv 33–34 give an application of the parable. Finally, v 35, a wisdom saying, stands over against vv 31–34 as a balancing antithesis.

Because of this lack of formal unity, the original unity of the materials is frequently disputed and therefore needs to be evaluated at each transition, as does the authenticity of each as belonging to the historical ministry of Jesus. The *Comment* section below argues that the materials have always stood together (except for vv 29–30) and that there is no adequate reason for dismissing the view that we have reflected here a genuine comment of Jesus, linking himself closely with John and criticizing the lack of perception of his contemporaries, but nevertheless confident that in the end God's wisdom would be vindicated.

Structurally, there is a chiastic relationship between vv 29–30 and 31–35, with v 29 taken up by v 35 and v 30 taken up by vv 31–34. Within vv 31–34 there is a second chiasm where the first line of the refrain in v 32 is taken up by v 34, while the second line is taken up by v 33. A double binary structure is determined by the paralleling of John and Jesus and by the contrasting of those who respond positively and negatively to John and Jesus.

Comment

Vv 18–23 have defined against the background of John's expectation Jesus' role in the inauguration of the era of salvation depicted in Isaiah. Vv 24–28 have in turn delineated John's place over against the new situation inaugurated by Jesus. In this third episode juxtaposing John and Jesus, the two stand together as signs of the coming kingdom of God, whose signals of the coming new era have been taken amiss, but whose work is, nevertheless, vindicated in the eyes of those whose openness to Wisdom allows them to penetrate through to the true significance of John and Jesus.

29 Vv 29–30 have no parallel in Matthew at this point. In their place, Matthew offers in 11:12–13 a parallel to Luke 16:16, which seems to have a more original setting in the Lukan context. It is more likely that Luke has developed something already present in his source at this point than that Matthew and Luke have independently disturbed the sequence of the materials related to John which they have in common (Schürmann, 422). If this is the case, however, the language indicators show that, nevertheless, the verses in their present form are highly Lukan (cf. esp. Luke 20:45; Acts 19:4; Luke 11:53) and should be treated as providing an important Lukan statement about the relationship between the ministries of John and Jesus (cf. Dömer, *Heil Gottes*, 15–17) as also about the distinction to be drawn between the People and the Jewish leaders.

Vv 29–30 are lame and artificial as a continuation of Jesus' words and should rather be read as a narrator's comment (against Schürmann, 421; Ernst, 248, 251; etc.). With their division between the people and the tax collectors they help to soften the rather global sounding "this generation" of v 31 (and in the opposite direction open up a space for a rejecting group after the positive tone of vv 24–25 and 3:7–21) and help to specify the scope of both that term and "children of [Wisdom]" in v 35. There is a chiastic correspondence between v 29 and v 35 and v 30 and vv 31–34.

What the People have heard is Jesus' reply to John's messengers in vv 18–23 and his delineation of John's place in the inauguration of the eschatological events in vv 24–28 (not the earlier preaching of John—as, e.g., Schürmann, 421; Fitzmyer, 676). Those who were reoriented to the purposes of God by the ministry of John are those who are now open to what is happening in the ministry of Jesus. Thus John has fulfilled his role as preparer (v 27). *δικαιοῦν*, "justify," is used here because of its occurrence in v 35 where the usage is more natural. Here the sense is not much different from "they glorified God," since there is nothing that God clearly needs to be acknowledged to be in the right about (this is the strongest point in favor of a Baptist ministry setting for vv 29–30, since no close parallel [closest is in 16:15] has been cited for such a use of the verb). Possibly the use of *δικαιοῦν* should lead us to see as implied here the people's positive answer to John's question in v 19: the people agreed that now God was beginning to effect in Jesus what through John they had been led to expect. This is, however, probably more precise than warranted by the wording of the text. For the response of the People and the tax collectors to John see 3:12 and 21. Syntactically "the tax collectors" seems to have been added as an afterthought (the verb agrees with "the People"). Its presence here is probably determined by the place of tax collection in v 34.

30 Pharisees and lawyers are paired in 11:53 (though the reading is not certain) and (with the order reversed) in 14:3. On the meaning of "Pharisee" and "lawyer" see note at 5:17. It is not easy to decide whether the word "lawyer" is Lukan (with A. R. C. Leaney, "NOMIKΟΣ in St. Luke's Gospel," *JTS*, n.s., 2 [1951] 166–67) or traditional (with G. D. Kilpatrick, "Scribes, Lawyers, and Lukan Origins," *JTS*, n.s., 1 [1950] 56–60). "Plan" is Lukan (23:51 and seven times in Acts). The Jewish leaders considered themselves a step above the need to be part of a repentance movement such as John's. Now they have no

greater enthusiasm for what Jesus is implying is the next stage of the unfolding of God's eschatological plan (esp. v 28b). *eis éautούς* has been variously taken as to be linked with "plan"—either God's plan for themselves (Schürmann, 422 n. 97; Fitzmyer, 676) or with the link not quite so close God's plan so far as it concerned themselves (Creed, 108)—or (with Aramaic syntax in mind) as linked with "set at nought": they themselves (emphatic) set at nought (Black, *Aramaic Approach*, 103; Ganger, *VCaro* 5 [1951] 141–44). The difference in meaning is not great. Word order perhaps favors Creed's suggestion (see also Marshall, 299). A link is to be drawn between "plan of God" here and "wisdom" in v 35.

31 Luke fails to indicate the resumption of direct speech after vv 29–30. Vv 31–35 are quite closely paralleled in Matt 11:16–19. The "then" of Luke's text depends for its referent on the negative reaction of the Pharisees and lawyers noted in v 30 and will, therefore, be Lukan. "The people" ("human beings": *τοὺς ἀνθρώπους*) may be a Lukan addition, since elsewhere he adds the term (e.g., 6:22; 5:18, 20; and see 11:31 cf. Matt 12:42). Luke's traditional double form of the question has been abbreviated in Matthew's text (cf. Linton, *NTS* 22 [1975–76] 161). The double question as a rhetorical device involves the hearers in the search for a suitable comparison (Schürmann, 423). It is a biblical idiom to address people as a "generation" (cf. Deut 32:5; Judg 2:10; Ps 78:8; Jer 2:31; etc.). But the term itself carries no automatic negative connotation (cf. 1:48, 50; 21:32), and certainly does not signal the devaluation of Israel (against M. Meinertz, "'Dieses Geschlecht' im Neuen Testament," *BZ* 1 [1957] 283–89). On the contrary, v 30 draws the focus here in v 31 onto Pharisees and lawyers as a leadership class and away from the People (*λαός* [v 29]=Israel).

32 Apart from the *τοῖς*, "the," which produces a more Hellenistic syntax (cf. BDF 270 [3]) and is probably Lukan (cf. 15:22; 23:49; Acts 7:35; etc.), as is also the use of the more general *ἐκλαύσατε*, "weep," which avoids the Palestinian touch of the expression of grief with a passionate beating of the breast, the differences between the Matthean and Lukan texts are slight and there is little possibility of confidently choosing the more original form. Perhaps Luke's other uses of *ἀλλήλους*, "one another," favor the originality of Matthew's *ἐτέροις*, "others." Because we are dealing here with an original Aramaic basis, one should heed Jeremias' warning (*Parables*, 100–103) not to press too far the narrowly focused comparison suggested by the Greek syntax (so: "the people of this generation are to be likened to a situation in which . . .," and not "the people of this generation are like children . . ."). *ἃ λέγει* is unexceptionable in the sense "who say," so there seems to be no need to appeal to any Aramaic substructure (as Black, *Aramaic Approach*, 304) and to give as the sense "as one says." Playing a flute ("we piped") is an invitation to dance also in Herodotus 1.141. The dancing in mind is that of a wedding celebration to which the activities of official mourners (wailing women) and the expressions of grief that their activity triggers form a suitable antithesis.

The imagery of the parable has proved elusive (as has its precise application). Do two groups of children own one line each of the words quoted? Then the situation is one of mutual recrimination and the point of focus is the children's failure actually to get (either) game played (P. Hoffmann, *Logienquelle*, 225–27). Does one group of children offer unwilling starters two alternatives? Then

the situation is one in which those invited to play cannot be pleased and will not play the game (cf. Mussner, *Bib* 40 [1959] 600: the reluctant children are contradictory, obstinate, and capricious). Have self-appointed leaders of the play allocated to themselves the easy roles (so: “sitting”) and are now complaining that the other children will not take up the more strenuous play tasks (dancing, vigorous displays of mourning) signaled for by the piping and wailing? Then the interest will be in the unreasonable behavior of those who give orders and criticize: “You play your childish game with God’s messengers while Rome burns” (Jeremias, *Parables*, 162). Or is the refrain actually part of the game—a chorus whose point is that the second group of children have been baffled by the first group’s mime which they have met with uncomprehending inactivity rather than the appropriate mimed response (Légasse, *L’enfant*, 299–301)? There are many variants of these major options. Worth noting is a motif which is combined with various of the above: for whatever reason, those criticized are allowing their opportunity at this decisive moment in history to be lost.

The arguments cannot be rehearsed here, but the refrain has all the marks of being a fixed piece (cf. Black, *Aramaic Approach*, 161) and not as ad hoc protest. This suggests either that we have a proverbial characterization of children’s inability to agree about what to play (thus the first suggestions above) or we have a refrain from an actual game (the final suggestion). Of these the latter seems to be less vulnerable to objection. (The other suggestion which remains attractive is that of Linton, *NTS* 22 [1975–76] 171–76, who develops a variant of the third option above. He maintains that the text requires a correspondence between what the children *say* [ἀ λέγει] and what people *say* [λέγετε in vv 33 and 34] about John and Jesus. According to Linton the refrain is an accusation of failure to fit in, an accusation which could be suitably leveled at John and Jesus.)

The asceticism of John and the expansive behavior of Jesus have not been responded to as the cues that they were in relation to the coming of the kingdom of God. The call has gone out but the same insensitivity that left John’s call to repentance unheeded has also left people unable to enter with Jesus into the festive joy of the arriving kingdom of God.

At least this is the present application, since the question must be raised whether vv 33–34 formed an original unity. An original unity is often denied on the basis of a rather doctrinaire conviction that Jesus could never have explained a parable (following Jülicher, *Gleichnisse*) or on the basis of an understanding of the parable which stands in tension with the Gospel explanation. If the refrain is, as suggested above, a fixed piece taken up by Jesus, then this limits the detailed correspondence of parable and explanation. But his correspondence is nevertheless really quite good except for the order of the activities mentioned. The point of comparison which gives the thrust of the parable is the failure to comprehend what has been enacted before them and calls for a response; but it is more than an accident that there is such a happy correspondence between wedding festivities and the activity of Jesus, and funeral mourning and John’s stern call to repentance. There is, then, every reason to think that vv 33–34 are either original or at least a fair representation of the original force of the parable. The degree of parallelism between John

and Jesus to be found here would be an unusual innovation to attribute to the later church.

33 Luke has a perfect tense for Matthew's aorist ("has come" for "came"). Matt 17:12 (cf. Mark 9:13) and Luke 5:32 (cf. Mark 2:17) show that either could be responsible for the change. Luke specifies John further as "the Baptist" (note the opposite difference in v 28). Luke speaks of John's abstention as from "bread" and "wine," presumably to avoid the possibility of an overliteral reading of the text: that John existed entirely without food. (The additions are not repeated in v 34.) An influence from Deut 29:5 (ET 29:6) with its evoking of Nazirite abstention (cf. Luke 1:15) and of God's sustaining in the wilderness (cf. Schlatter, 495–96) is also possible. The additions would be pointless if bread and wine were here simply stock terms for food as 1QapGen 22:15 takes them to be in Gen 14:18 (cf. Fitzmyer, 681). Luke may reflect here the tradition that John was sustained on locusts and wild honey (Mark 1:6). Böcher's mistranslated-Aramaic-source exegesis (*NTS* 18 [1971–72] 90–92) is both unnecessary and unlikely. In Luke the people criticized are addressed ("you say") rather than spoken about ("they say"). Here also it is not clear which is original, though perhaps Luke is influenced by vv 29–30, where those who have failed to identify with John and Jesus are present. Apart from the present text, the idiom "to have a demon" occurs in the NT only at 8:27 and several times in John's Gospel.

John's ascetic self-denial was a sign of the pressing need to prepare in repentance for the eschatological intervention of God, but his strangeness was dismissed as the deranged behavior of a demoniac (cf. John 10:20).

34 The difference of tense noted in v 33 recurs in v 34, as does the difference between second and third person form ("you say"/"they say"). Otherwise one change of word order ("friend" and "of sinners") is all that separates the Matthean and Lukan texts. Bultmann's judgment (*Synoptic Tradition*, 155–56) that the use of ἐληλυθεν, "has come," betrays a postresurrection perspective lacks cogency (cf. Mussner, *Bib* 40 [1959] 602–3; Légasse, *L'enfant*, 309). The usage reflects no more than the sense of divine mission which characterized both John and the historical Jesus.

The use of "Son of Man" raises more difficulties, and its titular use in this kind of context has generally been judged to be not in line with the diction of the historical Jesus. This conclusion is, however, far from firm (cf. discussion following 9:21–22), and in any case the term could easily have been added here in place of an original "I" or treated in a titular manner, when in the Aramaic it was no more than an oblique self-reference (cf. Vermes, *Jesus the Jew*, 182, 188–91; also appendix in Black, *Aramaic Approach*, 310–30). In the Lukan text, "Son of Man" is a somewhat mysterious term of dignity, perhaps "the man, divinely raised up and given authority, with whom the destiny of humankind (Israel) is bound up" (see discussion in *Form/Structure/Setting* for 6:1–5).

"Eating and drinking" makes a neat antithesis to John's behavior (esp. in the pre-Lukan form), but this structural advantage is paid for by the need to read between the lines of the resulting accusation for a more precise identification of the behavior intended. Jesus seemed to behave as though there was continually something to celebrate (cf. 5:33–34), and he drew into this celebra-

tion tax collectors and sinners—people known to be unsavory types who lived beyond the edge of respectable society (cf. at 5:30). The uncomprehending generation could not understand that Jesus was signaling the in-breaking of the eschatological time of salvation: that his meals with sinners presaged the eschatological banquet (cf. at 13:29) of those who have received God's grace and forgiveness at the time of his eschatological visitation. The harsh judgment upon Jesus here expressed is not likely to have been formulated in the later church.

Missing entirely the message encoded in Jesus' behavior, his accusers saw what made them think rather of the dissolute behavior of a rebellious son (Deut 21:20 MT; cf. Prov 23:20)—a judgment confirmed when they observed the company that he kept.

Like children who in their game miss entirely the directive given to them by their play-fellows, this generation, especially in the person of its leaders, has failed to see in the behavior of John and Jesus the signs of the times (Matt 16:3; cf. Mussner, *Bib* 40 [1959] 604).

35 Without v 35, vv 31–34 have an entirely negative role and depict a state of affairs which lacks resolution. Légasse (*L'enfant*, 311; cf. Dibelius, *Johannes dem Täufer*, 18) is right, therefore, despite standard critical opinion, to speak of v 35 as a quasi-obligatory counterpart to what precedes. V 35 no longer belongs to the application of the parable, but it provides a necessary counterpart to the grim situation delineated by vv 31–34.

Luke's text differs from Matthew's in the reference to "children" rather than to "works." Here there is broad agreement that Matthew is secondary (cf. Matt 11:2). Luke has added here, as in a number of other places, an "all" to his text: for Luke Christianity is no small movement.

There is a measure of personification of Wisdom here, in line with the OT and intertestamental Jewish wisdom tradition (Prov 1:20–33; 8:1–9:6; Sir 1 and 24; Bar 3 and 4; 1 *Enoch* 42; 4 *Ezra* 5.10; 2 *Apoc. Bar.* 48; Wis 7:22–11:1; and cf. 11QP^a 18), but not here to the degree that it occurs in 11:49. But the fact that wisdom is introduced here only in the context of its positive affirmation should make us wary of introducing here too readily the wisdom motif of the rejection of Wisdom's envoys (see Luke 11:49).

The Greek *ἀπό* (lit., "from") or the Aramaic lying behind it has been taken in a variety of ways. Wisdom could be justified "over against" her children (Dibelius, *Johannes dem Täufer*, 19 and n. 2), or "in the experience of [i.e., "by"]" her children (Marshall, 303; Schürmann, 427 n. 145), or "on the basis of" her children (Jeremias, *Parables*, 163 n. 43; Grundmann, "Weisheit," 181). The precise sense of "justify" varies accordingly. The aorist tense has here a timeless or gnomic force (cf. BDF 333).

The idea of "children of Wisdom" is implied by Prov 8:32; Sir 4:11, and analogous formations are well known in Semitic idiom (in the NT cf. Luke 16:8; John 12:36; 1 Thess 5:5; Eph 5:8). The natural identity of the "children of Wisdom" is that they are those who allow themselves to be formed by Wisdom's directives. To identify (as Suggs, *Wisdom*, 35) John and Jesus as the "children of Wisdom" (perhaps along with the prophets before them) produces no adequate antithesis in v 35 to vv 31–34, and provides a sense for which it is

difficult to imagine any adequate setting. There is no link between the “children” of v 32 and those of v 35, since the word used in the latter case is different and implies nothing about age (*τέκνον*=“offspring”; cf. Légasse, *L’enfant*, 317).

In the Lukan text v 35 has been somewhat interpreted ahead of time by vv 29–30, where “the plan of God” is a near synonym for “Wisdom” and the justifying of God forms a counterpart to the present justifying of Wisdom. This lead requires us to understand the justifying as an activity of the children of Wisdom. These are known to be children of Wisdom by their hearing of the voice of Wisdom in (i.e., by their recognizing as the plan of God) what is happening in John and Jesus and in aligning themselves with what they perceive.

The unmitigated gloom of vv 31–34 is not the whole story, nor even the main part of the story. Despite every setback, the main line of the story is given to the recognition by those who have an openness to the wisdom of God that in John and Jesus God’s wise plan is here coming into effect.

Explanation

In vv 18–23, 24–28 Jesus and John have respectively been defined over against what is represented by the other. Now the two figures are brought together: the life of each of these has been a signal of the coming new era of the kingdom of God, but in both cases the signal has, especially by the Jewish leaders, been taken amiss. Nonetheless, it is God’s wisdom that stands behind the actions of John and Jesus, and Wisdom will in the end have its way and find its children. And the children of Wisdom will penetrate through to the true significance of John and Jesus and recognize there the wisdom of God’s plan.

Vv 29–30 are an editorial aside. Formally they describe the mixed response to Jesus’ words about John and himself, but their actual concern is to establish in readiness for vv 31–35 the principle: as with John so with Jesus. Thus John is seen to have fulfilled his role of preparer (v 27). These verses also serve to guide the reader away from giving too global a sense to “this generation” in v 31 by suggesting that it is the leadership group in Judaism that is particularly to be faulted and not so much the main body of the Jewish People, who had in fact been quite favorable both to John and Jesus. “Justified” means here something rather like “glorified.” On Pharisees and lawyers see at 5:17–26.

Jesus resumes speaking in v 31, but Luke provides no specific indicator for this. In a rhetorical manner Jesus involves his hearers in the search for a suitable similitude to characterize “this generation.” It is a biblical idiom to speak of people in terms of a generation (Deut 32:5; Judg 2:10; Jer 2:31; etc.), and as we have seen Luke would not have us take it too literally. Probably because an Aramaic idiom is reflected, the formula of comparison is actually misleading. The comparison is in fact between the generation and the whole situation pictured (so not necessarily the first element, i.e., the children). The actual point of comparison can only be discovered by close attention to the dynamics of the scene depicted. A variety of interpretations have been proposed for this little parable.

The scene involves two groups of children playing a game that involves

the miming by the first group of something for which there is a natural response, which is then to be mimed by the second group. It would appear that there was a standard ditty through which the initiating group could announce the failure of the second to construe and respond to their mime correctly. It is this ditty which Jesus reproduces.

The ditty speaks of a failed response by describing a standard set of two contrasting initiatives and the responses that failed to come. The piping is a call to imitate a wedding dance. The wailing is that of professional mourners at a funeral whose activity is meant to trigger dramatic expressions of grief from the bereaved.

Given this perspective, the point would seem to be that this generation has missed the cues that have been given it. The application in vv 33–34 confirms this interpretation and suggests that the joy of wedding festivities and the sorrow of a funeral have counterparts in the expansive behavior of Jesus and the ascetic self-denial of John.

The description of John's self-denial may owe something to Deut 29:5 (and cf. Luke 1:15), in which case there will be an evocation of the idea of Nazirite abstention, and of God's sustaining in the wilderness. John's ascetic self-denial was a sign of the pressing need to prepare in repentance for the eschatological intervention of God, but instead John's strangeness was dismissed as the deranged behavior of a demoniac (cf. John 10:20).

The description of Jesus' behavior neatly matches as a converse that of John. But to discern what is actually involved we need to read between the lines of the critical responses. Jesus seemed to behave as though there was continually something to celebrate (cf. 5:33–34), and he drew into this celebration tax collectors and sinners—people known to be unsavory types who lived beyond the edge of respectable society (cf. at 5:30). In this way Jesus signaled the in-breaking of the eschatological time of salvation: his meals with sinners were a foreshadowing of the eschatological banquet (cf. at 13:29) of those who have received God's grace and forgiveness.

Missing entirely the encoded message, Jesus' accusers thought in terms of the dissolute behavior of a rebellious son (Deut 21:20; cf. Prov 23:20)—a judgment confirmed when they observed the company that he kept.

In the description John is called the Baptist, pointing to his characteristic activity; Jesus is called the Son of Man, that mysterious title of authority and destiny designating one with whom the future of humankind is bound up.

Misunderstanding and hostile response do not, however, have the last word. A positive counterpart is provided by a wisdom saying. In the OT, wisdom is sometimes personified as here (Prov 1:20–23; 8:1–9:6). Wisdom is an alter ego for God and his wise purposes in creation and redemption (cf. Luke 7:30). The children of Wisdom are those who are open to Wisdom and allow themselves to be formed by its initiatives (cf. Prov 8:32).

Despite every setback, the climax belongs to a positive note. God's wise plan, tied up as it is in the roles of John and Jesus, will certainly not come to nothing. There may be many who do not comprehend, but Wisdom will seek out its children. And they will see the wise purpose of God coming into effect to their own great benefit in the initiative represented by the coming of John and Jesus. They will have no doubt that it has all been done right.

The Pharisee and the Sinful Woman (7:36–50)

Bibliography

- Ahern, B. M.** "By the Grace of God." *Way* 17 (1977) 3–11. **Bevan, T. W.** "The Four Anointings." *ExpTim* 39 (1927–28) 137–39. **Bouman, G.** "La pécheresse hospitalière (Lc. vii, 36–50)." *ETL* 45 (1969) 172–79. **Braumann, G.** "Die Schuldner und die Sünderin Luk. vii. 36–50." *NTS* 10 (1963–64) 487–93. **Brodie, T. L.** "Luke 7,36–50 as an Internalization of 2 Kings 4,1–37: A Study in Luke's Use of Rhetorical Imitation." *Bib* 64 (1983) 457–85. **Buzy, D.** *Les paraboles traduits et commentées*. VS 6. 2nd ed. Paris: Beauchesne, 1932. 238–67. **Charpentier, É.** "Le Prophète, ami des pécheurs: Lc 7,36–8,3." *AsSeign* 42 (1970) 80–92. **Dammers, A. H.** "Studies in Texts: A Note on Luke vii, 36–50." *Theology* 49 (1946) 78–80. **Daube, D.** *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism*. 312–24. **Dauer, A.** *Johannes und Lukas: Untersuchungen zu den johanneisch-lukanischen Parallelperikopen Joh 4,46–54/Lk 7, 1–10—Joh 12,1–8/Lk 7,36–50; 10,38–42—Joh 20, 19–29/Lk 24,36–49*. Forschung zur Bibel 50. Würzburg: Echter, 1984. **Delobel, J.** "L'Onction de Jésus par la pécheresse: La composition littéraire de Lc., VII, 36–50." *ETL* 42 (1966) 415–75. **Derrett, J. D. M.** *Law in the New Testament*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 266–78. **Donahue, J. J.** "The Penitent Woman and the Pharisee: Luke 7:36–50." *AER* 142 (1960) 414–21. **Drexler, H.** "Die grosse Sünderin Lucas 7,36–50." *ZNW* 59 (1968) 159–73. **Dublin, J.** "ὁ ἁρῶν." *ExpTim* 37 (1925–26) 525–26. **Dupont, J.** "Le Pharisien et la pécheresse." *ComLit* 4 (1980) 260–68. **Eichholz, G.** *Einführung in die Gleichnisse*. BibS 37. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener 1963. 44–53. **Elliott, J. K.** "The Anointing of Jesus." *ExpTim* 85 (1973–74) 105–7. **Feuillet, A.** "Les deux onctions faites sur Jésus, et Marie-Madeleine." *RevThom* 75 (1975) 357–94. **Fuller, R. C.** "The Anointing of Christ in Luke vii." *Scr* 4 (1949) 90–91. **Goodenough, E. R.** "John a Primitive Gospel." *JBL* 64 (1945) 145–82, esp. 152–55. **Grubb, E.** "The Anointing of Jesus." *ExpTim* 26 (1914–15) 461–63. **Hahn, F.** "Lukas 7,36–50." *Göttinger Predigt-Meditationen* 17 (1969) 285–91. **Henss, W.** *Das Verhältnis zwischen Diatessaron, christlicher Gnosis und "Western Text": Erläutert an einer unkanonischen Version des Gleichnisses vom gnädigen Gläubiger: Materialien zur Geschichte der Perikope von der namenlosen Sünderin Lk 7,36–50*. BZNW 33. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1967. **Holst, R.** "The One Anointing of Jesus: Another Application of the Form-critical Method." *JBL* 95 (1976) 435–46. **Holzmeister, U.** "Die Magdalenenfrage in der christlichen Überlieferung." *ZKT* 46 (1922) 402–22, 556–84. **Jeremias, J.** "Lukas 7:45: ΕΙΣΗΛΘΟΝ." *ZNW* 51 (1960) 131. **Joüon, P.** "Reconnaissance et action de grâces dans le Nouveau Testament." *RSR* 29 (1939) 112–14. ———. "La pécheresse de Galilée et la parabole des deux débiteurs (Luc, 7,36–50)." *RSR* 29 (1939) 615–19. **Kilgallon, J. J.** "John the Baptist, the Sinful Woman, and the Pharisee." *JBL* 104 (1985) 675–79. **Lagrange, M.-J.** "Jésus a-t-il été oint plusieurs fois et par plusieurs femmes?" *RB* 9 (1912) 504–32. **Laren, D. J. M.** "Luke vii 47." *ExpTim* 30 (1918–19) 378. **Lattey, C.** "The Sinner of the City." *Expos* 8 (1909) 55–63. **Legaré, C.** "Jésus et la pécheresse: Analyse sémiotique d'un fragment de l'évangile de Luc: 7,36–50." *SémiotBib* 29 (1983) 19–45. **Legault, A.** "An Application of the Form-Critique Method to the Anointings in Galilee (Lk 7,36–50) and Bethany (Mt 26,6–13; Mk 14,3–9; Jn 12,1–8)." *CBQ* 16 (1954) 131–45. **Löning, K.** "Ein Platz für die Verlorenen: Zur Formkritik zweier neutestamentlicher Legenden (Lk 7,36–50; 19,1–10)." *BibLeb* 12 (1971) 198–208. **Louw, J. P.** "Macro Levels of Meaning in Lk 7:36–50." In *A South African Perspective on the New Testament*, FS B. M. Metzger, ed. J. H. Petzer and P. J. Hartin. Leiden: Brill, 1986. 128–35. **Manns, F.** "Luc 7,47 et les traditions juives sur Rahab." *RSR* 61 (1987) 1–16. **März, C.-P.** "Zur traditionsgeschichte von Mk 14,3–9 und Parallelen." *SNTU* 6–7 (1981–82) 89–112. **McCaughy, T.** "Paradigms of Faith in the Gospel of St. Luke." *ITQ* 45

(1978) 177-84. **Meecham, H. G.** "Luke vii. 47." *ExpTim* 38 (1926-27) 286. **Nesbitt, C. F.** "The Bethany Traditions in the Gospel Narratives." *JBR* 29 (1961) 119-24. **Orchard, R. K.** "On the Composition of Luke vii 36-50." *JTS*, o.s., 38 (1937) 243-45. **Platt, E. E.** "The Ministry of Mary of Bethany." *TToday* 34 (1977) 29-39. **Plummer, A.** "The Woman That Was a Sinner." *ExpTim* 27 (1915-16) 42-43. **Prat, F.** "Marie-Madeleine, Marie de Béthanie et la pécheresse qui oignit les pieds du Sauveur." In *Jésus-Christ, sa vie, sa doctrine, son oeuvre*. Paris: Beauchesne 1933. 2:501-6. **Ramaroson, L.** "Simon et la pécheresse anonyme (Lc 7,36-50)." *ScEs* 24 (1972) 379-83. **Ravens, D. A. S.** "The Setting of Luke's Account of the Anointing: Luke 7.2-8.3." *NTS* 34 (1988) 282-92. **Sanders, J. A.** "Extravagant Love." *NB* 68 (1987) 278-84. **Sanders, J. N.** "'Those Whom Jesus Loved' (John xi. 5)." *NTS* 1 (1954-55) 29-41. **Saxer, V.** "Les saintes Marie Madeleine et Marie de Béthanie dans la tradition liturgique et homilétique orientale." *RevScRel* 32 (1958) 1-37. **Schramm, T.** *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*. 43-45. **Sybel, L. von.** "Die Salbungen: Mt 26,6-13, Mc 14,3-9, Lc 7,36-50, John 12,1-8." *ZNW* 23 (1924) 184-93. **Weiss, K.** "Der westliche Text von Lc 7,46 und sein Wert." *ZNW* 46 (1955) 241-45. **Wilckens, U.** "Vergebung für die Sünderin." In *Orientierung an Jesus*, FS J. Schmid. Freiburg im B.: Herder, 1973. 394-424. **Winandy, J.** "Simon et la pécheresse (Luc 7,36-50)." *BVC* 47 (1962) 38-46. **Winterbotham, R.** "Simon and the Sinner: St. Luke vii. 36-50." *Expos* 6 (1877) 214-29. **Wood, H. G.** "The Use of ἀγαπᾶω in Luke viii [sic] 42, 47." *ExpTim* 66 (1954-55) 319-20.

Translation

³⁶A certain one of the Pharisees asked him to eat with him; he went into the Pharisee's house and reclined at table. ^a³⁷Now^b there was a woman who was publicly^c a sinner. Learning that he was reclining at table in the Pharisee's house, she obtained an alabaster jar of perfume ³⁸and standing behind, at his feet, weeping, she began to wet his feet with her tears and she wiped them off^d with the hair of her head; she was kissing his feet and anointing them with the perfume. ³⁹When he saw this, the Pharisee who had invited him said to himself,^e "If this fellow were a^f prophet, he would know who and what kind of woman this is who is touching him—that she is a sinner."

⁴⁰In response^g Jesus said to him, "Simon, I have something to say to you." The other said, "Teacher, say it." ⁴¹"There were two debtors to a certain creditor. The one owed five hundred denarii, the other fifty. ⁴²When they had nothing to give back he canceled the debts of both. Which, then, of them will love him more?"^h ⁴³Simon answered,ⁱ "I suppose that it is the one for whom he canceled the greater debt." He said to him, "You have judged correctly."

⁴⁴Turning to the woman, he said to Simon, "You see this woman? I came into your house, and you did not provide water for my feet; with her tears she wet my feet and with her hair she wiped them. ⁴⁵You did not give me a kiss; from the time I entered she has not ceased kissing my feet. ⁴⁶You did not anoint my head with oil; she anointed my feet with perfume. ⁴⁷On the basis of this I can say to you, 'Her sins which are many have been forgiven, seeing that she has loved greatly; the one to whom little is forgiven loves little.'"

⁴⁸He said to her, "Your sins have been forgiven." ⁴⁹And the fellow guests began to say to themselves, "Who is this, who even forgives sins?" ⁵⁰He said to the woman, "Your faith has saved you, go into peace."

Notes

^a *ἀνεκλήθη* is found in A W Θ Ψ etc., *κατέκειτο* in N*, with no real change of meaning.

^b Lit., "and behold."

^c Lit., "in the city."

^d The aorist *ἐξέμαζεν* is read by P³ N* A D L W etc. and could be original.

^e A pleonastic *λέγων*, "saying," is untranslated.

^f B* Ξ etc. read *ὁ*, "the."

^g Lit., "and having answered."

^h The word order of this clause varies in the MSS and an extra *εἰπέ*, "say," is added by (A) K P Θ Δ etc. MSS occasionally omit either *πλείον*, "more," or *αὐτόν*, "him."

ⁱ Greek has the pleonastic *ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν*, "answering he said."

Form/Structure/Setting

7:36–50 is the final unit of the section 7:1–50, in which the relationship between the ministries of John and Jesus has been the controlling motif. While Luke does not make it quite explicit, the structuring of the section is best respected if we see in the sinful woman's readiness for Jesus and evident prior acquaintance with the forgiveness that comes through him an indication that her life had already been touched by the ministry of John: 7:36–50 illustrate by way of an extreme example the principle of vv 29–30. On the structure of the section see further at 7:1–10.

The present form of the episode is complex; consequently its form history is much disputed and there are many views about the original kernel of the material. In general the attempts made to identify parts of the story as later additions must be judged as unsuccessful. The classical position of Wellhausen (31–32), which treats the parable (vv 41–43) as a later addition to the story, has been shown by Wilckens ("Vergebung," 401) to leave the Pharisee's concerns of v 39 without adequate answer. But Bultmann's judgment (*Synoptic Tradition*, 20–21) that the setting for the parable is an ideal scene constructed on the basis of Mark 14:3–9 does no justice to the atypical originality of the scene (Wilckens, 404). The less extreme view that only the anointing is borrowed from the Markan tradition has more to commend it, but finally involves an unnatural interpretation of the woman's other actions (see *Comment* on v 38). The view that we have two originals, the parable and the story, which have been secondarily fitted together (Braumann, *NTS* 10 [1963–64] 487–93) fails to persuade. Not only is the fit too good, but the supposed original story is of questionable unity and if pressed into a unity would be a foreign element in the gospel tradition ("she might be a sinful woman, but she treated me better than you did, so I forgive her"). Furthermore, the parable is provided with no convincing transmission history (how would the parable be told to illuminate the Gentile mission? Dammers' conjecture [*Theology* 49 (1946) 78–80] that the parable originated after the resurrection and before the ascension does little to ease the problem). Vv 44–46 have also fallen under suspicion of being a later addition, but as Löning has demonstrated (*BibLeb* 12 [1971] 200), they play a vital role in the structuring of the pericope, which would be considerably weakened by their omission (see further at *Comment* on v 44). Vv 48–50 have generally been viewed as later accretions to the episode (v 48=5:20;

v 49=5:21; v 50=8:48). But to deny to Jesus any direct address to the woman is to cause the pericope to fail as a literary unit. Of the three verses it is v 50 which can be most readily integrated into the pericope. Vv 48-49 are likely to belong to a later (probably Lukan) elaboration (see *Comment* on vv 48 and 50). Brodie's claim that Luke 7:36-50 is largely spun out of 2 Kgs 4:1-7, 8-37 has little attraction, despite the other Elijah/Elisha connections found in Luke (cf. esp. at 4:25-27; 7:11-17), because of the generality of the common features to which Brodie can appeal.

While the anointing account in Mark 14:3-9 exhibits a considerable degree of general congruence with the Lukan pericope (Fitzmyer, 684, finds seven reasons for relating the anointings), it is when we introduce the Johannine version of the Bethany anointing (John 12:1-8) that it becomes impossible not to admit some connection to the Lukan episode. To the general congruences of the Markan account, the Johannine account adds the striking agreements in the anointing of the feet rather than the head and in the wiping of the feet with the let-down hair. Despite the similarities there is not sufficient reason for identifying the Lukan and the Bethany anointings. Nevertheless, the degree of similarity appears in the case of the Johannine account to have led to a transfer of motifs from the one episode to the other, and it is possible but by no means so certain that some of the language affinities between the Lukan and the Markan accounts have a similar cause (cf. the general position of Legault, *CBQ* 16 [1954] 131-45).

Suggestions have been made that in the context of transmission the story has been formulated to address the attitudes of those in the church who would be judgmental like Simon and who were in danger of losing their awareness of the eschatological equality of all people before the forgiving grace of God (Löning, *BibLeb* 12 [1971] esp. 206-7), or even more specifically to address the attitudes of those who were critical of church leaders who accepted hospitality from converts who had been notorious sinners (Bouman, *ETL* 45 [1969] 172-79). Another popular option has been to locate the pericope's use in the apologetic and polemic of the Palestinian community (as Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 39-41) in defense of the church's openness to sinners. No doubt the story could be used for all these purposes, but it seems altogether more likely that first and foremost the pericope has been formulated as a proclamation of the grace of God to sinners. None are too far gone in sin to be reached by John and Jesus for the eschatological bestowal of forgiveness. The more the sin, the more the forgiveness. The more the forgiveness, the more the gratitude. The worse the sinner, the more dramatic the change wrought by the gracious intervention of God.

The pericope does not fit neatly the traditional form-categories. For the most part the account could be classified as an elaborate pronouncement story, but Löning (*BibLeb* 12 [1971] 202-7) is right to insist that the figure of the woman, although she takes no active part in the dispute, becomes altogether too important for the usual limits of that form: her active initiative is extensively elaborated; she is presented in a sympathetic light. The degree to which the woman's response to Jesus is exemplary draws the story into the sphere of that form which Dibelius called "legend" (without prejudice to the historicity of the material involved).

The material of the pericope is structured around three instances of report and accompanying evaluation (vv 36–38/39; vv 40–42/43; vv 44–46/47) with vv 48–50 as an epilogue. The unit vv 36–39 is bracketed by the mention of the Pharisee in the opening and closing verses. In vv 40–43 the extremities are marked by bracketing in a chiasitic form: in v 40 Jesus asks for an audience and Simon agrees; in v 43 Simon produces his judgment and Jesus agrees. In v 39 and v 43 the evaluations are those of Simon. Failing to recognize the equivalence between the situation of vv 37–38 and that of the story in vv 40–42, he passes opposite judgments in the two situations. Vv 44–46 function to uncover the equivalence by retelling vv 37–38 in light of vv 40–42. Then in this third sequence of report and evaluation, the Pharisee who has passed judgment in the first two sequences becomes now the one whose judgment is itself judged. The epilogue vv 48–50 brings the story to its completion by allowing Jesus to address the woman whose behavior has been the subject of his interchange with Simon (cf. Löning, *BibLeb* 12 [1971] 200; Dupont, *ComLit* 4 [1980] 262–63).

Comment

The touching display of affectionate gratitude shown to Jesus by this woman off the street well illustrates the claim of v 35 that Wisdom is justified by her children. Simon saw little to impress him in his guest (he was of that class which had seen fit to ignore the urgent appeal of John) and remain imperceptive to the coming of God's salvation into his midst, but the woman (already prepared by John's baptism of forgiveness?) was ready with a fitting welcome for the coming Lord, and in her encounter with him her experience of God's eschatological forgiveness comes to its full flower.

36 Only Luke tells us that Jesus on occasion dined by invitation with Pharisees (cf. 11:37; 14:1). With such reports Luke indicates Jesus' social standing as a well-known teacher. Pharisaic approval of Jesus is not implied. In fact, on each occasion Jesus' behavior scandalizes his host. Delobel suggests (*ETL* 42 [1966] 458–64) that Luke has in mind here and in other meal scenes of the Gospel a Greek literary genre which made use of a meal setting in the report of a discussion. This is likely, but the meal setting here is too integral to the episode to have been created merely for the sake of this literary convention. On Pharisees see at 5:17.

37 καὶ ἰδοὺ γυνή (lit., "and behold a woman") may be a Lukan touch (cf. Jeremias, *Sprache*, 52), as ἐπιγνοῦσα ὅτι ("realize"/"learn"/"perceive"; cf. at 1:22). It is best to connect ἐν τῇ πόλει (lit., "in the city") with "sinner" and to give it in accord with Semitic idiom a sense like "publicly" or "well-known" (P. Joüon, *L'Évangile de notre Seigneur Jésus-Christ*, 341, cited in Feuillet, *RevThom* 75 [1975] 372 n. 40). The dramatic impact of the woman's actions appears most strikingly if "sinner" is understood as a euphemism for "prostitute" or "courtesan." Tradition has frequently identified this unknown woman as Mary Magdalene (cf. 8:2; 24:10) and sometimes also, or instead, as Mary of Bethany, sister of Martha (cf. 10:39, 42; John 11:1–2; 12:3), and these identifications have recently been rigorously defended by Feuillet (*RevThom* 75 [1975] esp. 380–86). The linchpin for Feuillet's case is the reading of John 12:1–8 as involving a deliberate repetition in Bethany by the same woman of elements from a much earlier

encounter with Jesus (i.e., Luke 7:36–50), since otherwise the Gospel tradition itself shows not a trace of any awareness of these traditional identifications. Feuillet's suggestion accounts creatively for the links between John 12:1–8 and Luke 7:36–50 but is placed in question by its inability to account for the similarities and differences between John 12:1–8 and Mark 14:3–9. It seems best to preserve the anonymity of the sinful woman who came to Jesus.

Scholars have regularly noted that the woman's approach to Jesus seems to presuppose a prior experience of forgiveness. Whatever we make of this in the tradition, in the Lukan text vv 29–30 may encourage us to view the woman as coming to Jesus to express gratitude to him for the forgiveness already proleptically bestowed on her by John (cf. at 3:3).

The reclining posture of Jesus (a Hellenistic custom which the Jews had adopted for festive banquets) with head toward the table and feet away from the table and thus most accessible is part of what accounts for the coming attention to the feet. The intention to anoint Jesus is the single aspect of the woman's behavior which is indicated as clearly premeditated. *ἀλάβαστρον* means here a flask carved from the expensive soft alabaster which was believed to help preserve ointments and perfumes (cf. Pliny the Elder, *Naturalis historia* 13.3.19). "An alabaster jar of perfume" is also spoken of in Mark 14:3, but there it is part of a more elaborate description. The theory that the anointing in the Lukan episode is a late intrusion under the influence of the tradition in Mark 14:2–9 (Orchard, *JTS* 38 [1937] 243; Legault, *CBQ* 16 [1954] 144; Delobel, *ETL* 42 [1966] 416–21; Wilckens, "Vergebung," 399) depends for its credibility on being able to view the woman's other actions as those of a penitent seeker (cf. Wilckens; Henss, *Verhältnis*, 17). The kissing of the feet in particular, however, hardly fits this picture. As in *Joseph and Asenath* 15.11, the kissing of the feet is clearly an expression of affectionate gratitude.

38 *παρά τοὺς πόδας*, "at the feet," and the use of *ἀρχεσθαι*, "to begin," may both be Lukan (as Delobel, *ETL* 42 [1966] 426–27). Despite the skepticism of some there is no adequate reason for disputing the possibility of a woman's walking in on a banquet in this way (cf. Jülicher, *Gleichnisse* 2:291). Life in general was much more public than is our experience. The woman claims no right to disturb the dinner party and so does not intrude further than to the feet of Jesus. Weeping in Luke normally connotes a sharp distress (often in bereavement) which does not fit here with the woman's other gestures. We may speak of tears of remorse, but not of anguish, because this woman has found her peace. The sorrow of regret is suffused with the warmth of grateful affection.

The language in which the woman's wetting and drying of Jesus' feet is reported seems already to be under the influence of the interpretation to be provided in vv 44–46 (as Drexler, *ZNW* 59 [1968] 164), so that the wetting of the feet is reported as though it were a deliberate act. We are, however, certainly not to understand that the woman's acts are meant as a conscious alternative to the gestures of hospitality omitted by Jesus' Pharisaic host. Rather, the accidental fall of tears on feet begins a chain reaction: with nothing at hand to remove the offending tears, the woman makes use of her let-down hair; the intimate proximity thereby created leads to a release of affectionate gratitude expressed in kissing the feet which have just been cleaned from the dust of journey in this unique and probably unintended manner; and the anointing

perfume, no doubt intended for the head (since only this has a place in Jewish custom) but finding no ready access thereto, is spent upon that part of Jesus' body with which the woman has already made intimate contact (some remote parallels for the anointing of the feet do exist [see Weiss, *ZNW* 46 (1955) 242–43; Str-B, 1:427–28], the closest of which refer to a domestic custom in which a man's feet would be anointed by his wife or daughter).

39 Jesus' passivity in the face of this behavior is extremely eloquent. It is not clear whether the idea that Jesus might be a prophet was one to which Simon had himself been inclined, or whether he repeats popular sentiment (cf. 7:16; 9:19) only to criticize it. The latter is more likely. The Pharisee's view of prophetic perception is similar to that found in John 4:19; Luke 22:64 and cf. 1 Cor 14:24–25, Acts 5:9. The Pharisee keeps his counsel to himself, but soon discovers that Jesus is aware both of Simon's own thoughts and of the situation of the woman whose affectionate display of gratitude he has failed to rebuff (cf. at 4:23). Behind Simon's thought lies the unexpressed assumption that a prophet would maintain the same respectable distance as Simon himself would from a notorious sinner. The underlying scandal of Jesus' behavior is here once again that he is friend to tax collectors and sinners (v 34).

40 ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν (lit., "having answered he said"), εἶπεν πρὸς, "he said to," and probably φησὶν, "he says," are all Lukan (cf. at 1:19; 1:13; historic present φησὶν is found eleven times in Acts). ἔχειν ("to have") + infinitive is also to be found dominantly in Luke's writing in the NT. The name of the Pharisee, Simon, is introduced only at this point. Elsewhere in Luke Pharisees are not introduced by name. As Drexler rightly notes (*ZNW* 59 [1968] 162), it is Jesus' initiation of an exchange with the Pharisee that necessitates the introduction here of the name. Simon is a common name, and the likelihood that its use here is based upon Mark 14:3 or the tradition behind it depends entirely upon the case for connecting those anointing traditions on other grounds. The Pharisee addresses Jesus as "teacher." Jesus is addressed or described as "teacher" by nondisciples in 8:49; 9:38; 10:25; 11:45; 12:13; 19:39; 20:21, 39. On the lips of disciples, Luke replaces the terms in 8:24; 9:33, 49. The term is used by disciples in 21:7 and by Jesus himself in 22:11 and cf. 6:40. "Teacher" is for Luke an objective description (equivalent to "rabbi") and indicates the societal rank and role of Jesus without prejudice to the personal attitude toward him of the one who uses the title (cf. at 5:5).

41 ἦσαν δανειστῇ τινι (lit., "were to a certain creditor") reflects Lukan diction (as Delobel, *ETL* 42 [1966] 442), as possibly the use of ὁ εἷς . . . ὁ ἕτερος, "the one . . . the other," which is found also in 17:34–35 (diff. Matthew) and 16:13; 18:10; Acts 23:6. As in most other cases, Luke introduces this parable in the nominative form (distinguished by Jeremias from the "dative form" of introduction which uses an actual or implied statement of likeness [*Parables*, 100–103]). The debt levels are quite parochial in terms of the life-style of the upper echelons of Roman society (Cicero's annual expenses were 150,000 denarii per year; office holders under Augustus received from 2,500 to 10,000 denarii per year, with those of procuratorial rank drawing 15,000 to 75,000 denarii per year), but nevertheless very pressing to ordinary folk for whom the agricultural laborer's daily wage was around one denarius (Heutger, *BZ* 27 [1983] 98). Two debtors are also features of the parable in Matt 18:21–35 and of

the rabbinic parable in *b. 'Abod. Zar.* 4a. Financial indebtedness also features in Luke 16:1–8; Matt 18:23–34.

As Wilckens has shown (“Vergebung,” 401) there can hardly have been a prior form of the episode not containing the present parable, since this would leave the Pharisee’s concerns of v 39 with no adequate response.

42 The parable is reported in the barest of forms with an almost total lack of narrative color (even the use of *χαρίζεσθαι* is probably a relatively colorless technical use for the remission of debts or sins). The different degrees of indebtedness, the inability to pay, and the remission of the debts are alone important. If the development of the account with its reference to love is considered to be secondary (cf. Henss, *Verhältnis*, 18–19) then it is possible that the parable was composed to confront the unforgiving Pharisee with the limitlessness of God’s readiness to forgive, now being brought to effective expression in the ministry of Jesus: Jesus’ reply to the unspoken offense of the Pharisee (v 39) would be that the creditor (God) is now forgiving debts and nothing is too bad to be forgiven. If, however, both lender and debtors in the parable are to be thought of as Jews (as is natural), then Deut 15 with its directives for the year of release suggests that the remission of debts should not be treated as such an extraordinary act (though it is a moot point to what degree the provisions of the year of release remained practically effective in the first-century period), since this and other OT laws sought to limit the liability of the debtor for whom things had not gone well (cf. further the Jubilee legislation in Lev 25:8–17). This may suggest that the focus should not fall so heavily on the extraordinary fact of the remission of debts. The spare reporting of the parable itself may also suggest that the focus of interest is in what is yet to come in Jesus’ follow-up question. As well, the two debtors with their specified and contrasting debts (the one part of the parable where there is a little detail) are best accounted for by seeing them as having a specific importance in the application of the parable (as is clearly the case in vv 42b–47). It seems best, then, to treat Jesus’ question in v 42b (along with v 43) as an integral part of this piece of parabolic teaching.

The presence of the forgiving love of God is assumed rather than proclaimed, but the thrust of Jesus’ words to Simon may be captured in the paraphrase: “Do you not recognize in this woman’s behavior the love of one who has been forgiven much?” As in 5:31–32 there is no disagreement with the Pharisees about the sinfulness of Jesus’ intimates, but he proposed a much more positive and creative manner of dealing with this fact.

Whether or not Jeremias is right to appeal to the absence of a distinctive word for gratitude in the Semitic languages (*Parables*, 127), there is naturally from the context a nuance of gratitude (grateful affection; cf. Ps 116 [114]:1) to the use of “love” in Jesus’ question in v 42b which carries over to the usage in v 47 (obviously for the second occurrence there and, as will be argued below, also for the first). As in 10:36 (the good Samaritan), the appended question engages the listener and presses him to a committed answer, to which he in turn will find himself answerable (cf. Schürmann, 434).

43 Simon offers only half-heartedly (“I suppose”) the obvious answer to Jesus’ question: he has some reservations about what he is letting himself in for. Nonetheless, Jesus commends his answer.

44 It would be possible to skip from v 43 to v 47 and find a smooth transition, and for this reason these verses are sometimes treated as a Lukan (or pre-Lukan) expansion (e.g., Delobel, *ETL* 42 [1966] 466; Wilckens, "Vergebung," 400; Schürmann, 436). This is not impossible, but there is nothing especially Lukan about the language, and the unit would be much weaker without these verses. It is true that in these verses the imagery of being a good host(ess) in receiving Jesus takes the place of what was earlier viewed as a display of affectionate gratitude by a forgiven debtor. But far from being an infelicity, the transformation represents a brilliant achievement of artistic license. The vital role played by vv 44–46 is brought into focus by Löning's analysis of the structure of the pericope (*BibLeb* 12 [1971] 200). As we have seen above (*Form/Structure/Setting*) the material is structured into three report and evaluation structures (vv 36–38/39; vv 40–42/43; vv 44–46/47). Not recognizing the equivalence between the situation of vv 37–38 and the story of vv 40–42, the Pharisee passes opposite judgments in the two situations. Vv 44–46 function to uncover the equivalence, by retelling vv 37–38 in light of vv 40–42. And in the third sequence the Pharisee who has passed judgment in the first two sequences becomes now the one whose judgment is itself judged.

Up to this point Jesus has quietly allowed the woman's display of affection without disengaging from the dinner party to direct his attention to her. His turning to the woman now draws together the threads from vv 37–39 and 40–43, and Simon is given to understand that there is a connection between Jesus' brief parable and Simon's own judgment of v 39. Simon is not accused of impoliteness. Throughout, his behavior has been correct, if "only correct" (Schürmann, 435). To provide water for guests to wash their feet after travel is well attested (Gen 18:4; 19:2; 24:32; 43:24; 1 Kgs 25:41; cf. John 13:13–14), but is not indicated in Jewish literature to be a normal provision for guests (Marshall, 312; Str-B, 1:427–28). To the woman off the street with her tears as water and her hair as towel, it has been left to show the extra thoughtfulness that would mark the hospitality of a host who owed a debt of affectionate gratitude to his guest.

45 Again, the kiss of greeting was not mandatory as a mark of hospitality to a guest, but it was an accepted form of greeting (Luke 22:48; 2 Sam 15:5; Str-B, 1:995–96). Since Jesus has cast her in the role of hostess, he hyperbolically allows her kisses of greeting to be part of his welcome, though in fact she arrives after Jesus (vv 37–38). (This is better than Jeremias' proposed mistranslation of an Aramaic original [ZNW 51 (1960) 131; and cf. the comments of Fitzmyer, 691].) $\alpha\phi' \eta\varsigma$ is taken by Grundmann, 172, to mean "from whose house" to provide a point of previous contact between Jesus and the woman, but this is strained and artificial. For the meaning "since" see Acts 20:18; 24:11.

46 For the custom of anointing the head with oil cf. Ps 133:2; 23:5; Str-B, 1:427–28. A host would not necessarily be expected to extend this courtesy to a guest (cf. Schürmann, 435 n. 34), but it is precisely in that which goes beyond the polite demands of respectability that the true attitude comes to expression. The woman had no access to Jesus' head, but she could reach his feet.

47 The meaning of v 47a comes out quite differently depending on whether

its sense is determined by what precedes or by what follows. οὐ χάριν, “because of which”/“for this reason,” can be linked with either “I say to you” (which is nearest) or “her sins have been forgiven” (treating the “I say to you” as parenthetical). Similarly, ὅτι, “because,” can be either logical, i.e., establishing a basis for the ideas expressed in the previous statement (as in 6:21; 13:2; John 9:16; Gal 4:6), or causal, i.e., giving the actual reason for the state of affairs formulated in the main statement. At stake is whether love is here the actual ground of forgiveness, or, alternatively, the way in which the actuality of forgiveness becomes transparent. The language is indecisive, but there are various reasons for insisting that v 47a find its sense first and foremost in connection with what precedes: (i) οὐ χάριν, “for this reason,” binds the statement with what precedes; (ii) the discussion of love in v 47 can only be a resumption of that in v 43; (iii) v 47 terminates the exchange with the Pharisee and must, therefore, be understood in the light of that interchange. This being the case, we must link οὐ χάριν, “for this reason,” closely with “I say to you” and take ὅτι in the logical sense: the woman’s profound display of grateful affection is a clear indication that she has been freed from the great burden of her moral debt. This interpretation finds confirmation from the fit thus achieved with the final part of the verse.

It is Dupont (*ComLit* 4 [1980] 266) who poses most sharply the questions: “Pardon of Jesus or pardon of God, love for Jesus or love for God?” And these questions are yet more pressing if, as suggested above, Jesus has discerned, but not himself to this point bestowed, the forgiveness which this woman has experienced. The pardon is certainly the pardon of God, as the theological passives already suggest, but it is his eschatological forgiving activity which is in view, and this has already been anticipated in the baptism of John and now finds its focus in the person of Jesus. The woman’s forgiveness has its basis in the coming of Jesus: it was offered because he was coming; and it made her ready for his coming (cf. at 3:3). Now the profundity of that forgiveness is able to reach her in a new way in her own intimate contact with the fact that God has visited his people (7:16). The revelation and actualization of God’s eschatological forgiveness now becomes quite concrete in the full acceptances she experiences with Jesus (cf. at 5:20–21). She extends him welcome and finds that she is welcomed. It is no surprise then that her gratitude to God should be focused upon Jesus.

V 47b completes the logic of the application of the parable from vv 41–43. Where v 47a has made an individualized application to the woman by equating her with the debtor forgiven much, the application in v 47b remains general. Because the Pharisee and the woman have been treated antithetically in vv 44–46 (and cf. vv 29–30), it is natural to look for some kind of reference to the Pharisee in v 47b. But this is difficult, and has occasioned embarrassment to interpreters. Is the statement-of-a-principle form a signal not to look for too precise an application to the Pharisee (cf. Schürmann, 437)? Do we need to intrude Simon’s own *self*-estimation as one who had been or needed to be forgiven little (Donahue, *AER* 142 [1960] 417; Feuillet, *RevThom* 75 [1975] 374)? Is it that Simon is being given in irony a face-saving explanation for his loveless behavior toward Jesus (Ramaroson, *ScEs* 24 [1972] 381–82)? Is Simon called to reflect on the inanity of the righteousness of which he is so proud and yet leaves him so lacking in that love for God which is ultimately

fundamental (Deut 6:4; Winandy, *BVC* 47 [1962] 40; cf. Wilckens, "Vergebung," 408–9; Dupont, *ComLit* 4 [1980] 266)? Does Simon's attitude mean that God has in fact shown him little forgiveness (cf. 18:10–14; Fitzmyer, 692)? Does the statement invite the reader to recognize that the only forgiveness there is is the forgiveness of much, and that therefore the obligation to much love falls upon all who have experienced God's forgiveness (cf. Löning, *BibLeb* 12 [1971] 207)? The suggestions continue! Perhaps it is best in the first instance to recognize that since v 47b completes the logic of the application which Jesus has made in v 47a of the parable of vv 41–43, it repeats in negative form the basis on which it was possible in v 47a confidently to deduce that the woman had been forgiven a great deal. The woman must have been forgiven much, because she does not fit the pattern: little forgiveness, little love. While there is no doubt that the Pharisee finds himself somewhere quite outside of what God has been now doing in John and Jesus, it is difficult to link Simon exactly with either claim of v 47b: there is no thought that Simon has any experience at all of God's eschatological forgiveness; and there is no suggestion that he is aware of any affectionate gratitude owed God in relation to what is now happening through John and Jesus in his own day. In the parable the debtors are not so much the woman and Simon as the woman and someone whose sin was in Simon's estimation not so great as to be beyond the reach of the grace of God. The thought is almost Pauline: "Where sin increased, grace abounded all the more" (Rom 5:20).

48 Vv 48–50 are often dismissed as intrusions from other traditions (e.g., Bouman, *ETL* 45 [1969] 179; v 48=5:20; v 49=5:21; v 50=8:48). But Drexler (*ZNW* 59 [1968] 171–72) and Wilckens ("Vergebung," 412) are right to insist that the pericope fails as a literary unit without a direct address to the woman. This will not, however, necessarily save vv 48–49 as original components of the pericope. The close verbal relationship with 5:20–21 produces a sense for these verses that creates difficulty for the pericope—namely, the apparent bestowing of forgiveness on one who is already forgiven. This suggests that we have here in vv 48–49 a secondary expansion of the text (not that the text does not have a clear enough Lukan sense, and not that the additions do not develop a motif that is already intrinsic to the pericope).

V 48 cannot be read as a fresh forgiveness of the woman, but it can and should be read as a confirmation of the woman's forgiveness, on the basis of Jesus' own authority. In the pericope already the connection is drawn between the woman's forgiveness and Jesus and his coming. Now this connection becomes explicit by means of Jesus' authoritative word: it is Jesus who brings the eschatological forgiveness of God (in 5:20 for the first time, here as confirmation and in the form of a deeper entry into the restored relationship with God implicit therein).

49 V 49 conflates the two clauses of the protest in 5:21 and removes the negative tone of that verse both by deleting the reference to "blasphemies" and by allowing the words to be spoken by the unknown fellow dinner guests rather than by the scribes and Pharisees of 5:21. Now there is openness to the possibility that there may be one who in virtue of his unique identity is able to dispense the eschatological forgiveness of God. Openness to this Christologically determined possibility is commended also to the reader.

50 The formula "your faith has saved you" appears also in 8:48; 17:19;

18:42, and is often considered to be secondary here to 8:48 (in 8:48 Luke also has *πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην*, “go into peace,” as in 7:50). Since, however, it does not appear to have been secondarily introduced by Luke into its other contexts, and since in the absence of vv 48–49 the episode requires some such conclusion (cf. at v 48), it seems best to allow it here as an original component of the episode (cf. Wilckens, “Vergebung,” 412, 416). If v 50 is an original component of the narrative, there is little point in claiming a baptismal context on the basis of this verse (as Braumann, *NTS* 10 [1963–64] 489–90; Wilckens, “Vergebung,” 418–22). As in 5:20 (see there) and elsewhere, faith is here attributed to one who acts decisively on the basis of the conviction that God’s help is to be found with Jesus and who responds in gratitude to God’s gracious action. McCaughey is right to insist that faith is not simply coming to Jesus for help (*ITQ* 45 [1978] 180–82), but his definition of faith as publicly expressed gratitude is too narrow. Faith is seen when there is no break in the pattern of divine initiative and human response by means of which a restored relationship to God is established. In 17:12–19 the pattern is broken for the nine. In 8:43–48 the woman’s desire to make anonymous contact with Jesus is not yet faith until she declares herself.

A strong connection between salvation and forgiveness is already established at 1:77, and these are in turn linked to the term “peace” in 1:79 (and see at 2:14). “Go in peace” is a common farewell formula in Judaism (e.g., Judg 18:6; 1 Sam 1:17; 18:6; 1 Kgs 22:17; Luke 8:48; Acts 16:36; Jas 2:16) which here takes on deeper significance in the context of the coming of eschatological salvation. The connotation of “peace” is more individual here than in 1:79; 2:14.

Explanation

In the section 7:1–50 the relationship between the ministries of John and Jesus has been the controlling motif. Jesus complements and completes what has been taught by John. Jesus’ presence is that eschatological visitation of God for which John was to prepare the way. Though often not recognized, it is God’s own wisdom that stands behind the actions of John and Jesus, and God’s wisdom will in the end have its way and find its children. The touching display of affectionate gratitude shown to Jesus by this woman off the street makes for a fitting climax to the section. Here Wisdom is justified by one of her children (v 35). Simon may have seen little to impress him in his guest (he was of that class which had ignored John’s call to baptism), but this needy woman (already prepared by John’s baptism of forgiveness) was more perceptive, and, ready with a fitting welcome for the Lord whose coming she had been led to expect, she experiences God’s end-time bestowal of forgiveness come to full flower.

On several occasions Jesus dined by invitation with Pharisees (see also 11:37; 14:1). This does not mean that they endorsed what he was doing (on each of these occasions Jesus’ behavior scandalized his host), but it does indicate Jesus’ social standing as a well-known teacher. On this occasion Jesus’ host is embarrassed by the intrusion of a publicly known “sinner”—probably a euphemism for “prostitute” or “courtesan.” The intrusion itself was not such a shock, since

life was much more public in that culture, but despite the fact that she sought to remain as unobtrusive as possible, the presence of *this* woman was a scandal to Simon's Pharisaic sensibilities. Yet worse, however, was the failure of his guest, Jesus, to repulse her attentions.

What Simon does not know is that this woman has found release from her past. She is coming to Jesus to express gratitude to him for the forgiveness to which she has already been introduced in the baptism of John, and which, she is aware, finds its focus in Jesus. She comes with a precious jar of anointing perfume, fit for the head of a king. But Jesus' head is beyond her reach. She claims no right to disturb the dinner party, and the reclining couches on which the guests are arranged allow her access only to Jesus' feet. Standing there in silence she weeps, and her tears of sorrow are suffused with the warmth of grateful affection.

Certainly not by intention, her tears wet the feet of Jesus, and the woman is precipitated into a new line of action. There is no towel at hand, so with her hair she removes the offending tears. But this brings her into intimate contact with Jesus and leads to a release of affectionate gratitude expressed in kissing those feet which have just been cleared from the dust of the journey in this most unconventional manner. And in this flood of action the feet also receive the precious perfume.

Jesus accepts it all and Simon is confirmed in his skepticism about the popular view that Jesus might be a prophet (cf. 7:16; 9:19). Ironically, Jesus, aware both of the woman's condition and of Simon's state of mind, fulfills precisely Simon's conception of prophetic awareness. The underlying scandal of Jesus' behavior is, however, that here once again he is a friend to tax collectors and sinners (v 34).

Simon has passed his judgment on what he has seen; Jesus now asks him to pass judgment on a fictional story, a parable. The Pharisee suspects a trap, but agrees that the debtor whose debt was ten times as large will have the greatest measure of affectionate gratitude when in the event of inability to pay the debts are remitted without penalty or further obligation. The challenge to Simon is, "Do you not recognize in this woman's behavior the love of one who has been forgiven much?"

So that Simon will recognize the equivalence between the situation of vv 37–38 and the story of vv 40–42, Jesus proceeds with a fresh description of the events of vv 37–38. But in the new version, with a brilliant stroke of artistic license, Jesus describes not only Simon, but also the woman, as performing the role of the host. As a host Simon has not been rude. Throughout, his behavior has been correct, but *only* correct. By contrast the woman has shown those marks of thoughtfulness and honor which would mark the hospitality of a host who owed a debt of affectionate gratitude to his guest. It is precisely in that which goes beyond the immediate polite demands of respectability that the true attitude comes to expression.

Simon was wrong to see only the woman's sin-stained past. The woman's profound display of grateful affection is a clear indication that she has been freed from the great burden of her moral debt. She, not he, was prepared to recognize and welcome the mighty intervention of God that was at that very moment taking place: God has visited and redeemed his people (1:68).

The woman had come to Jesus on the basis of an experience of God's forgiveness. Now in contact with Jesus the profundity of that forgiveness is able to reach her in a new way: the revelation and actualization of God's eschatological forgiveness now becomes quite concrete in the full acceptance she experiences with Jesus (and in his words that confirm her full release from the past).

The last section of v 47 raises the question of who it is who is forgiven little and loves little. There is no easy answer. Simon hardly fits. Best perhaps is to think of a figure created purely for Simon's benefit, a person whose sin was in Simon's estimation not so great as to be beyond the reach of the grace of God. To this restriction the drift of the story responds: "Where sin increased, grace abounded all the more" (Rom 5:20).

Up to this point a profound, but mute, contact and communication has taken place between Jesus and the woman, but the story cannot be complete without a direct address to the woman. The woman is in no doubt that she owes her forgiveness to Jesus. Now his role as bestower of eschatological forgiveness becomes explicit (v 48)—a fact highlighted by the probing question of the fellow guests (v 49).

It is faith which sums up the response which the woman has made to Jesus. As elsewhere in the Gospel faith is here attributed to the one who acts decisively on the basis of the conviction that God's help is to be found with Jesus and who responds in gratitude to God's gracious action. Faith is seen when there is no break in the pattern of divine initiative and human response by means of which a restored relationship to God is established. The woman leaves Jesus a whole and rescued creature: she departs into peace.

Itinerant Preaching with the Twelve and the Women (8:1–9:20)

The material of this section (a little teaching, but mostly miraculous deeds: calming a storm, exorcism, healing, raising the dead, feeding) is set by means of an opening framework pericope into the context of Jesus' itinerant preaching of the kingdom of God. This happens in the company of the Twelve, who participate in the mission (9:1–6) and come to see that Jesus is the Christ of God (9:20), and in the company of a body of women who take care of the needs of the traveling group out of their own means and thus contribute to the mission, and whose presence with Jesus from early days plays its own special role in the apostolic function of guaranteeing the total transfer into the life of the church of the significance of the ministry of Jesus.

Itinerant Preaching with the Twelve and the Women (8:1–3)

Bibliography

Conzelmann, H. *The Theology of St. Luke*. 46–48. **Hastings, A.** *Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem*. 38–49. **Hengel, M.** "Maria Magdalena und die Frauen als Zeugen." In *Abraham unser Vater*, ed. O. Betz et al. 243–56. **Ryan, R.** "The Women from Galilee and Discipleship in Luke." *BTB* 15 (1985) 56–59. **Witherington, B.** *Women in the Ministry of Jesus: A Study of Jesus' Attitude toward Women and Their Roles as Reflected in His Earthly Ministry*. SNTSMS 51. CUP, 1984.———. "On the Road with Mary Magdalene, Joanna, Susanna, and Other Disciples—Luke 8, 1–3." *ZNW* 70 (1979) 243–48.

Translation

¹*It happened that, in what follows, Jesus^a was traveling about from town to town and village to village, preaching and announcing the good news of the kingdom of God, and the Twelve were with him, ²and certain women who had been healed from evil spirits and diseases (Mary who is called Magdalene, from whom seven demons came out, ³and Joanna, wife of Chuza, Herod's steward, and Susanna) and many other women who took care of their^b needs out of their own means.*

Notes

^aLit., "he" (αὐτός).

^bMany texts read αὐτῶν ("his"; & A L X etc.), but this is probably dependent on Mark 15:41 and may be Christologically motivated.

Form/Structure/Setting

At the beginning of this new section Luke reaches back for the thread of continuity to the generalizing statement in 4:43–44 that concluded the section

4:14-44 and indicated the itinerating nature of the ministry to which Jesus had been called. He also reaches back to the concluding pericope of the following section, 5:1-6:16, where he has reported the choosing of the Twelve to be apostles (6:12-16). The Markan material he is about to make use of gives considerable prominence to the Twelve or some of their number, and includes the account (9:1-6, 10) of the first ventures of the Twelve as "fishing associates for Jesus" (cf. at 5:1-11). Luke highlights as the themes for this section motifs from Mark's account of the choosing of the Twelve (3:13-19) which he had passed over in his version of that pericope: their appointment (*i*) to be with Jesus and (*ii*) to be sent out to preach (Mark 3:14). Their being with Jesus culminates in the confession of Jesus as "the Christ of God" (9:20); their being sent out to preach (9:1-6), as an extension and continuation of Jesus' own ministry, is set within a section which is provided with the framework statement, "in what follows [Jesus] was traveling about from town to town and village to village preaching and announcing the good news of the kingdom of God" (8:1), and includes examples of the healing activity of Jesus which the Twelve were to emulate. If Luke is interested in focusing attention on the presence of the Twelve with Jesus, he takes the opportunity also to set in parallel the presence of a body of women with Jesus. After the opening pericope, these play no further visible role in the section, but their mention here prepares for their role in the passion/resurrection narrative (23:49, 55-56; 24:1-11).

The pericope consists of one long involved sentence with syntactical ambiguities. In particular, it is unclear whether the final relative clause (v 3b) refers to all the women (vv 2-3a), or whether it forms a structural parallel to the relative clause of v 2a and refers only to the "many others." It is also possible, but not likely, that the "many others" of v 3 are to be included in the "certain women" of v 2 and are then to be included in the relative clause of v 2a. The pericope is a Lukan summary statement designed to serve as an interpretive framework for the section it introduces (8:1-9:20). As a pericope it is a literary product which brings together traditional elements but evidences no earlier life as an oral unit.

Luke seems to have brought together various traditional elements to form this pericope. There is influence from Luke 4:43-44 (behind that is Mark 1:38-39), Mark 3:14, and possibly Mark 15:40-41. The last is uncertain only because Luke has a tradition other than Mark 15:40-41 from which he draws the list of women who accompany Jesus (cf. Hengel, "Maria Magdalena," 247; note esp. the traditional-sounding clause on Mary Magdalene) and the extent of overlap of this tradition with Mark 15:40-41 is uncertain. Schürmann's claim (447-48) that Q material reflected in Matt 11:1 and 9:35 is also an influence is made less likely by the Matthean redaction evident in those verses.

Comment

Luke offers his next section 8:1-9:20 as a set of samples from Jesus' itinerant ministry of preaching the kingdom of God. The Twelve are with him and come at last to the conviction that he is "the Christ of God" (9:20). They now at length are specifically set to work (9:1-6, 10, 13) as the "fishing associates of Jesus" (cf. at 5:1-11) which they had already been called to be (5:1-11;

6:12–16). If Jesus has a body of men intimately present with him as part of his traveling company, so he also has a body of women with him. The women “take care of the needs” of the traveling group “out of their own means,” and thus contribute to the mission. They play no visible role in the unfolding of the section. But their mention here, besides serving the purpose of setting the women’s role in parallel with that of the men, prepares for the significant role for the women in the passion/resurrection narrative (23:49, 55–56; 24:1–11).

1 ἐγένετο (“it happened”) + καί + finite verb is a frequent Lukanism (cf. at 5:1). καθεξῆς (“in order”; here, “in what follows”) is used only by Luke in the NT (six times). διοδοῦν, “to travel through/about,” occurs elsewhere in the NT only at Acts 17:1. In plural form, Luke uses again in 13:22 the idiom κατὰ πόλιν καὶ κώμην, “from town to town and village to village.” εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, “to evangelize/announce the good news,” is much favored by Luke.

The itinerant nature of Jesus’ ministry has not been specifically commented on by Luke since 4:43–44, though it is clear that Jesus has made appearances in a variety of locations (e.g., 5:1, 12; 7:1, 11). Luke now brings Jesus’ itinerant nature into prominence by creating in 8:1–3 a framework statement for the next major section of his narrative (8:1–9:20). The use of καθεξῆς, “in what follows,” reminds the reader of Luke’s concern (expressed in 1:3 by the use of the same term) for an account which is coherently organized in relation to its overall sense. In the present pericope this concern for order surfaces clearly in Luke’s introduction of the accompanying women in vv 2–3. In Luke’s Markan source, by contrast, we only learn that such women have been part of Jesus’ company after the fact in the report of Jesus’ execution (Mark 15:40–41). “Preaching and announcing the good news of the kingdom of God” echoes the language of 4:43–44 (see there). Since for Luke the ministry of the apostles is an extension and continuation of Jesus’ own ministry (cf. at 5:1–11), the statement here concerning Jesus’ itinerant preaching ministry is already preparing for 9:1–6. In the section 5:1–6:16, apostolic partners for Jesus have been established, but since their choice in 6:12–16 (see there), they have played no visible role in Luke’s narrative. Now Luke makes good this deficit. In “the Twelve were with him” he takes up a motif from Mark 3:14 passed over in his own account of the choosing of the Twelve (in 9:2, the language, “sent them to preach,” will also echo words from Mark 3:14 which Luke did not earlier take up). The sequence of Markan materials which Luke is to use in this section lend themselves to an interest in Jesus’ close companions. In calling the apostles here “the Twelve” (for the first time), Luke refers back to 6:12–16 and takes up a Markan usage (Mark 3:16; 4:10; 6:7; etc; and cf. 1 Cor 15:5; John 6:67, 70, 71; 20:24) which later in the section (9:12) he will himself add to a Markan episode.

2 Luke draws on a tradition distinct from Mark 15:40–41 for his list of women who accompanied Jesus (cf. Hengel, “Maria Magdalena,” 247), but may himself be responsible for the language of the opening clause of v 2 (cf. 5:15; the use of τινές, “certain”; etc.). Luke establishes a deliberate parallel between the apostles and the women (his gospel is marked by such paralleling of men and women: Zechariah and Mary in Luke 1–2; the woman of Zarephath and Naaman in 4:25–27; perhaps the demoniac and Simon’s mother-in-law

in 4:31-39; the centurion and the widow of Nain in 7:1-17; the man with sheep and the woman with coins in 15:3-10; perhaps the vindicated widow and the justified tax-collector in 18:1-14). Like the apostles (cf. Acts 1:21-22) these women were with Jesus during his ministry and were part of the group of those to whom the resurrected Jesus appeared (Luke 24:22, 33, 36-49). They saw Jesus' execution (23:49), were the first to encounter the empty tomb (24:3), and were sole recipients of the message that Jesus was alive once more (24:4-8). In fact the women are Luke's only witnesses to the burial of Jesus (23:55), and thus only they are brought into connection with all four stages of the traditional confession preserved in 1 Cor 15:3-5 (death, burial, resurrection [=empty tomb], and resurrection appearance). No doubt it is an impulse going back to the historical Jesus which allows the women to have such a prominent role (cf. Hengel, "Maria Magdalena," 243; the more usual place for women in Judaism is reflected in John 4:27; *Pirke 'Abot* 1:5 and cf. Str-B, 2:438, though a more complex state of affairs is demonstrated in recent studies such as that of B. J. Brooten, *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue* [BJS 36; Chico, CA: Scholars, 1982]). Nevertheless, it is an exaggeration to suggest that the women appear on the same level as the men (as Grundmann, 174; Marshall, 316): the women are drawn into and support the apostolic witnessing function; but their only independent attempt at bearing witness is received as an idle tale (24:11).

Exorcism is treated as a species of healing already at 4:40 (see there). Witherington's translation (ZNW 70 [1979] 245), "spirits of wickedness and sickness" gains some support from the partial parallel in Luke 13:11, but requires a sense for *πονηρός*, "evil," which is unparalleled. Luke does not report the healing of any of these women. The place of Mary Magdalene at the head of the list (cf. Mark 15:40, 47; 16:1) is probably due to her prominent place as first (?) witness of the resurrection (John 20:11-18; cf. Matt 28:1, 9-10; cf. Hengel, "Maria Magdalena," 248-56). Magdalene = from Magdala. The location of Magdala is unknown, unless it is to be identified with Tarichaeae, a town on the west coast of the Sea of Galilee whose name in later rabbinic writings appears as *Migdāl nūnayyā* (מִגְדָּל נִנְיָא). The number "seven" points to the severity of the demonized state (cf. 11:24-26).

3 Joanna is otherwise unknown, but her inclusion among the three named women in Luke 24:10 causes the third named in Mark's corresponding list (Salome) to be dropped (Mark 15:40-41). Joanna is mentioned because as wife of Herod's steward she is a person of substance. Luke is quick to mention the fact that Christian influence has penetrated to high places (cf. Acts 13:26-39; 13:1, 7, 12; 18:8; 19:31; etc.). This may be partly responsible for Luke's preference for the list he uses over that available to him in Mark 15:40-41. The mention of Herod's steward also fits well with the role of Herod later in the section (9:7-8). Though a married woman, Joanna is apparently traveling with Jesus' group away from her husband (cf. 18:29?). Chuza is otherwise unknown, but the name occurs in Aramaic inscriptions. Susanna does not surface elsewhere in the NT, but must have been of some importance in the early church. Hengel ("Maria Magdalena," 248-51) has demonstrated that NT lists normally imply a ranking, but offers no adequate basis for setting this within the context of alleged competing claims to authority and prestige

in the early Christian community. In the present setting, the addition of an unspecified number of additional women who shared the same experience (also at 24:10) has a leveling effect and suggests that the naming has to do, not with privilege, but with the existence of definite specifiable witnesses (cf. Deut 19:15; Acts 1:21–22). Grammatically it is not clear whether the “many others” had necessarily experienced healing from Jesus or not, nor whether the support group consisted of all the women or only of the “many others.” “Provided for” (RSV) is too impersonal for *διηκόνουν*, but the restricted sense of “serving at table” is too narrow, especially with the following “out of their own means.” “Took care of their needs” is perhaps best. *ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων αὐταῖς*, “out of their own means,” may be Luke’s own touch, since Mark 15:41 lacks this expansion and in the NT only Luke (12:15; Acts 4:32) uses the dative with *ὑπάρχοντα*, “means”/“possessions”/“property.” Luke has a recurring interest in the utilization of one’s “means” (12:15–21, 33–34; 14:33; 16:9; 19:8; etc.). There are good Jewish parallels for women supporting rabbis and their disciples out of their own money, property, or foodstuffs (cf. Witherington, ZNW 70 [1979] 244), but these women are far more intimately caught up in the enterprise in which Jesus is engaged.

It is not unlikely that the Twelve and the women with Jesus serve here also as positive examples of what comes from the sowing of the seed in good soil (vv 4–15, esp. v 15; so Ellis, 124), but Conzelmann (*Luke*, 47–48) is surely wrong to contrast the Twelve and the women with Mary and the brothers (vv 19–21), especially when Luke drops the reference to sisters from his Markan source (Mark 3:31–35; cf. Schürmann, 444 n. 3).

Explanation

Luke here begins a new section (8:1–9:20) for which these three verses (8:1–3) form a framework: in what follows Jesus is (i) accompanied by the Twelve, (ii) provided for by certain women who also travel with the group, and (iii) engaged in itinerant preaching of the kingdom of God.

In the intervening sections Jesus has appeared in a variety of locations (e.g., 5:1, 12; 7:1, 11), but not since 4:43–44 has Luke actually commented on Jesus’ itinerant preaching of the kingdom. Now this is once again brought into focus in 8:1, with language that echoes that of the earlier text. Luke is partly looking ahead to 9:1–6, which he wishes to present as an extension and continuation of Jesus’ own ministry (thus the mention of the Twelve as “with him,” which, however, also makes use of a theme from Mark 3:14 and has its culmination in Peter’s confession [Luke 9:20]).

The mention of the women in parallel with the Twelve is yet another example of Luke’s setting of men and women in parallel. As with the mention of the Twelve, a future role is anticipated for the women: they witness the decisive events of the passion and resurrection (23:49, 55; 24:3, 4–8); they are drawn into and support the Twelve’s apostolic witnessing function.

The place of Mary Magdalene at the head of the list is probably due to her prominent place as first (?) witness of the resurrection (John 20:11–18; cf. Matt 28:1, 9–10). Joanna is mentioned because as wife of Herod’s steward she is a person of substance: Luke is quick to mention that Christian influence

has penetrated to high places (cf. Acts 13:26-29; 13:1, 7, 12; etc.). Though a married woman, Joanna is apparently traveling with Jesus' group away from her husband.

The grammar of 8:2-3 leaves it unclear whether all or only some of the women had been healed and whether the named women also, or only the unnamed others, provided the financial underwriting of the expenses of the group.

Potent Seed and Varied Soils (8:4-8)

Bibliography

- Bowker, J. W.** "Mystery and Parable: Mark IV, 1-20." *JTS*, n.s., 25 (1974) 300-317.
- Bultmann, R.** "Die Interpretation von Mk 4, 3-9 seit Jülicher." In *Jesus und Paulus*, FS W. G. Kümmel, ed. E. E. Ellis and E. Grässer. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1975. 30-34.
- Carlston, C. E.** *The Parables of the Triple Tradition*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975. 70-76.
- Courthial, P.** "Du texte au sermon, 17: La parabole du semeur en Luc 8/5-15." *ETR* 47 (1972) 397-420.
- Cranfield, C. E. B.** "St. Mark 4:1-34." *SJT* 4 (1951) 398-414; 5 (1952) 49-66.
- Crossan, J. D.** "The Seed Parables of Jesus." *JBL* 92 (1973) 244-66, esp. 244-51, 261-66.
- Dahl, N. A.** "The Parables of Growth." *ST* 5 (1951) 132-66, esp. 152-55.
- Dalman, G.** "Viererlei Acker." *PJ* 22 (1926) 120-32.
- Didier, M.** "La parabole du semeur." In *Au service de la parole de Dieu*, FS A.-M. Charue. Gembloux: Duculot, 1969. 21-41.
- . "Les paraboles du semeur et de la semence qui croît d'elle-même." *Revue diocésaine de Namur* 14 (1960) 185-96.
- Dietzfelbinger, C.** "Das Gleichnis vom ausgestreuten Samen." In *Der Ruf Jesu und die Antwort der Gemeinde: Exegetische Untersuchungen*, FS J. Jeremias. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1970. 80-93.
- Dodd, C. H.** *The Parables of the Kingdom*. New York: Scribner, 1961. 145-47.
- Doncoeur, P.** "La parabole du semeur qui sème à tout terrain." *RSR* 24 (1934) 609-11.
- Drury, J.** "The Sower, the Vineyard, and the Place of Allegory in the Interpretation of Mark's Parables." *JTS*, n.s., 24 (1973) 367-79.
- Dunkel, F.** "Des Sämanns Arbeit in des Erlösers Heimat (Die realistischen Elemente in der Parabel vom Sämann)." *Das heilige Land* (Köln) 69 (1925) 82-86.
- Dupont, J.** "La parabole du semeur dans la version de Luc." In *Apophoreta*, FS E. Haenchen. BZNW 30. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964. 97-108.
- . "Le semeur (Lc 8, 4-15)." *AsSeign* 23 (1964) 37-54.
- . "La parabole du semeur." *CBVF* 5 (1967) 3-25.
- . "Le chapitre des paraboles." *NTR* 89 (1967) 800-820, esp. 807-11.
- Essame, W. G.** "Sowing and Ploughing." *ExpTim* 72 (1960-61) 54.
- Evans, C. A.** "On the Isaianic Background of the Sower Parable." *CBQ* 47 (1985) 464-68.
- Finlayson, S. K.** "The Parable of the Sower." *ExpTim* 55 (1943-44) 306-7.
- George, A.** "Le sens de la parabole des semailles (Mc. IV, 3-9 et parallèles)." In *Sacra Pagina*, vol. 2, BETL 13, ed. J. Coppens et al. Paris/Gembloux: Gabalda/Duculot, 1959. 163-69.
- Gerhardsson, B.** "The Parable of the Sower and Its Interpretation." *NTS* 14 (1967-68) 165-93.
- Gnilka, J.** *Die Verstockung Israels*. 119-29.
- Grayston, K.** "The Sower." *ExpTim* 55 (1943-44) 138-39.
- Hahn, F.** "Das Gleichnis von der ausgestreuten Saat und seine Deutung (Mk iv. 3-8, 14-20)." In *Text and Interpretation*, FS M. Black, ed. E. Best and R. McL. Wilson. Cambridge: University Press, 1979. 133-42.
- Haugg, D.** "Das Ackergleichnis." *TQ* 127 (1947) 60-81, 166-204.
- Horman, J.** "The Source of the Version of the Parable of the Sower in the Gospel of Thomas." *NovT* 21 (1979) 326-43.
- Jeremias, J.** *The Parables of Jesus*. Rev. ed. New York: Scribner,

1963. 11–12, 149–51. ———. "Palästinakundliches zum Gleichnis vom Säemann (Mark. iv. 3–8 Par.)." *NTS* 13 (1966–67) 48–53. **Jülicher, A.** *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*. 2:514–38. **Klauck, H.-J.** *Allegorie und Allegorese in synoptischen Gleichnistexte*. 186–200. **Krämer, M.** "Die Parabelrede in den synoptischen Evangelien: Eine überlieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung der parallelen Stellen Mt 13, 1–53—Mk 4, 1–34—Lk 8, 4–18." In *Theologie und Leben*, FS G. Söll, ed. A. Bodem and A. M. Kothgasser. Rome: LAS, 1983. 31–53. **Kuhn, H.-W.** *Ältere Sammlungen im Markusevangelium*. SUNT 8. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971. 112–20. **Laliberté, J.** "Sur la parabole du semeur (Saint Luc, VIII, 5–16)." *RUV* 4 (1949–50) 475–90. **Léon-Dufour, X.** *Études d'évangile*. 255–301. **Linne-mann, E.** *The Parables of Jesus*. 114–19, 180–85. **Lohmeyer, E.** "Das Gleichnis von der Saat." *DT* 10 (1943) 20–39. **Luck, U.** "Das Gleichnis vom Säemann und die Verkündigung Jesu." *WD* 11 (1971) 73–92. **Marshall, I. H.** "Tradition and Theology in Luke (Luke 8:5–15)." *TynB* 20 (1969) 56–75. **März, C.-P.** *Das Wort Gottes bei Lukas*. 57–59, 67–69. **McCool, F. J.** "The Preacher and the Historical Witness of the Gospels." *TS* 21 (1960) 517–43, esp. 530–41. **Neil, W.** "Expounding the Parables; II: The Sower (Mk 4:3–8)." *ExpTim* 77 (1965–66) 74–77. **Payne, P. B.** "The Authenticity of the Parable of the Sower and Its Interpretation." In *Gospel Perspectives*, vol. 1, ed. R. T. France and D. Wenham. Sheffield: JSOT, 1980. 163–207. ———. "The Order of Sowing and Ploughing." *NTS* 25 (1978) 123–29. **Riddle, D. W.** "Mark 4:1–34: The Evolution of a Gospel Source." *JBL* 56 (1937) 77–90. **Robinson, W. C., Jr.** "On Preaching the Word of God (Luke 8:4–21)." In *Studies in Luke-Acts*, ed. J. L. Martyn, 131–38. **Schramm, T.** *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas*. 114–23. **Schürmann, H.** "Lukanische Reflexionen über die Wortverkündigung in Lk 8,4–21." In *Ursprung und Gestalt: Erörterungen und Besinnungen zum Neuen Testament*. Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1970. 29–41. **Schweizer, E.** "Du texte à la prédiction, 2: Marc 4, 1–20." *ETR* 43 (1968) 256–64. **Sprengrer, G.** "Jesu Säe- und Erntegleichnisse, aus den palästinischen Ackerbauverhältnissen dargestellt." *PJ* 9 (1913) 79–97. **Szimonidesz, L.** "Das Gleichnis vom Säemann und von der selbstwachsenden Saat." *NTT* 25 (1936) 348–61. **Walker, M. B.** "Luke viii. 4," *ExpTim* 75 (1963–64) 151. **Weder, H.** *Die Gleichnisse Jesu als Metaphern*. 108–17. **White, K. D.** "The Parable of the Sower." *JTS*, n.s., 15 (1964) 300–307. **Wilder, A. N.** "The Parable of the Sower: Naiveté and Method in Interpretation." *Semeia* 2 (1974) 134–51. **Zingg, P.** *Das Wachsen der Kirche*. 76–100.

See also bibliography on parables in *Introduction*.

Translation

⁴As a large crowd was coming together and people from town after town were coming to him, he spoke parabolically. ⁵"The sower went out to sow his seed. In his sowing, ^aone lot fell along the path and it was trampled under foot, and the birds ^bof heaven consumed ^cit. ⁶Another lot ^ddropped onto the rock and, having come up, it withered away because it had no moisture. ⁷Another lot fell in the middle of thorns, and when the thorns came up along with it, they choked it. ⁸Another lot fell ^einto the good soil, and when it came up, it produced fruit a hundredfold." As he was saying these things he began to cry out, "Let the one who has ears to hear, hear."

Notes

^aB W 2643 etc. use here the plural form ἃ μὲν, "some lots."

^b"Of heaven" is omitted by D W and some Latin and Syriac texts.

^cIn line with the alternative reading of *Note a*, the plural (αἰρά) is read here by P⁷⁵ B 16 21 etc.

^dReading κατέπεσεν (lit., "fell down") with P⁷⁵ B L R Ξ etc. The simple ὑπεσεν, "fell," is found in most texts.

^eἐπί, "upon," is read here by D W etc.

Form/Structure/Setting

The previous pericope (8:1-3) established as framework for the section 8:1-9:20 Jesus' itinerant ministry of "preaching and announcing the good news of the kingdom of God" (8:1). In vv 4-21 Luke fashions a subsection which concerns itself with the need for a proper response to the word from God that Jesus is proclaiming. The material of vv 4-21 is all represented in Mark (vv 4-8 = Mark 4:3-9; vv 9-10 = Mark 4:10-12; vv 11-15 = Mark 4:14-20; vv 16-17 = Mark 4:21-22; v 18a = Mark 4:24a; v 18b = Mark 4:25; vv 19-21 = Mark 3:31-35).

The repetition in v 4 of the phrase "from town to town" from v 1 (κατὰ πόλιν) provides immediate linkage with the preceding pericope. Luke manipulates the Markan materials in various ways to create a unified scene in vv 4-21 and to establish a more restricted and focused set of concerns: Luke strips away the Markan interest in the use of parables as such (Mark 4:2: cf. Luke 8:4, and note the lack of any parallel to Mark 4:33-34); with this goes any idea that this parable is a key parable (Mark 4:13 is not represented); the privacy of Mark 4:10, with the sharp insider/outsider distinction which accompanies it, is dispensed with (leaving Luke 8:10 somewhat inadequately motivated); this allows the crowd of v 4 to persist through vv 19-21 (Mark's "a crowd" becomes in Luke 8:19 "the crowd," i.e., the crowd of v 4); a unity of scene between vv 19-21 and vv 4-8 (and following) is made possible by the elimination of the lakeside setting with Jesus in a boat (Mark 4:1); the parable with its explanation (vv 4-15) and the visit of Jesus' family (vv 19-21) are further linked together by the Lukan introduction into v 11 and v 21 of the phrase "word of God," which in v 21 is linked to the verb "to hear" which Luke repeats from v 15; the Markan Jesus taught "many things in parables" (Mark 4:2) concerning the kingdom of God (cf. v 11 in context, vv 26-29; vv 30-32), whereas the corresponding Lukan scene is not now concerned with preaching the kingdom, but more restrictedly with response to its preaching (Mark 4:26-29 and 30-32 are dropped).

Despite a series of minor verbal agreements between Matthew and Luke and against Mark in the wording of the parable, Schramm's argument for a second Lukan source here (*Markus-Stoff*, 114-23) has not found support. If it is true that Luke's version eliminates from the Markan parable elements which anticipate the explanation to follow and which make the parable seem more akin to an allegory (cf. Schramm, 118), this is but consistent with the reduced allegorical content which is a general feature of Lukan parables (cf. Goulder, *JTS*, n.s., 19 [1968] 58-62), and may attest to no more than Luke's finely attuned sense for the dramatic movement of a story (cf. Klauck, *Allegorie*, 199). And it is also true that Luke tailors the parable to the interpretation to come at least in his addition of "the word" in v 5 (cf. v 11), most likely with

his abbreviation of v 8, and just possibly with the addition in v 5 of "of heaven" and "it was trampled under foot."

It is not unlikely that the Markan parable contains some developments which are to be attributed to attempts to clarify the imagery and to undergird the interpretation. While there can be no certainty here, it is likely that there has been development in Mark 4:5–6 (cf. Crossan, *JBL* 92 [1973] 245–48). The case of the rocky ground is developed disproportionately. Probably, an elliptical original has been clarified in a manner influenced by the explanation (cf. vv 16–17). It is easy to see how an earlier *καὶ ἄλλο ἐπέσεν ἐπὶ τὸ πετρῶδες καὶ ὅτε ἀνέτειλεν ὁ ἥλιος ἐκαυματίσθη*, "another lot fell onto the rocky ground and when the sun came up it was scorched," could have been expanded, but contrary to repeated claims, the original would have had in view, not the destruction by the hot sun of seed lying exposed on a rock surface (as Crossan, 245), but rather the burning off by the sun of tender new growth (dried out, overheated, or both) not adequately nourished by a good soil base. There is no contradictory imagery in the Markan expansion. Of the expansion, only the rapid germination is not already implicit in the elliptical original, and despite the skepticism of Drury and his authority (*JTS*, n.s., 24 [1973] 369–70), this too is consonant with Palestinian experience (see Dalman, *Arbeit und Sitte* 2:16; Haugg, *TQ* 127 [1947] 179). In Mark 4:7 "and did not give fruit" may be an addition, unless Crossan is right to see this comment as summing up the fate of the seed on all three types of ground (*JBL* 92 [1973] 246). There could be some development in v 8, but the end stress of the parable favors a more expansive form here. "Coming up (?) and growing" (*ἀναβαίνοντα καὶ αὐξανόμενα*) is least likely to be original. The opening and closing exhortation to hear (vv 3, 9) form no necessary part of the original parable.

The attribution of the original parable to Jesus has been scarcely questioned (but see Linnemann, *Parables*, 185; Drury, *JTS*, n.s., 24 [1973] 379), and there is little difficulty in providing for it a plausible setting in the ministry of Jesus (Klauck, *Allegorie*, 186–87, summarizes the evidence for a Semitic original behind the Markan text; Payne, "Authenticity," argues in detail for the authenticity of the parable). The explanation offered in vv 11–15 raises more difficulties.

Aspects of Palestinian agricultural practices have been examined to clarify the imagery of the parable. Does the parable depict a typical act of sowing and its consequences? Are the yield figures extravagant or realistic? Is the sower reprehensibly careless (does he deserve to get a poor crop)? Are we to see here the grand gesture (Doncoeur, *RSR* 24 [1934] 610: "sèmeur au grand geste"), the openhandedness of one who does not need to be parsimonious with his seed, directed as he is by a vision of the vivacity and exuberance of life (Wilder, *Semeia* 2 [1974] 137), and so not ultimately concerned about the various possibilities of miscarriage (the seed is good; the crop will be plentiful)?

The average yield for grain sown in Palestine seems to have been between seven- and fifteen-fold (Dalman, *Arbeit und Sitte* 3:153–54, 164), but Gen. 24:12 has a yield figure of one hundred ("God blessed him") and Varro (*De re rustica* 1.44.2) gives a yield figure of one hundred for several sites including the neighborhood of Gadara (southeast of the Sea of Galilee). White maintains (*JTS*, n.s., 15 [1964] 301–3) that Varro's figures, like those of other ancient accounts, refer to how many grains may be produced from a single seed and

not to a yield achieved for a whole field, but fails to demonstrate that such was ancient practice (contrast *Cant. Rab.* 7:3 [§ 3]: "Before wheat seed is taken out for sowing it is carefully measured and when it is brought in from the threshing-floor it is again measured"). It seems best, then, to treat the yields in the parable as extraordinary, but not as fantastic. The yield is not typical of Palestinian agriculture, but neither is it beyond one's wildest imaginings.

If the yield is not typical, are the sowing procedures typical? Jeremias (*Parables*, 11-12) has argued that they are, on the basis of a Palestinian practice of plowing not before but rather after the sowing (the makeshift path would soon be plowed up; the rocky area would make its presence known only when struck by the plow; the thorns are about to be plowed in). In the subsequent discussion (see esp. White, *JTS*, n.s., 15 [1964] 300-307; Essame, *ExpTim* 72 [1960-61] 54; Jeremias, *NTS* 13 [1966-67] 48-53; Payne, *NTS* 25 [1978] 123-29) it has become clear that Palestinian agricultural practice was more complicated and varied than originally allowed for by Jeremias. Seed was certainly plowed in, but it could be sown in soil that had been prepared or not, depending on the time of year, the rainfall, and variations in local practice. Even if, however, we assume sowing on unprepared soil, Jeremias' explanation of deliberate disregard of path and thorns, and ignorance of the location of rocky ground, occasions some difficulties. A single plowing of compacted earth would make it little more hospitable to the sown seed than was the trodden path (White, *JTS*, n.s., 15 [1964] 306), and would it not in any case be trodden out again at once as a traditional right of way? And why is it that the seed on the path was vulnerable to birds while that on the unprepared field was not (cf. *Jub.* 11.11; Linnemann, *Parables*, 115, 180-81). Again, the thorns would predictably seed a new generation unless special measures were taken, which is clearly not the case in our parable. Finally, on Jeremias' reckoning, the seed sown on the rocky ground is left as the odd man out (the other losses were not to be expected; here there is an inevitable waste).

Another way of understanding the sowing procedure as typical is to treat the cases of miscarriage as marginal phenomena: a little falls beside the established path and the plow does not reach it; the sower maximizes his use of the land and sows as close as he can to the rocky outcrops, and inevitably there is some loss; weeds are difficult to eradicate, especially along the edges of a field, but the farmer is reluctant to concede good soil to them, so inevitably they exact a certain toll from the crop (e.g., White, *JTS*, n.s., 15 [1964] 301). A frugal farmer is making the most of his field! There is no difficulty here with agricultural practice, but the story gives prominence to the cases of miscarriage and lacks any indication that most of the seed falls into good soil: the cases of miscarriage are overwhelmed, not by the percentage of good soil, but rather by the extravagance of the yield in the parts which are good soil.

We conclude that the sowing procedure envisaged is not typical. Just as the yield is extravagant, so is the sowing practice. There is an unusual generosity, almost a joyous abandon about this sower's technique: he is not eking out a living, but sowing seed of extraordinary fecundity. He feels no need to apportion carefully his supply of seed grain; he will soon have almost more than he knows what to do with!

If this analysis is correct, then the present parable is to be classified formally

as a parable proper, that is, as reflecting a particular situation, and not as a similitude, where a typical situation is in view. The parable is marked by an extreme economy of language which is relaxed only for the climax. A unity of development is imposed upon the parable by the single character, the sower, and the single activity, sowing. The original parable (see discussion above) seems to have been built upon patterns of three (cf. Crossan, *JBL* 92 [1973] 249): three cases of miscarriage; three verbs explore the fate of each lot of seed; the seed in good soil is divided into three lots (in ascending order of productivity; note the plural *ἄλλα*, “other lots,” in Mark 4:8), which balances the three cases of miscarriage. Luke restores some Markan dislocations of this pattern, and introduces additional triplets, though he does delete the three-fold division of the good soil.

Comment

As the crowds gather in response to Jesus’ itinerant preaching of the kingdom of God, Jesus in this parable expresses his confidence that no matter what miscarriages may ensue along the way, the potency for renewal in the seed that he sows is such that rich fruitfulness will be the certain outcome. With his varied images of miscarriage and extravagant fruitfulness, he holds up a mirror to his hearers so that each might be challenged by finding his/her own response patterns imaged in Jesus’ tale.

4 Luke dispenses with the lakeside setting: he has used something similar in 5:1–3, and the elimination allows Luke to create a single setting for 8:4–21. The opening genitive absolute fits with Luke’s fondness for this construction: of fifty-six uses of the genitive absolute in the Gospel of Luke only two reproduce the text of Luke’s source (Dupont, “Parable du semeur,” 98 n. 1). The gathering is in response to Jesus’ itinerant preaching activity (note the repetition from v 1 of the phrase *κατὰ πόλιν*, “from town to town”). *καί* is best taken as exegetical (“namely,” not “and”). The phrase *τῶν κατὰ πόλιν ἐπιπορευομένων* may be a second genitive absolute (“the ones from town after town were coming [to him]”) or it may depend on *ὄχλου*, “crowd,” and the participle be used as a substantive (lit., “of the ones coming [to him] from town after town”). The present participles hint, perhaps, that the parable is spoken *with reference to* the gathering crowd as much as it is *to* them. That Luke drops Mark’s opening “listen” (*ἀκούετε*) reinforces this impression. *διὰ παραβολῆς* may have an adverbial force: “parabolically” (cf. Acts 15:27). This would underline the indirectness of the communication and prepare for the interpretation in vv 11–15. The phrase is not attested elsewhere in the NT.

5 Luke adds an explicit mention of the seed (“his seed”) which he then takes up in v 11. “His seed” underlines the distinctiveness of this seed. The sower’s behavior and its outcome are intelligible only in light of the unique qualities of this seed. Luke (as Matthew) drops Mark’s *ἐγένετο*, “it happened.” Mark’s “the sowing” (*τῷ σπείρειν*) becomes for Luke (as Matthew) “his sowing” (*τῷ σπείρειν αὐτόν*). He will take Mark’s *παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν* to mean “along the path” (it is doubtful whether *παρὰ* + accusative can mean “on” [Horman, *NovT* 21 (1979) 336 n. 321]; in any case Luke carefully distinguishes in the parable and its explanation between *παρά*, *ἐπὶ* and *ἐν/εἰς* [Schürmann, 453 n. 63]; the

other option, “alongside,” belongs in a “marginal phenomena” understanding of the imagery of the parable which is argued against in *Form/Structure/Setting* above). Luke adds *καὶ κατεπατήθη*, “and it was trampled under foot.” In the LXX the term indicates utter destruction (Robinson, “On Preaching,” 134), but since nothing is made of this addition in the explanation (v. 12), we should probably not take the expansion allegorically (despite Heb 10:29). Luke likes the biblical ring of the language (as with his addition of “of heaven” to Mark’s “the birds”; cf. Dupont, “Parabole du semeur,” 100 and n. 9), but will have in mind seed being crushed and thence unable to germinate. See *Form/Structure/Setting* above for the view that the sower exhibits carefree excess in his disregard of path, rocks and weeds as he sows, because of the extraordinary potential for fruitfulness in his seed stock.

6 Luke thoroughly recasts his Markan source at this point. No doubt he found the Markan development here to be overelaborate—and perhaps confusing. The LXX text of Jer 17:7–8 forms an interesting middle ground between the Markan and the Lukan form and possibly may have played some role in the transition from the one to the other. Luke may think of germination on bare rock (*πέτραν*, “rock,” for Mark’s *πετρώδες*, “rocky ground”, but more likely we have only simpler but looser diction. For the middle one of the three cases of miscarriage Luke uses the intensive *καταπίπτειν*, “to fall down,” rather than the simple *πίπτειν*, “to fall.” (Note also that this use of *καταπίπτειν* creates a set of three consecutive verbs with *κατά* prefix.) Similarly, he uses *συμφέσθαι*, “to come up together,” in the middle one (v 7) of the three cases of successful germination and *φύεσθαι*, “to come up,” for the first and third cases (vv 6 and 8). In the NT *φύεσθαι* is found only in vv 6 and 8 here and in an LXX citation in Heb 12:15. Luke deduces correctly the part that lack of moisture would play in the Markan scenario (this is better than treating “because it did not have moisture” as a virtual tautology). The Lukan explanation (v 13) depends upon the Markan detail which Luke has himself eliminated.

7 Luke consistently replaces Mark’s *ἄλλο/ἄλλα* (vv 5, 7, 8: “another lot”/“other lots”) with *ἕτερον* (vv 6, 7, 8: “a different lot” [there is no clear difference of sense for NT Greek]). Mark’s “into the thistles” becomes “in the midst of the thistles”; *συνέπνιξαν*, “they choked,” becomes its close synonym *ἀπέπνιξαν* (also introduced by Luke at 8:33; Luke reverts to Mark’s verb in the explanation [v 14]; using *συμφυεῖσαι* (here only in the NT; “having come/grown up together [with the sown seed]”) of the thorns allows the sprouting/growth of the sown seed to be expressed at the same time (and see at v 6 for the patterning involved as well). Mark’s “and it did not give fruit” is dropped as redundant. Luke’s “in the midst of thorns” underlines the avoidability of the sower’s indiscriminate sowing. The directive in Jer 4:3 is “sow not among thorns.” Luke probably thinks of already visibly growing thistles in an area too infested to bother plowing them under.

8 Luke greatly compresses, simplifies, and rewords Mark 4:8. Mark has three lots of grain on good soil to balance the three lots of miscarrying grain: “they bore fruit: one lot thirty[fold], one lot sixty[fold], and one lot a hundred-[fold]” (reading *ἐν . . . ἐν . . . ἐν* with D Θ φ etc., and noting the plural *ἄλλα*, “other lots”). Luke has only one lot, and it produces a hundredfold (cf. Gen 26:12). While there is no need at all for the lots to be equal, no justice is

done to the story by treating the losses as involving only a marginal amount of the seed (see further the discussion in *Form/Structure/Setting* above). In Luke's version there is more of a contrast between the final lot of seed and the three lots mentioned earlier (in Mark there was already a measure of contrast but also more a progression from failure to germinate through aborted growth to varying degrees of fruitfulness [cf. Krämer, "Parabelrede," 38]). But as it was in Mark, the contrast is based on a spatial and not a temporal distinction (different parts of the field, not harvest-time versus the earlier stages of sowing and development; against Jeremias, *Parables*, 150).

If at the beginning (see on v 4) Luke has given the emphasis to the parable's being told not so much *to* as *with reference* to the crowds, now at the end he strengthens the impression that the parable has relevance for the crowds (note especially ἐφώνει, "he called out"). Mark's ὃς ἔχει, "[he] who has," becomes the participial ὁ ἔχων, "the one having," as in Matthew. The addition of ταῦτα, "these things," is a Lukan touch (cf. 7:9; 9:34; 13:17; etc.). The participial form of this saying (with or without the infinitive "to hear") occurs also at Luke 14:35; Matt 11:15; 13:9, 43; Rev. 2:7, 11, 17, 29; 3:6, 13, 22. The saying clearly had an independent currency in the tradition which here influences Luke's wording.

To this point we have explored only the imagery and structuring of the story. The Lukan sense is partly dictated by the framework he establishes (see *Form/Structure/Setting*) and is explicitly given in the explanation to come. But what of the original sense? Bultmann (*Synoptic Tradition*, 199–200) has declared the original meaning of the parable to have been irrecoverably lost. The great diversity of the interpretations which have been proposed adds a certain weight to his contention (see for example the survey of views in Dietzfelbinger, "Ausgestreuten Samen," 83–87). My own view, however, is that it is possible, on the basis of analysis of the story, comparison with other parables, and attention to elements in Jewish tradition and in the teachings and experience of Jesus, to eliminate from consideration most of the proposed senses.

Krämer ("Parabelrede," 38) has shown that in the other parables and metaphors of the Jesus tradition where there is parenetic intent (i.e., exhortation), the encouraged option is treated first and then the discouraged. Thus, the present parable inverts the expected parenetic sequence. Similarly, parenetic parables typically have two persons or groups set over against each other, which is scarcely the case in our parable. Again, the soils imagery is more naturally explanatory or descriptive than hortatory: the soil is not naturally to be thought of as changing itself. So the parable is not, or at least not primarily, hortatory.

The parable is also forced when it is read as an explicitly eschatological parable: there is no harvest imagery. Nor is the parable about encountering the necessary venture and risk of life in confidence that existence offers plenitude and even excess (as Wilder, *Semeia* 2 [1974] 137, 141, etc): this sower goes beyond venture and risk to carelessness.

Sowing is a natural image for the divine giving of life (*1 Enoch* 68.8; 2 Esdr 8:41) or the renewal of the life of God's people (*Hos* 2:23; *Jer* 31:27 [cf. *Ezek* 36:9]). In 2 Esdr 9:31 (cf. 8:6) this becomes the sowing of the law in God's people and its fruitfulness there (Schürmann, 452 n. 6 also notes in

this respect *Tanḥ* 28:73). This comes closest to the imagery of the present parable, where, however, there is a much greater emphasis on the potency of the seed (cf. Isa 55:11), as well as considerable interest in the cases where it miscarries. Different outcomes from sowing provide the imagery in 2 Esdr¹ 8:41. (See Klauck, *Allegorie*, 192–93, for a survey of Jewish and other use of the images of this parable.) In the parable Jesus expresses his relaxed confidence that God is working the renewal of his people through his (Jesus') ministry. The work of renewal will have an extravagant fruitfulness, no matter how much of the field receives the sowing in vain. In the parable Jesus expresses something of his own vision. But the parable is not without challenge as well. Jesus, as it were, holds up a mirror for each to see his own place: to find imaged his own engagement with this impetus for renewal (Krämer, "Parabelrede," 41).

Explanation

Having set up in 8:1–3 a framework of itinerant preaching of the kingdom of God, Luke fashions a subsection in vv 4–21 which focuses on the need for a proper response to the word from God that Jesus is proclaiming. Luke achieves this by "cutting down" Mark's parables chapter (chap. 4) and by forming a climax out of an episode he draws from Mark 3:31–35.

The subsection opens with a little narrative about a particular sower: his sowing practices and their consequences. Much of the difficulty in interpreting this story results from the need to work out how the story fits in with ancient Palestinian farming practices and experiences. Various suggestions have been made and these are reviewed above.

This sower seems not to care that much of his seed will go to waste. Here is no typical farmer, eking out a living and needing to maximize the yield from his precious seed grain. This sower sows seed which has an extraordinary yield potential. He knows he is in line for a bumper yield; he can afford to be generous with his seed. The end of the story vindicates his confidence: the yield is a remarkable hundredfold return (cf. Gen 26:12), which is to be compared to a typical yield of seven- to ten-fold.

Luke has simplified and sharpened the Markan form of the story, and has added some artistic touches of his own (for example, the patterns of three discussed in *Comment* on v 6), but has not changed the basic thrust of the parable. With more precision than Mark, Luke suggests that the parable is told with reference to the crowds (see v 4), but at the same time it has something to say to the crowds (see v 8).

In Jewish sources sowing is used of God's giving of life, of his renewal of the life of his people, and of the giving of the law and the fruit it must bear. Our parable builds on this background and expresses Jesus' confidence in the great potency of the renewal that is being worked through his ministry. In relaxed confidence Jesus sows generously, assured of an extravagant fruitfulness, no matter how much of the field receives the sowing in vain. The question to each individual in the crowds is: "In which soil do you find imaged your own engagement with the renewal set off by Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God?"

Knowing the Secrets of the Kingdom of God (8:9–10)

Bibliography

Cerfaux, L. "La connaissance des secrets du royaume d'après Matt. xiii. 11 et parallèles." *NTS* 2 (1955–56) 238–49. **Fusco, V.** "L'accord mineur Mt 13,11a/Lc 8,10a contre Mc 4,11a." In *Logia: Les paroles de Jésus—The Sayings of Jesus*, FS J. Coppens, ed. J. Delobel. Leuven: University Press, 1982. 355–61. **Gnilka, J.** *Die Verstockung Israels*. 119–29. **Jeremias, J.** *The Parables of Jesus*. 13–18. **Lampe, P.** "Die markinische Deutung des Gleichnisses vom Sämann Markus 4, 10–12." *ZNW* 65 (1974) 140–50. **Moule, C. F. D.** "Mk 4:1–20 Yet Once More." In *Neotestamentica et semitica*, FS M. Black, ed. E. E. Ellis and M. Wilcox. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1969. 95–113. **Schelke, K. H.** "Der Zweck der Gleichnisrede (Mk 4, 10–12)." In *Neues Testament und Kirche*, FS R. Schnackenburg, ed. J. Gnilka. Freiburg: Herder, 1974. 71–75. **Siegmán, E. F.** "Teaching in Parables (Mk 4,10–12; Lk 8,9–10; Mt 13,10–15)." *CBQ* 23 (1961) 161–81. **Wenham, D.** "The Synoptic Problem Revisited: Some New Suggestions about the Composition of Mark 4,1–34." *TynB* 23 (1972) 3–38, esp. 17–20, 24–31. **Windisch, H.** "Die Verstockungs-idee in Mk 4, 12 und das Kausale *ἵνα* der späteren Koine." *ZNW* 26 (1927) 203–9.

See also at 8:4–8.

Translation

⁹*His disciples asked him^a what this parable might be.* ¹⁰*He said, "To you it has been granted to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God; to the rest—enigmatic,^b so that 'seeing, they may not see, and hearing, they may not understand.'*"

Notes

^aMost texts have an added λέγοντες, "saying," which would require us to take the question as expressed directly rather than as in the present translation. λέγοντες is absent from P⁷⁵ & B D L etc.

^bLit., "in parables."

Form/Structure/Setting

For the place of vv 9–10 in the subsection vv 4–21 see at 8:4–8. Luke narrows the scope of his Markan source to focus clearly on the issue of making a right response to the preaching of the kingdom.

There are definite indications that Luke has utilized here another source along with Mark 4:10–12. These indications concentrate especially in v 10a where Matthew and Luke agree against Mark with ὁ δὲ εἶπεν, "he said," the position of δέδοται, "has been given," the addition of γινῶναι, "to know," the plural τὰ μυστήρια, "the mysteries." The use of βλέπωσω, "they may [not] see," in v 10b (cf. Matthew's βλέπουσιν, "they do [not] see") probably indicates that the second source also alluded to Isa 6:9 (most likely in a brief form like the

present v 10b [cf. Matt 13:13]). It is not possible to delineate further the scope of the second source or any context for it.

Fusco ("L'accord mineur," 357–59) argues effectively for the secondary nature of the Markan text at several points: Mark omits "to know" because of the negative use in 4:13; the shift in word order helps to compensate for this loss (and produces a word order which is not at all Semitic); a change to the plural "mysteries" would be a "de-Christologization," and thus unlikely (Bowker, *JTS*, n.s., 25 [1974] 312–13, notes the use of מִסְתֵּרִין, *mistêrîn* ["mystery"], as a loanword in rabbinic sources, and pointing out that its form allows it to function as a Semitic plural, makes the interesting suggestion that in the plural of Matthew and Luke and the singular of Mark we have translation variants for an original *mistêrîn*).

As Cerfaux (*NTS* 2 [1956] 243–47) has shown the material brings together the motifs of apocalyptic revelation and of the fulfillment of a prophetic warning (see further in *Comment*). Both motifs are well enough represented elsewhere in the Jesus tradition, but it is more difficult to be sure whether the present conjunction is original, or, again, whether the material in whole or in part had an original connection with a discussion about "why parables?" (as in Matthew and Mark) and/or with the telling of the parable (and its explanation).

Krämer defends an original connection with a "why parables?" discussion. His view, however, that Jesus taught in parables in consequence of the hardening of the people to his message hardly fits the parabolic corpus as we have it, and depends at least in part on his identification of a trajectory of fading interest in the early church as to why Jesus spoke in parables ("Parabelrede," 36, 40–41). The direction of Krämer's trajectory depends on the unlikely assumption that Matt 13 contains the earliest form of these materials. A rising interest seems altogether more likely, and argues against an original connection with a "why parables?" discussion.

Cerfaux (*NTS* 2 [1956] 244–46) offers an attractive argument for finding an original connection between the apocalyptic revelation motif and the two-phase revelation here (by parable and explanation). Cerfaux points to the role of two-phase revelation (allegories, visions, symbols, etc., which are then given an authorized interpretation) in apocalyptic revelation texts, and especially in Daniel. We may add to this the observation that both the parable with its explanation and the materials sandwiched between have to do with success and failure in the appropriation of God's eschatological revelation now publicly proffered (heard and seen as in Luke 8:10).

There remains, however, the possibility that a catchword association by means of the word "parable" has led to the linking of this material to the parable, and that this in turn has led to the application to the question "why parables?" of material which originally had a more general character. Most favor this view.

There is no compelling reason why the apocalyptic revelation and the prophetic motifs should not have been together from the beginning.

This material has a place among the sayings of Jesus which interpret the situation of his ministry (cf. Luke 4:24; 10:16, 18; 11:20; etc.).

In the Lukan structuring the *ἔστιν δὲ αὐτῇ ἡ παραβολή* of v 11a, "this is the

parable,” takes up the *τις αὐτῇ εἶη ἡ παραβολή*, “what this parable might be,” of v 9. This makes v 10 into a preamble. In v 10, “to you” is balanced by “to the rest,” and establishes the basic parallelism of the structure. “In parables” is a severely elliptical expression of the required “the mysteries of the kingdom of God remain in parables.” This severe ellipsis allows the explanatory *ἵνα* clause (“so that seeing . . .”) to be added without overwhelming the balance of the two halves.

Comment

For the most part the material of the subsection vv 4–21 highlights the need for proper response to the preaching of the kingdom. But in the midst of this important emphasis, as a preamble to the explanation of the parable, Luke, following the pattern of his Markan source, underscores the priority of God’s grace: all hear the teaching and experience the ministry of Jesus, but only some become insiders to the mysteries of the kingdom of God.

9 Luke deletes Mark’s opening clause, “And when he was alone.” For Luke there is a unity of scene from vv 4–21, and his preference is for Jesus to speak to his disciples in the hearing of others (cf. 6:20; 12:1; 16:1; cf. v 14; 20:45). In this more public setting he can dispense as well with Mark’s complicated “those who were about him with the disciples.” Mark’s opaque “the parables” as the content of the questioning gives way to a simple indirect question using the optative: “What this parable might be.” V 11a will be formulated with this wording in mind.

10 Luke’s wording here is mostly controlled by his second source (see above). On disciples see at 5:30. The disciples’ privileged status is expressed also in 10:21, 23–24; 12:32; 22:29; Acts 13:48; cf. Matt 16:17, etc. We may compare the Jewish sense of privilege in being given the law (e.g., Deut 4:7–8; Ps 147:20; in later Jewish tradition it is sometimes possession of the [oral] mishnah that becomes decisive [*Pesiq. R.* 5:11]). In Dan 2:28, 44 God is seen as a revealer of the mysteries about the coming kingdom that shall never be destroyed. More generally we should note God’s revealing of his secret (𐤒𐤓𐤕, *sôd*) to those who fear him (Ps 25:14; Prov 3:32) and, in another way, to the prophets (Amos 3:7). Compare also the use of 𐤓𐤕𐤕𐤓, *rāzê ’ēl* (“secrets of God”), in the Qumran documents (1QpHab 7.4–5, 8; 1QS 3.23; 1QM 3.9; 1QH 4.23–24; etc.). The disciples are in intimate and living contact with what God is now doing. (This contact is not, however, considered to be established directly by either parable or parable plus explanation.) On the kingdom of God see at 4:43.

If some know the mysteries of the kingdom of God, others are not so favored. The use of *τοῖς λοιποῖς*, “the rest,” is probably Lukan (cf. Luke 18:9, 11; 24:10; Acts 5:13; 17:9; 27:44; 28:9). It is a colorless term beside Mark’s “to those who are outside” (4:11). Luke would not exclude transition from the one category to the other. We should complete the Lukan ellipsis with “the mysteries of the kingdom of God remain in parables.” (This is surely better than Fitzmyer [708], “it has been granted in parables.” The point is that they do not have a knowledge of the mysteries.) Luke does not otherwise use the plural “parables.”

Nowhere else does he treat Jesus' use of parables as having any obscuring function (cf. Gnllka, *Verstockung*, 126–27). It seems best, therefore, to give ἐν παραβολαῖς here an almost adjectival force and translate as “obscure, like a riddle, enigmatic” (cf. the use in John 16:25, 29 of ἐν παροιμίαις with a similar force). Jeremias has argued for this sense in the original tradition, partly on the basis of the semantic range of the underlying Hebrew לְשׁוֹן, *māšāl*, or Aramaic מַטְלָא, *matlā*. Luke may be influenced here by LXX usage (cf. Ps 77[78]: 2; Sir 38:33; 39:2, 3). For the rest, the mysteries of the kingdom of God remain enigmatic. They too hear the preaching of Jesus; they too experience his ministry; but the heart of the matter remains opaque to them.

Luke's allusion to Isa 6:9–10 is brief to the point of being almost cryptic. This slight allusion is probably original and has been expanded in Matthew and Mark (or their sources). The Isaianic order (hearing, seeing) is reversed (cf. Luke 10:24) to produce an order which is more natural outside the specific Isaiah context (warning not heeded, then judgment not understood). The introductory ὥστε, “so that,” has occasioned much discussion. At one extreme there is Krämer's confidence that only a Gentile Christian could speak this way about the exclusion of Jews from salvation (“Parabelrede,” 37). As confident on the other extreme is Moule (“Mk 4:1–20,” 99–100), who points out that literalism is hardly appropriate in Isa 6:9–10 in its own context, and treats the ὥστε clause (which formally denotes purpose) as no more than a vigorous way of stating the inevitable. Perhaps it is best not to eliminate entirely the sense of divine purpose (as Moule does) but to link it in the first instance with the fulfillment of Scripture: “so that ‘seeing they may not see. . . ,’” in other words “so that there will be fulfilled the situation depicted in Isa 6:9–10.” People do exhibit a hardened attitude; Scripture anticipates it; and it takes its place within the larger sweep of the plan and purpose of God. The setting in vv 4–22 shows that whatever divine inevitability there might be in the end about the failure of some to respond, the thrust is toward sowing the seed and causing the light to shine (vv 16–17).

That some come to know the mysteries of the kingdom while others fail to see the point parallels in scope the outcome of the sower's activity.

Explanation

It is the disciples who are motivated to seek clarification of the parable. On the principle that it is to those who already have insight that more will be given (v 18), we may see that this initiative already identifies them as those to whom it has been granted to know the mysteries of the kingdom of God (v 10).

As preamble to explaining the parable, Jesus identifies two categories of people. There are the disciples who, as a precious God-given privilege, have been brought into intimate and living contact with what God is now doing in the setting up of his eternal kingdom (cf. Dan 2:28, 44). Then there are others of whom Isa 6:9–10 prophesies: they see but do not see; they hear but do not understand. They too experience the ministry and teaching of Jesus, but what God is doing in it remains opaque to them. That this should be so is

puzzling, but it is not unanticipated by Scripture, and it is not outside the plan and purpose of God.

Of course for Luke this division is not one to be complacently accepted. Transition may occur from one category to the other, and the whole thrust of the context is toward sowing the seed and causing the light to shine (vv 16–17).

We should note that Jesus is already here speaking about the varied effect of the sowing of the seed. The whole thrust of vv 4–21 is to highlight the need for proper response to the preaching of the kingdom, but here, as if for balance, the same scope of success and failure is viewed in terms of a supernatural inward illumination which comes by God's grace as privilege and gift.

The Parable Explained (8:11–15)

Bibliography

Brown, R. E. "Parable and Allegory Reconsidered." *NovT* 5 (1962) 36–45. **Cerfaux, L.** "Fructifier en supportant (l'épreuve): A propos de Luc, viii, 15." *RB* 64 (1957) 481–91. **Gervais, J.** "Les épines étouffantes: Luc 8, 14–15." *EglT* 4 (1973) 5–39. **Kosmala, H.** "The Three Nets of Belial: A Study in the Terminology of Qumran and the New Testament." *ASTI* 4 (1965) 91–113, esp 109–13. **März, C.-P.** *Das Wort Gottes bei Lukas*. 57–59. **Payne, P. B.** "The Seeming Inconsistency of the Interpretation of the Parable of the Sower." *NTS* 26 (1980) 564–68. **Suys, É.** "Le commentaire de la parabole du semeur dans les synoptiques (Mat. XIII, 18–23; Marc IV, 13–20; Luc VIII, 11–15)." *RSR* 14 (1924) 247–54. **Wenham, D.** "The Interpretation of the Parable of the Sower." *NTS* 20 (1973–74) 299–319. **Zedda, S.** "πορεύόμενοι συμπύκνουνται (Lc 8, 14)." *Euntes docete* 27 (1974) 92–108.

And see further at 8:4–8.

Translation

¹¹"This is the parable: the seed is the word of God; ¹²those along the path are those who have heard—then the Devil comes and takes away the word from their hearts,^a so that they might not believe and be saved; ¹³those on the rock^b [are those who have heard],^c who, when they hear, receive the word with joy (and these^d have no root), who believe for a time but in a time of trial they withdraw; ¹⁴the part that has fallen into the thorns—these are those who have heard, and on the way, they are choked by the worries and riches and pleasures of life, and they do not bring fruit to maturity; ¹⁵the part in the good soil—these are the ones who, having heard with a fine and good heart, hold firmly onto the word and bear fruit through perseverance."

Notes

^aSingular in Greek.

^bℵ* D 1241 etc. read the accusative instead of the genitive here, but the motion thereby suggested is less likely in the Lukan context.

^cThe bracketed clause is supplied from the context to complete the syntax.

^d“They” in B⁸ 1241 etc.

Form/Structure/Setting

For the position of vv 11–15 in the subsection vv 4–21 see at 8:4–8 and 8:9–10. V 10 functions as a preamble to an answer to the disciples’ question in v 9. The correspondence between v 9b and v 10a signals that vv 11b–15 are offered as the actual answer to the question.

There is widespread scholarly agreement that despite the extensive differences of wording, Luke has only his Markan source for these verses. Only the use of *καρδία*, “heart” (Matt 13:19; Luke 8:12) and the use of a pendant construction by both Matthew and Luke in the final three of the four kinds of sowing might give us pause (Matthew: ὁ δὲ . . . οὗτός ἐστιν [vv 20, 22, 23]; Luke: οἱ δὲ . . . καὶ οὗτοι [v 13]; τὸ δὲ . . . οὗτοί εἰσι [v 14]; τὸ δὲ . . . οὗτοί εἰσι [v 15]). But the first is a biblical idiom (Deut 30:14), and there is no point of precise agreement in the pendant constructions.

There has been more serious disagreement about the relative priority to be given to the Matthean and the Markan forms. Several scholars have argued along quite independent tracks for the priority of the Matthean form (Gerhards-son, *NTS* 14 [1967–68] 165–93; Wenham, *NTS* 20 [1973–74] 299–319; Krämer, “Parabelrede,” 31–53). Krämer tends to assume that Matthean priority for the explanation follows from his case for Matthean priority for the parable and its setting, but that case does not convince. Gerhardsson finds a pattern of Jewish exegesis of the *Shema*^c reflected in the Matthean form, but this may tell us more about Matthew than about original forms. Wenham offers the most carefully argued case. He accounts for grammatical difficulties which he finds in the Markan text as unfortunate attempts by Mark to eliminate the (Semitic) pendant constructions of the Matthean syntax, and argues that the web of agreements and disagreements between the three accounts suggest that the Matthean form is the middle term. But Mark’s Greek does not really require special explanation (a period after λόγος in Mark 4:15 best reflects the flow of thought and eases the syntax at this point), and a use of pendant construction (the only striking part of Wenham’s pattern of similarities) works well for making reference to sections of a text being commented upon and could easily have commended itself independently to Matthew and Luke (especially as they never do it in quite the same way as each other). Markan priority remains the most likely source solution here.

Following Jülicher (*Gleichnisreden*, 2:523–38) most scholars this century have declared themselves against the attribution to Jesus of the explanation of the parable. An impressive list, however, of more recent scholars can be set against this trend (Cranfield, Cerfaux, R. E. Brown, Krämer, Moule, Didier, Gerhards-son, Bowker[?], Payne, Léon-Dufour, Marshall).

Release from the rigidity of Jülicher's insistence on a parable as a one-point non-allegorical story has reopened the possibility that Jesus may have on occasion offered explanation of his stories. Cerfaux (*NTS* 2 [1956] 244–46) can point to the parallel provided by the two-phase revelation in apocalyptic texts with their allegories, visions, symbols, etc., followed up by an explanation. Payne points out (“Authenticity,” 171–72) that not just the parables with full-blown explanations but many more of Jesus’ parables are presented in the Gospel tradition as given by Jesus with some measure of interpretive guidance. The difference between the thrust of parable and explanation has usually been exaggerated by an excessively eschatological understanding of the parable. The two are different, but that is because the explanation does not repeat the content of the parable. It is content to answer the “Where do we (and others) fit it?” question. (It is in line with this that so much of the [Markan] explanation remains “in the picture” [Linnemann, *Parables*, 118].) Suspicion on the basis of the apparent inconsistency of the explanation about whether people are to be identified with the soils or the seed has little to commend it. The people are the plants. They come from the seed being sown in the soil. Any looseness of expression is based on this, so to speak, double origin of the plants (cf. Schürmann, “Lukanische Reflexionen,” 36–37).

The most serious questions for those who would defend the authenticity of the explanation are posed by (i) the pervasive presence of vocabulary which we encounter in the Epistles as the vocabulary of the church; (ii) the lack of Semitisms and such limits on vocabulary as would make for an easy retroversion into Aramaic; (iii) the often-repeated claim that the whole explanation implies a situation where there is already a Christian community. Here the arguments are fairly evenly balanced. It is already clear from the three forms that the explanation had much less stability in transmission than the parable itself. But even so, for the most part the elements do have a believable setting in the ministry of Jesus and not only in a developed church situation (see, e.g., Moule, “Mark 4:1–20,” 11–12; Gerhardsson, *NTS* 14 [1967–68] 191, points out that the OT and Jewish literature provide the themes and metaphors that are used). Nothing counts decisively against a basic explanation which goes back to Jesus. But in the nature of the case, such cannot be definitely identified from the present text.

In form, the text with its constant references back to the parable is uniquely an explanation. As already mentioned, explanations of apocalyptic visions provide the best comparison. The Markan text evokes the parable most fully, as it points first to the broadcast of the seed (Mark 4:14) and then in turn to the places where it has fallen (vv 15, 16, 18, 20) and the subsequent outcomes. It repeats the parables’ own climax in abundant fruitfulness. The Lukan text foreshortens the focus by starting only with the deposited seed (vv 12, 13, 14, 15) and quite loses sight of the abundance that overshadows the losses.

Mark introduces each soil by using a different grammatical construction. Luke first identifies the seed as the word of God (v 11) and those along the path (and by implication the other coming categories) as the hearers of the word of God (v 12). οἱ δέ, “those,” introduces the cases of those along the path and those on the rock (v 13). In the latter case εἰσω οἱ ἀκούοντες, “are those who hear,” needs to be understood after πέτρας, “rock.” The final two

cases are also paired and are introduced by the pendant construction $\tau\omicron\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$. . . $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota\ \epsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon$, “the lot . . . these are” (vv 14, 15). In each of the four cases the opening construction is carried on in a distinctive manner.

Comment

After the preamble of v 10 (which balances the main human responsibility thrust of the subsection vv 4–21 with an emphasis on privilege and gift) comes Jesus’ answer to the disciples’ question about the parable. The explanation leaves behind the dramatic movement and wholeness of the story. It is content to identify the seed as the word of God and then to go on to describe its varied receptions by the hearers in a manner which explores with some care and precision the issues at stake in a proper hearing of the gospel and in appropriate follow-through from that hearing.

11 Luke deletes the Markan criticism of the disciples (Mark 4:13), and with it the Markan tension between culpable ignorance and privileged insight (v 11). Markan texts in which the disciples ask for clarification disappear almost entirely in Luke (Gnilka, *Verstockung*, 120). Luke also has no place for the Markan treatment of this parable as a key parable. Mark’s resumptive “and he says to them” is eliminated; Luke introduces with “this is the parable,” which he formulates to correspond with the indirect question form in v 9; v 10 has been preamble; now the question is answered.

The Lukan commentary picks up on the story one step later than the Markan text (4:14) by beginning only with the (deposited) seed. This loss is part of a consistent pattern: the drama, movement and imagery of the parable itself are everywhere less present in the Lukan explanation than in the Markan. For the most part, Mark’s interpretation is Luke’s point of departure for his own (Robinson, “On Preaching”, 133–34). He has, however, anticipated in v 5 by the introduction of “his seed” the explanation here of the seed as the word of God (on “the word of God” see at 5:1).

12 Luke follows the Markan movement from focus on the seed itself to a focus on where the seed has fallen, but completely reformulates. If the seed is the word of God, those along the path are those who have heard this word. At this point the identification of this first set of hearers is a paradigm for the cases to come: the other location will also represent groups of hearers. As in v 11 the Markan evocation of the sowing has been omitted (similarly in vv 13 and 15; v 14 is the exception with its “the part that has fallen into the thorns”). The importance of hearing and the consideration that it may or may not be successful have already been signaled in vv 8, 10. For all his reformulation, Luke is following quite closely the underlying structure of the Markan narrative. He is left with a break in syntax after “those who have heard,” because he has no place for Mark’s clause “and when they hear.” Luke uses Markan wording for “comes and takes the word,” but he finds the Markan “immediately” too restrictive. He changes Mark’s Semitic “Satan” to “the Devil” to conform with the usage in 4:2, 3, 6, 13, but does not sustain this pattern. From this point in the Gospel, all references will be to Satan (10:18; 11:18; 13:16; 22:3, 31). That the birds should signify the Devil is not arbitrary allegory: see *Jub.* 11.11; *Apoc. Abr.* 13.3–7; *1 Enoch* 90.8–13. Luke naturally thinks of

what has been heard as stored in the heart (Luke 1:66; 2:19, 51; cf. 2 Esdr 8:6), so that is where the Devil must take it from. Luke's added "so that they may not believe and be saved" is not likely to be connected with his briefer allusion than Mark in v 10b (against Dupont, "La parabole du semeur (Luc)," 102, etc.), since Luke follows a different source at that point (see there). The importance of believing for Luke has already emerged in the contrast between Luke 1:45 and 20. To believe is to accept the message (Acts 2:44; 4:32; 19:2; cf. Luke 1:45). For the link between believing and salvation cf. Luke 8:50; Acts 14:9; 15:11; 16:31.

13 Like the first set, the second set of hearers is introduced by a *οἱ δέ* construction. Depending upon this echo (Mark paired the first two sets with *ὁμοίως*, "likewise"), Luke allows the *οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς πέτρας* (lit., "the ones on the rock") to stand elliptically for the full "the ones on the rock are those who have heard." This helps him to avoid fulsomeness, because he is about to repeat Mark's use of the verb "to hear." Luke catches here the change in diction from "rocky ground" to "rock" which he introduced in the parable. For the next two clauses he follows Mark closely. He makes Mark's Greek a little more elegant by deleting Mark's expressed object for the subordinate verb and replacing his pronoun object for the second verb with this expressed object. Once again (as in v 12), Luke finds Mark's "immediately" unduly limiting. Luke changes Mark's verb for "they receive" to *δέχονται* and thus creates a phrase with the following "the word" which elsewhere regularly indicates a believing response to the preaching of the gospel (Acts 8:14; 11:1; 17:11; 1 Thess 1:6; 2:13; Jas 1:21). Joy is quite the right response as far as it goes (cf. 1:14; 2:10; 24:41, 52; and see at 1:14). In Luke's syntax the clause about not having a root is best taken as a parenthesis. It is basically the Markan clause, but with a change of emphasis (addition of *οὗτοι*, "these," and relocation of *ρίζαν*, "root"), and with Mark's difficult "in themselves" deleted. Luke failed to use this part of the Markan parable (see at v 6), and the present, somewhat awkwardly placed clause is a kind of compensation for that lack. Luke makes no effort to bridge from his own reference to shortage of moisture (despite C. Maurer, *TDNT* 6:988). To be not (adequately) rooted is an obvious metaphor (contrast 2 Kgs 19:30) in connection with flourishing and/or endurance. The root of the wicked strikes the rock in Sir 40:15, but in our text here rootlessness is closer to being an independent metaphor than an exposition of the primary imagery of the parable. Luke gives up Mark's contrast ("but") between the rootlessness clause and that following. Instead, he sets the following clause in parallel with the earlier relative clause and begins with *οἱ*, "who." Mark's unusual *πρόσκαιροί εἰσιν* (lit., "are for-a-time") is reformulated to clarify and to emphasize further the role of faith: "they believe for a time." The remainder of the verse is totally reformulated. Luke speaks of "a time of trial" (*πειρασμός*) for Mark's "tribulation or persecution because of the word" (*θλίψις; διωγμός*). Luke's choice of language evokes the earlier time of trial for Jesus (4:1–13; see at 4:2), and probably the note of enticement there is not to be lost here either. The Christian's fidelity is tested not only in the tribulation and persecution of the Markan text, but more broadly in every pressure which makes trial of the Christian life (cf. Cerfaux, *RB* 64 [1957] 485–88). Times of trial may take many guises. Luke brings out the apostasy implied in Mark's *σκανδαλίζονται*,

"they are caused to stumble," with his use of ἀφίστανται, "they withdraw," which in the LXX is frequently used of falling away from God (BAGD, 126-27).

14 For the final two sets of hearers Luke uses a pendant construction (τὸ δὲ . . . οὗτοι εἰσιν, "the . . . these are"), in the first with a participle πεσόν, "having fallen," which is Luke's only reflection in the explanation of the activity of sowing in the parable. Here an influence of the parable text not mediated by the Markan explanation is evidenced. In Jer 4:3 the opposite imagery ("sow not among thorns") involves a rooting out of evil. The next clause follows Mark closely, except that, as consistently through the explanation, Luke will not allow an expressed object after ἀκούειν, "to hear"; cf. vv 12, 13; in v 15 τὸν λόγον, "the word," is allowed to stand for the sake of the κατέχουσιν, "hold fast," which follows and with which it should primarily be read. Luke casts Mark's following clause into the passive and abbreviates the items in the Markan list of things which choke (not "the word," for Luke, but the people themselves). "Of life" (τοῦ βίου) should probably be linked to each of the items and not only to the final item (compare esp. 21:34 μερίμναις βιωτικαῖς, "cares of this life"). The worries of life can be an oppressive burden (21:34 again) that stifles growth and development to spiritual maturity. The cognate verb is used of Martha's preoccupations (10:41) and of concern about the basic provisions for life (12:22-25). For Luke not only the desire for riches (as Mark's text) but riches themselves constitute a danger. On the problem of riches see at 6:20, 24. For Luke riches and cares are closely related snares: they derail us by creating a delusion about that in which our true life consists (cf. 12:15). For Mark's "other desires" (τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιθυμίαι) Luke prefers "pleasures of life." Luke always uses ἐπιθυμία and its cognate verb with a positive force (15:16; 16:21; 17:22; 22:15; Acts 20:33 is an exception, but the sense there would conform the third danger too closely to what has already been covered by the first two; cf. Dupont, "La parabole du semeur [Luc]," 105). The kind of pleasures Luke has in mind are well illustrated by 7:25; 12:19; 16:19. Luke evokes a horizon bounded by present existence. πορευόμενοι (lit., "going") is difficult. Schürmann, 464, contrasts "going on their way" here with "going in" (εἰσπορευόμενοι) in v 16. But the context in v 14 does not favor this reading. Zedda (*ED* 27 [1974] 92-108) has argued at length that we have here a descriptive participle that marks the transition from one action to another (a colloquial translation might be "they go and get themselves choked"). This is certainly possible, but the passive verb following makes it a little difficult and it is probably better to see the word as pointing to the gradual development of a plant toward maturity and fruitbearing (they are choked on the way). After changing Mark's term for choking in the parable (see v 7), here in the explanation he allows Mark's term to stand. Luke's use of τελεσφοροῦσιν, "bring fruit to maturity" (only here in the NT) fits with the way we have taken πορευόμενοι above. Luke pictures an arrested development, a goal not reached.

15 As he did in the elliptical expression in v 13, Luke carries over here from the previous set of hearers the fact that those in the good soil are another group of those who have heard, but here he does not depend upon this for his syntax. In line with his tendency to dismiss from view the sowing imagery of the parable Luke has "in the fine soil," not the "upon" of the Markan

explanation ("sown upon") or the "into" of the Lukan parable. The Markan text is almost completely reformulated to be much more specific in its exhortation. Fine (*καλή*) soil means a fine and good heart. Here Luke combines the adjectives of the parable references to "good" soil (which he changed from Mark's "fine") with that of the explanation's reference to "fine" soil (repeating Mark). This enables him to echo the ethical language of Greek humanism (Dupont, "La parabole du semeur [Luc]," 107): surely this is the only honorable way to be hearers! A good heart (see at 6:45; and cf. Acts 8:21) allows the message full access and follows through consistently its implications. Luke dispenses with Mark's reference to welcoming or receiving the word: many of the casualties have done that. Holding firmly onto it is what makes the difference, a point which Luke underlines with the *ἐν ὑπομονῇ*, "with perseverance," with which the explanation ends. Cerfaux finds a special link between *ὑπομονῇ* and *πειρασμοῦ*, "trial," in v 13: holding up under that which puts our faith on trial (*RB* 64 [1957] 488–89). But surely Luke also has an eye upon the arrested development of v 14 (*καρποφοροῦσιν*, "they bear fruit," and *οὐ τελεσφοροῦσιν* [lit., "they do not bear (fruit) to the end"]) are clearly to be linked) and perhaps even the giving up of the word to the Devil in v 12. Perseverance concerns Luke also in Luke 21:9; Acts 11:23; 13:43; 14:22 and cf. Luke 18:1, 8. Luke eliminates any expression of the degree of fruitfulness. This represents the most serious change in emphasis from parable to explanation: Luke's explanation expounds only the human responsibility aspect of the parable; the confident and carefree sowing has already disappeared from sight (cf. at v 11), and now has gone as well the sower's vindication through an extraordinary crop which quite puts into the shade the significance of the cases of miscarriage. At least to a degree, Luke has allowed the explanation to become an independent piece of moral exhortation which no longer draws its basic dynamic from the parable which it purports to explain.

Explanation

As preamble v 10 has looked from another aspect, that of God's grace and initiative, at the twofold effect of Jesus' ministry. The explanation of the parable in vv 10–15 resumes the major emphasis on human responsibility that characterizes the subsection vv 4–21.

There has been a great deal of dispute about whether the explanation was ever given by Jesus himself or whether it was produced to meet the needs of the early church. There is at the end of the day no good reason for denying the explanation to Jesus, as long as we allow for a number of provisos. (i) The actual wording of the explanation has developed in church use (note the differences already between Matthew, Mark, and Luke on the wording). (ii) The explanation only takes up and develops an aspect of the parable; it does no justice to the *whole* thrust of the parable. (iii) In that sense the explanation does not tell us what the parable *means*.

V 10 picks up the wording of the disciples' question in v 9: now they get their answer. The answer, however, does not cover the whole story. It starts only with the deposited seed and stops before the description of the abundance of the fruitfulness. The explanation expounds only the immediate human responsibility aspect of the parable.

The seed is the word of God, and the first place it has fallen is along the path. The initial group hear, but get no real hold on the word of God. The Devil has no difficulty in extricating it from their hearts. In their case, no response of faith has bound the message to their hearts. They have not really believed the message (cf. Luke 1:45 in contrast to v 20) which could have brought them salvation (cf. Acts 15:11; 16:31).

The second group have a different problem. They “receive the word”—a mode of expression that indicates a right believing response to the gospel (Acts 8:14; 11:1; etc.). Their joy shows they have caught something of the great thing God is doing here (cf. Luke 1:14; 2:10; etc.). But appearances can be deceiving. The real potential of these newly germinated plants will only come to light when the pressures come on in some kind of trial. Just as the true deep loyalties of Jesus were put on trial on Luke 4:1–13, so will those of every respondent to the Christian gospel also be. If the rootedness is not there, the new life will wither away. Apostasy is the outcome.

For the third group, the word falls among thistles. The word of God brooks no other competing loyalty (e.g., Luke 14:26). Preoccupation with the issues of life threatens to be just such a competing claim to loyalty (cf. 12:22–31). Growth and development to spiritual maturity can be stifled by the worries of life (cf. 10:41; 21:34), by riches which delude us about that in which our true life consists (cf. 12:15), and by the pleasures of life (cf. 12:19; 16:19) which narrow our focus and leave us thinking that our present existence is all that really matters. Worries, riches, and pleasures are the stuff of an arrested development; that is the way not to reach the goal of bringing fruit to maturity.

There is, however, also good soil. Here Luke speaks of a “fine and good heart” in language that echoes ancient humanistic ideals: “if you want to be a fine fellow, this is the only way to go!” Such a heart allows the word full access and follows through consistently on its implications. In the unfolding of life, these hearers are tenacious: they have come on board for the long haul, and they see this thing through to a fruitful end.

Take Care How You Hear (8:16–18)

Bibliography

- Dodd, C. H.** “Changes of Scenery in Luke.” *ExpTim* 33 (1921–22) 40–41. **Dupont, J.** “La lampe sur le lampadaire dans l’évangile de Saint Luc (VIII,16; XI,33).” In *Au service de la parole de Dieu*, FS A.-M. Charue. Gembloux: Duculot, 1969. 43–59. ———. “La transmission des paroles de Jésus sur la lampe et la mesure dans Marc 4, 21–25 et dans la tradition Q.” In *Logia: Les paroles de Jésus—The Sayings of Jesus*, FS J. Coppens, ed. J. Delobel. Leuven: University Press, 1982. 201–36. **Dupont-Sommer, A.** “Note archéologique sur le proverbe évangélique: Mettre la lampe sous le boisseau.” In *Mélanges Syriens*, FS R. Dussaud, vol. 2, BAH 30. Paris: Librairie orientale Paul Guethuer, 1939. 789–94. **Gnilka, J.** *Die Verstockung Israels*. 39–40, 125–26. **Hahn, F.** “Die Worte vom Licht Lk 11,33–36.” In *Orientierung an Jesus: Zur Theologie der Synoptiker*, FS J. Schmidt, ed. P. Hoffmann et al. Freiburg im B.: Herder, 1973. 107–38. **Jeremias,**

J. "Die Lampe unter dem Scheffel." ZNW 39 (1940) 237–40. **Kennedy, H. A. A.** "The Composition of Mark iv. 21–25: A Study in the Synoptic Problem." *ExpTim* 25 (1913–14) 301–5. **Klauck, H.-J.** *Allegorie und Allegorese in synoptischen Gleichnistexte.* 227–40. **Krämer, M.** "Ihr seid das Salz der Erde . . . Ihr seid das Licht der Welt: Die vielgestaltige Wirkkraft des Gotteswortes der heiligen Schrift für das Leben der Kirche aufgezeigt am Beispiel Mt 5, 13–16." *MTZ* 28 (1977) 133–57, esp. pp. 143–47. **Laufen, R.** *Die Doppelüberlieferung der Logienquelle und des Markusevangeliums.* 156–73, 456–69. **Lindeskog, G.** "Logia-Studien." *ST* 4 (1950) 129–89, esp. 148–55. **Schneider, G.** "Das Bildwort von der Lampe: Zur Traditionsgeschichte eines Jesus-Wortes." ZNW 61 (1970) 183–209. **Schramm, T.** *Der Markus-Stoff.* 23–26. **Vaganay, L.** "L'étude d'un doublet dans la parabole de la lampe." In *Le Problème synoptique: Une hypothèse de travail.* Bibliothèque de théologie 3/1. Tournai: Desclée et Cie, 1954. 426–42. **Zimmermann, H.** *Neutestamentliche Methodenlehre.* 181–91.

Translation

¹⁶"No one lights a lamp and then^a covers it with a vessel, or places it under a bed; rather, one places it on a lampstand, ^bso that those who would come in may see the light. ¹⁷For there is nothing hidden which will not become open to view, nor secret which will not be made known and come into open view.

¹⁸"Take care, then, how you hear! For whoever has—more^c will be given to him; and whoever does not have—even what he seems to have will be taken from him."

Notes

^aParataxis with "then" to represent aorist participle with present tense principal verb.

^bFrom here to the end of the verse is omitted by P⁷⁵ B.

^cImplied.

Form/Structure/Setting

The Lukan subunit vv 4–21 continues here (see on vv 4–8). The conversation with the disciples begun in v 9 is concluded with vv 16–18. Compared to his Markan source, Luke has created a tighter unity by dispensing with (i) Mark's fresh beginning in 4:21, "and he said to them," as well as (ii) that in v 24, and also (iii) the major clause of Mark's v 24 ("the measure you give. . .") which moves beyond Luke's focus for vv 4–21. Other changes noted in *Comment* below contribute further to the tight focus and unity of the piece.

Vv 16–17 take their point of departure from v 15, but also pick up especially on v 10. V 18 is more broadly related to the whole of the explanation (vv 11–15).

Luke has followed the Markan sequence of his materials but has been influenced in a number of places by the wording of other source materials which he shares here with Matthew. Matthew's use and Luke's additional use elsewhere of this other source material reveal that the materials paralleled in 8:16–17 were not gathered together or related to each other in this additional source material.

There is broad scholarly agreement that Luke's second source for v 16

had a wording very close to that of Matt 5:15 (e.g., Jeremias, *ZNW* 39 [1940] 237–38; Schneider, *ZNW* 61 [1970] 185–86; Dupont, “La transmission,” 210–11). (Luke is again heavily influenced by this second source in 11:33, but also by his own redaction in 8:16.) It has proved more difficult to make decisions about the common tradition behind Matt 5:5 and Mark 4:21. The Markan form has been claimed as Palestinian by Jeremias (*ZNW* 39 [1940] 238; cf. Krämer, *MTZ* 28 [1977] 146–47) who urges in favor of this view (i) the presence of definite articles where the sense is indefinite, (ii) the striking treatment of the lamp as an active agent, and (iii) the question form of the Markan text which fits the style of other wisdom sayings in the Jesus tradition. But these arguments have been more than answered by Dupont (“La transmission,” 215–18; and cf. Schneider, *ZNW* 61 [1970] 186–99). The Markan distinctives do not clearly identify the text as Semitic; and the Markan form fits so clearly the literary and theological development of Mark that its wording is best attributed to Mark himself.

Luke’s second source for v 17 is used by him at 12:2 where, apart from the compound verb *συγκεκαλυμμένον*, “covered up,” instead of the simple *κεκαλυμμένον*, “covered” (as Matt 10:26) he reproduces his source verbatim (cf. Matt 10:26). The Markan form (4:22) with its paradoxical assertion that one hides precisely in order to reveal is once again determined by Markan theological concerns and is to be considered secondary (Schneider, *ZNW* 61 [1970] 198–99; Dupont, “La transmission,” 216–19).

In Luke’s equivalent (v 18) to Mark 4:25, the second source (see Luke 19:26; Matt 25:29) has had no influence. In this case the difference is hardly more than grammatical, and it is the Markan text which is clearly more Semitic in its syntax (cf. Dupont, 225–26).

There is no good reason for denying any of these proverbial sayings to the historical Jesus. But what he might have meant by them remains quite conjectural. Jeremias’ suggestion remains attractive (*Parables*, 121), that 8:16 originated in a context where Jesus has been urged to protect himself by taking a low profile (cf. Luke 13:31). An eschatological reference would make good sense of v 17. For v 18 there is no setting that easily commends itself.

Vv 16 and 17 are closely linked, with v 17 developing and justifying the thoughts of v 16. V 18 is independently linked to the context and has something of a summarizing function.

Comment

The subsection (vv 4–21) on the need to respond rightly to the word of God continues here with an emphasis on living the word out visibly, because this will serve God’s purpose to spread its knowledge beyond the present privileged group.

16 Luke avoids impersonal plurals which reflect an Aramaic substructure (cf. Dupont, *Béatitudes*, 1:84 n. 2, 242 n. 1, 243, 286, 310) and therefore does not repeat the *καίουσιν*, “they light”/“have something burning,” of the Matthean text (5:15). Instead, Luke uses a participial construction and the more precise verb *ἀπτεω* with its sharp focus on the act of lighting. It has been suggested that in the original imagery the role of the peck-measure (*μόδιος*) was to suffocate

the flame (Jeremias, *ZNW* 39 [1940] 239), but the sabbath context of the texts to which Jeremias appeals suggests, not a standard method of extinguishing lamps, but rather an unusually indirect one designed to circumvent the sabbath prohibition of the lighting or extinction of lamps. Originally and in our present texts, we have pictured a bizarre way (or ways) of interfering with the normal light-giving role of the lamp. *μόδιος*, "peck-measure" (Dupont-Sommer's attempt to identify *μόδιος* as a larger measure supported by a three- or four-legged stand under which one could slip a lamp ["Note archéologique," 790] has not been followed; cf. Schneider, *ZNW* 61 [1970] 189 n. 29) is a Latin loanword which Luke replaces with the quite general *σκεῦος*, "vessel." As if in compensation for this vagueness, the action is specified more precisely ("hides/covers"; cf. Matthew's "place"). The alternate "or under a bed" is added in from Mark 4:21. For Luke the goal of the activity is that those coming into the house may see the light, rather than, as Matthew, that the light might provide illumination for all in the house. Luke probably thinks of a more generously proportioned Greco-Roman house (cf. also 11:33 where the house has a cellar) and not the one-room structure originally envisaged (for Matthew and/or Mark there is one bed, one lampstand, the peck-measure is ready to hand, and the light of a single lamp provides illumination for the whole house).

The lamp that has been lit is the one who has heard the word of God (and responded). And since the word of God can not only be spoken and heard but also done (v 21), the lamp in place on the lampstand will be the person living out and therefore making visible the word of God. In view is God's purpose for the lamps which he has set alight (v 10). His intention is that those who still need to find their way in may see the word of God streaming out from those already inside. (Schürmann, 467, thinks too narrowly of the obligation to preach, which is certainly not to be excluded; Dupont, "La lampe," 53, emphasizes ethical fruit without attention to the message content of the light.)

17 Luke has blended his two sources here (cf. 12:2 where the second source is reproduced almost verbatim [cf. Matt 10:26]). He paraphrases Mark's *φανερῶθῃ*, "be made manifest," with *φανερὸν γενήσεται*, "become manifest"/"open to view," with no change of meaning (Mark uses a similar kind of construction in the following clause). The second source's "will not be known" is made more emphatic with a double negative construction. The most notable difference from Mark is the loss of any idea that the hiddenness has its own special role to play in the achievement of the ultimate goal of coming out into the open and being revealed.

Luke keeps the link between v 17 and v 10 which is evident in his Markan source (4:22 cf. vv 11–12), even adding a verbal link (the use of *γινώσκειν*, "to know") by his use of alternative sources. Luke's point will be that the light display implicitly called for in v 16 will achieve God's purpose. As proverbially all secrets come out, so it is God's purpose that this secret, the knowledge of the mysteries of the kingdom of God, now restricted to a privileged few, should become broadly accessible (cf. Acts 2:36).

18 Luke has no place for Mark 4:23. The Markan text has been concerned with the matter of *gaining* of access for oneself to the mystery. Such is not Luke's drift. He has been concerned with the *giving* of access. Having dropped

v 23, Luke reproduces the opening clause of v 24 (minus the fresh introduction) and then v 25. The remainder of v 25 is already somewhat obscure in the Markan context. In any case the careful attention to what is heard, for which it seems to call, is not in line with Luke's focus on what one does with what has been heard. For Luke the issue is "how" you hear, not Mark's "what" you hear. Luke also smooths the logic of the text with "what he seems to have" for Mark's "what he has."

V 18 takes us more broadly back to the explanation (vv 11–15) after the focused development from v 15 in vv 16–17 (Marshall, 327, takes v 18 as a closing statement for vv 4–18). In all four cases in the explanation we are dealing with hearers. It is how they hear which differentiates them. All the groups seem to have the word of God at least for a while (it is taken away from the first [note the same verb] before it has any effect), but only in the final case does it prove to be a secure and increasing possession. In each case it comes with its potency to create faith, life, joy, and the possibility of fruit. But only where it is heard with good heart and patiently held onto does it not soon vanish away.

Explanation

Luke here refashions the Markan material 4:21–25 with the help of alternative traditional forms for some of the verses and by deleting and modifying Markan details to sharpen his own thrust for the materials. Vv 16–17 develop one aspect of what is involved for those who hear with a good heart (v 15). They are likened to lamps—God's lamps. And like any other lamplighter God wants lamps to perform their natural task, in this case to send a shaft of light out to those who (in the imagery used) still need to find their way into the house. The word of God must not only be spoken and heard, but also lived out (cf. v 21). And as lived out it can be seen in action and thus experienced as light (cf. Matt 5:16).

There is a privileged group who already know the secrets of the kingdom of God (v 10). But just as proverbially all secrets get out, it is God's purpose that these secrets get out. The shining of the light is God's instrument for making them broadly accessible (cf. Acts 2:36).

V 18 is more of a summary verse. It looks back to the whole scope of the parable explanation in vv 11–15. What matters is what you do with what you have heard. That you have it, in the sense of having heard it, matters little. It was so for all four groups of the parable explanation. Only for those who have it in proper and active use will it prove to be a secure and increasing possession.

Jesus' Mother and Brothers (8:19–21)

Bibliography

Blinzler, J. *Die Brüder und Schwestern Jesu*. SBS 21. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1967. 73–82. **Brown, R. E.**, et al., ed. *Mary in the New Testament*. New York/Philadelphia:

Paulist/Fortress, 1978. 167–70. **Conzelmann, H.** *The Theology of St. Luke*. 35, 47–48. **Crossan, J. D.** “Mark and the Relatives of Jesus.” *NovT* 15 (1973) 81–113. **Lambrecht, J.** “The Relatives of Jesus in Mark.” *NovT* 16 (1974) 241–58. **März, C.-P.** *Das Wort Gottes bei Lukas*. 67–68.

Translation

¹⁹His mother^a and brothers came to him, but they were not able to join him because of the crowd. ²⁰It was reported to him,^b “Your^c mother and your brothers are standing outside wanting to see you.” ²¹He said^d to them, “These who hear and do the word of God^e are a mother to me and brothers for me.”^f

Notes

^aⲛ ⲉ repeat the “his.”

^bλεγόντων (“saying” [pl. gen. pres. ptc.]) is added here by A Ⲙ f¹³ and the majority text.

^cIn P⁷⁵ ⲛ one “your” serves for both “mother” and “brothers.”

^dA pleonastic ἀποκριθεῖς, “having answered,” is not translated.

^eThe majority text has αὐτόν, “it,” as a separate object for “do.”

^fSee *Comment* for the translation of this sentence.

Form/Structure/Setting

The subsection on making a proper response to the word of God (vv 4–21) reaches its climax and conclusion with the words of v 21: “Those who hear and do the word of God are a mother to me and brothers for me.” For the Lukan redaction linking vv 19–21 into the subsection see at 8:4–8.

Luke uses here Mark 3:31–35 from the material he passed over when he left his Markan source after 3:19 (=Luke 6:16), eventually to return at 4:1 (=Luke 8:4). There is no reason to suspect a second source, despite Luke’s extensive recasting (cf. Schramm, *Markus-Stoff*, 88). Luke makes no use of Mark 3:20–21, which in the Markan text prepares for vv 31–35. The negative tenor of those verses does not fit easily with Luke’s positive materials on Mary (e.g., 1:38; and cf. Acts 1:14), and even the verses he does take up no longer contain in their Lukan form any suggestion that Jesus’ family is outside the believing community.

Partly on the basis of the discrepancy between the focus on hearing in vv 31–34 and the focus on doing in v 35, Mark 3:31–35 has been variously taken as composed of an original pronouncement story (vv 31–34) expanded by a church addition (Dibelius, *Tradition*, 46–47, 57, 63–64; Crossan, *NovT* 15 [1973] 97–98, attributes the expansion to Mark himself) or an original saying of Jesus (v 35) secondarily provided with an imaginary setting (vv 31–34; Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 29; Lambrecht, *NovT* 16 [1974] 249–51, attributes vv 31–34 to Mark). The material may well be composite, but there is no good reason for not tracing both parts back to the historical Jesus (cf. Bultmann’s remarks on v 21 [*Synoptic Tradition*, 301]).

V 19 sketches a scene that includes a hindered plan. This provides the dramatic starting point for the unfolding of the pericope, but dramatic completeness is never achieved because there is in fact no resolution of the original

presentation problem. Instead the action of the episode consists in Jesus' being informed of the arrival of his family (v 20) and responding by saying that he has family already present in the persons of those who hear and do the word of God (v 21).

Comment

Those who make a right response to the word of God as brought by Jesus vindicate the sower's confidence in the seed (vv 4–8), demonstrate that they know the mysteries of the kingdom of God (vv 9–10), avoid the perils that would lead to miscarriage in the life of faith (vv 11–15), shine as revealing lights as they live out the content of the word they have heard (vv 16–18), and now find themselves to be part of an intimate family community with Jesus himself (vv 19–21).

19 Luke abbreviates the Markan description (3:31–32a), but he spends extra words to make it quite clear that the family members are outside not because they have no sympathy with what Jesus is doing (as perhaps Mark intends) but because they cannot get through the crowd. *παρεγένετο*, “came,” is Lukan (twenty-eight uses in Luke-Acts). Luke keeps back Mark's “standing outside” for use in v 20. He omits Mark's mention of the family's initiative in getting word of their presence through to Jesus. Luke's crowd is presumably that present from v 4, so he adds a definite article.

Mary has featured in the infancy narratives, is mentioned obliquely in 11:27, and is part of the early church (Acts 1:14). The brothers occur in Luke only here and in Acts 1:14 (see further Mark 6:3; Gal 1:19). The natural sense of *ἀδελφοί*, “brothers,” is other children of Mary, but the word can be used with quite a diversity of senses (cf. Blinzler, *Die Brüder*, 73–82; Fitzmyer, 724). The matter is of no importance to Luke.

20 Luke uses a passive construction to indicate how Jesus learned of the presence of his family. He drops “sisters” from Mark's list here: in the second (here) and fourth occurrence Mark resolves “brothers” into “brother(s) and sister(s)”; Luke does not vary the form, but *ἀδελφοί* will be viewed as an inclusive form by Luke. “Standing outside” is from Mark 3:32 but is slightly odd in the Lukan context, which is much more naturally seen as assuming an open-air setting (cf. v 4). It is probably the house imagery implied in v 16 that allowed this difficulty to escape Luke's attention. Schürmann, 470–71, and Schneider, 188, are wrong to think of “inside” and “outside” here in connection with the disciples' privileged access to inner church instruction. Less likely still is Conzelmann's claim (*Theology*, 35, 47–48) that the family members are characterized as miracle seekers like Herod (9:9; 23:8; and cf. 4:23) from whom even what they seem to have (i.e., family connection) will be taken away (8:18). These views misunderstand Luke by starting from a Markan perspective.

21 Luke severely abbreviates Mark, mostly by uniting Mark's identification of an alternative family (4:33b) with the following statement of the principle (v 35) on which the identification is based. Luke also deletes the rhetorical question (v 33b) and the gesture with its specific identification of those addressed (v 34a). *εἶπεν πρὸς*, “he said to,” is Lukan (see at 1:13).

The proper translation of Luke's form of Jesus' statement is disputed. R. E. Brown (*Mary*, 168) and many others treat "my mother and my brothers" as subject. Fitzmyer, 725, insists that this phrase is a nominative absolute, resumed by "these." For both, it is Jesus' physical family that is pointed to as exemplary (though this does not follow necessarily from Brown's translation [cf., e.g., Schürmann, 471]). But there are no definite articles with these nouns despite the possessive personal pronouns ("my"); so surely it is best, as in Mark (4:35), to take the phrase as a predicate (so Plummer, 224). (For the way "these" must then be taken, compare Acts 2:7). The indefiniteness may quite deliberately avoid denying for Jesus the importance of his family link with Mary and the brothers (the translation proposed reflects this possibility). Luke's deletion of the rhetorical question (Mark 3:33) supports this view. Family bonds are not so much negated as other bonds are affirmed and focused upon (but cf. 14:26; 18:29–30; the place left for Mary and the others is in the end based upon their obedience to God rather than upon their physical relationship to Jesus). "These" will be the disciples who form the inner core of the crowd about Jesus (cf. at v 9).

For Mark's "do the will of God" Luke has "hear and do the word of God" (the Markan context implies hearing). Luke is clearly influenced by vv 11 and 15, but perhaps also by the source he uses at 11:28, where there is also reflection on the value of physical relationship in comparison with obedience to God. The circle of disciples, as those who hear and do the word of God brought to them by Jesus, are linked together as a family with one another and with Jesus. The word of God has the power to create family (Schürmann, 471).

Explanation

Luke rearranges the Markan order of materials to use this section as climax and conclusion to his subsection on making a proper response to the word of God (vv 4–21).

Mary plays a very positive role in Luke's portrayal (see 1:38 and Acts 1:14), and he carefully avoids the impression left by the Markan account (3:20, 21, 31–35) that Jesus' family had little sympathy with what he was doing. But Luke agrees with the Markan text that physical family is not finally what matters (cf. Luke 11:27–28). The word of God has power to create even more important bonds; and those who hear and do the word of God that comes to them through Jesus find themselves bound in a family community with Jesus himself. Mary and the brothers are family with Jesus not because of their physical link but because they too hear and do the word of God.

The Stilling of the Storm (8:22–25)

Bibliography

Hilgert, E. *The Ship and Related Symbols in the New Testament*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1962. 72–89. ———. "Symbolismus und Heilsgeschichte in den Evangelien: Ein Beitrag

zur Seesturm- und Gerasenererzählung." In *Oikonomia*, FS O. Cullmann, ed. F. Christ. Hamburg-Bergstedt: H. Reich, 1967. 51–56. **Kertelge, K.** Die Wunder Jesu. 91–100. **Klauck, H.-J.** *Allegorie und Allegorese in synoptischen Gleichnistexte*. 340–48. **Kreyenbühl, J.** "Der älteste Auferstehungsbericht und seine Varianten." *ZNW* 9 (1908) 257–96. **Léon-Dufour, X.** "La tempête apaisée." *NRT* 87 (1965) 897–922. **Loos, H. van der.** *The Miracles of Jesus*. 638–49. **Pesch, R., and Kratz, R.** *So liest man synoptisch: Anleitung und Kommentar zum Studium der synoptischen Evangelien*. Vol. 3, *Wundergeschichten, Teil II: Rettungswunder—Geschenkswunder—Normendwunder—Fernheilungen*. Frankfurt: Knecht, 1976. 17–29. **Peterson, E.** "Das Schiff als Symbol der Kirche: Die Tat des Messias im eschatologischen Meeressturm in der jüdischen und altkirchlichen Überlieferung." *TZ* 6 (1950) 77–79. **Rahner, H.** "Navicula Petrie." *ZKT* 69 (1947) 1–35. **Schenke, L.** *Die Wundererzählungen des Markusevangeliums*. 1–93. **Schille, G.** "Die Seesturmerzählung Markus 4 35–41, als Beispiel neutestamentlicher Aktualisierung." *ZNW* 56 (1965) 30–40. **Schmithals, W.** *Wunder und Glaube: Eine Auslegung von Markus 4:35–6:6a*. BibS[N] 59. Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1970. **Stallmann, M.** "Das Problem der biblischen Erzählung im Unterricht, erläutert am Beispiel der Geschichte von der Stillung des Sturmes." *Die biblische Geschichte im Unterricht*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963. 88–108.

Translation

²²It happened in one of those days^a that he^b (and his disciples) got into a boat and he said to them, "Let us go across to the other side of the lake." So they set off.

²³As they were sailing along, he fell asleep, and a wind-storm^c came down upon the lake and they were being swamped and were in danger.

²⁴They came and woke him up, saying, "Master, Master, we are perishing!" After he had been woken up, he rebuked the wind and the raging of the water, and they stopped and there was a calm. ²⁵He said to them, "Where is your faith?" They were afraid and amazed, saying to one another, "Who, then, is this, that he commands the winds and the water, and they obey him?"

Notes

^aLit., "the days."

^bThe emphatic "he" (αὐτός) is missing from P⁷⁵ & D.

^cP⁷⁵ B 579 separate the two words involved here by the following "upon the lake." This order may well be original.

Form/Structure/Setting

Some studies identify the pericope as the beginning point for a new major section (e.g., Fitzmyer, 726). But while it clearly does represent a break between groupings of pericopes (so 8:4–21 has been identified as a subsection), the links across the break are too important for us to relegate the materials to different major sections of the Gospel. See already the discussion at 8:1–3, and note also that (i) after 4:43 Jesus or his disciples are spoken of as preaching the kingdom of God only in 8:1; 9:2; 9:11; (ii) the disciples' itineration (9:6) echoes that of Jesus (8:1; cf. the place of Mark 6:6b before vv 7–13 [Mark 6:6b has influenced Luke's rendering of v 12 in Luke 9:6]); and (iii) the traveling group and the itinerant pattern provided in 8:1–3 are made little use of in

vv 4–21, which Luke sets all in one location, but come into their own in the following pericopes.

While, however, the links across the break here are important, it is also true that the present pericope has its major structural links with what follows. There is clearly a focus on Jesus' mighty works which begins here and culminates in the confession in 9:20. The account of the stilling of the storm is generally treated as one of three reports of mighty works (8:22–56; e.g., Schürmann, 473; Marshall, 332), but it may be better to view it as one of four (including the feeding, 9:10–17) and to distinguish the first and fourth from the intervening two: the central two have to do with demons and disease, and this power is specifically shared with the Twelve (9:1); the first and fourth are distinct as not performed directly on people (they are the so-called nature miracles) and are closely linked by Luke to the question of Jesus' unique identity (8:25; 9:18–20 cf. vv 7–9).

Luke is essentially continuing to follow the Markan sequence from which he necessarily deletes Mark 6:1–6 (because of his parallel tradition in 4:16–30), decides to delete 6:17–29 (Luke does not take up the Markan motif that makes the sufferings of John the adumbration of those of Jesus [cf. the omission of Mark 9:9–13]), and omits all of 6:45–8:26 (the great omission that has attracted so much attention, but, in bringing the Petrine confession into close connection with the feeding, is in line with Mark's concerns in 8:14–21).

Despite a series of minor agreements of the Lukan text with Matthew and against Mark, it is not possible to speak confidently of a second source for Luke beyond Mark 4:35–41 (against Schramm, *Markus-Stoff*, 124–25). The possibility should not be totally ruled out, however, because the most striking agreement with Matthew (*ἐθαύμασαν λέγοντες*, "they marveled saying") is preceded immediately in the Matthean text (8:27) by an unusual use of *ἄνθρωποι*, "men," which may come from a source (cf. Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 216).

The extent of Markan redaction and earlier development in 4:35–41 is judged variously. In vv 35–36 Mark has clearly provided links with 4:1–34 (see esp. Schenke, *Wundererzählungen*, 5–9, who examines the tensions created by this linking), but Schille's total attribution of these verses to Markan redaction on rhythmical grounds (ZNW 56 [1965] 32) is hardly warranted (the pre-Markan form must have had Jesus and others in a boat at sea and probably had a reference to the late hour in preparation for Jesus' being asleep).

V 38 has fallen under suspicion because (i) the logical sequence would be to mention Jesus' being asleep before introducing the storm (cf. Luke 8:23), and (ii) the disciples' question considerably complicates the logic of the account, does not fit well with the pericope's putative early Christian use in commending Jesus as all-powerful, and is easily treated as an addition based on later inner-church use of the episode. But as Schenke (*Wundererzählungen*, 54) notes, in its present location v 38 functions effectively as a dramatic device and is in no way a careless insert. The disciples' question, however, does seem to be formulated on the basis of a different frame of reference (Jesus *could* do something about their plight) from that reflected by v 41 (Jesus' ability to deal decisively with the problem startles) and is probably to be judged a (pre-)Markan development.

There is quite broad agreement that v 40 is an addition, probably a Markan

development—part of his highlighting of the failure of the disciples. Some would also consider as secondary v 41 from “that even the wind . . .” (e.g., Schille, *ZNW* 56 [1965] 32), but this text is defended by others on the basis of the parallel with Mark 1:27 (e.g., Kertelge, *Wunder Jesu*, 95). Perhaps this is best taken as an explication of a Christological intent already implicit in the account (cf. vv 39, 41a).

Schenke (*Wundererzählungen*, 59) is most perceptive about the form of the original story. He identifies it as an epiphany story designed to challenge to a Christological decision. Beyond this original evangelistic use of the story, the addition of v 38b (and v 40) betrays an inner-church use. For those in the church who share the Christological affirmation, the original logic of the pericope can be reversed: to think that the Lord has left us to perish is to deny the faith that affirms him as Lord. It is doubtful whether the crisis of faith that calls forth this fresh use of the pericope was either the occasion of Jesus’ death (as Schille, *ZNW* 56 [1965] 38) or a crisis induced by the delay of the Parousia (as Schenke, *Wundererzählungen*, 76). The pressure of persecution is a much more likely context.

Jesus is not the only figure in antiquity who is linked with deliverance from the dangers of the sea. Already Moses, Joshua, and Elijah exercise control over the waters (Exod 14:15–16; Josh 3:10–13; 2 Kgs 2:8). The Jonah story provides a striking series of links with our pericope (see Jonah 1:4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 15, 16). In this case the vocabulary links are such that we may assume that our narrator has made use of elements of the Jonah story for the construction of his narrative (for similar influence from the Jonah account see *j. Ber.* 9:1, where the story is told of a Jewish child whose prayer to God successfully calms a storm after the attempts of his heathen traveling companions to invoke their gods have brought no deliverance [for this story cf. further Deut 4:7]).

The broader Hellenistic culture was quite ready to attribute to the gods power over sea and wind and to report instances of successful magical influence over the elements. Power over sea and storm is attributed to kings and to wise men (Caesar, Caligula, Xerxes, Apollonius of Tyana, Empedocles; see, e.g., Porphyry, *Life of Pythagoras*, 29). Surprisingly enough, however, there does not seem to be any actual account of a human figure using his own native powers to still a storm. Perhaps the closest we get to this is an account in which people press to travel in the same boat with Apollonius because they consider him to be more powerful than storm, fire, or other dangers (Philostratus, *Life of Apollonius*, 4.13). For the history-of-religions materials see Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 234–35, 237–38; Fiedler, *Wetterzauber*; Schenke, *Wundererzählungen*, 59–69.

None of the materials available for comparison offers any close parallel to the overall thrust of our pericope, and it is, therefore, difficult to understand Bultmann’s judgment (*Synoptic Tradition*, 235) that we have here an alien miracle story transferred to Jesus. The Jewish background has clearly influenced elements in the narrative form, the broader Hellenistic background obviously illuminates aspects of the way in which early hearers of the story would be thinking, and it is not unlikely that the telling has been tailored a little from this perspective. But further we have no reason to go.

That a range of experiences with Jesus were theophanic in some way repre-

sents an important element of the Jesus tradition which should not be lightly set aside (cf. 5:1–11). No doubt the conceptual articulation belongs to a later stage of Christological development, but it is doctrinaire to screen the material on the basis of a reconstruction of the stages of Christological development (as, e.g., Schenke, *Wundererzählungen*, 72–74). This approach is not dissimilar to the older impulse to turn such events into misplaced resurrection stories (as Kreyenbühl, *ZNW* 9 [1908] 257–96; and cf. at 5:1–11). Such events are not the stuff of normal history and are clearly not accessible to the normal methods of historical inquiry. They may, nevertheless, happen,

Léon-Dufour (*NRT* 87 [1965] 913) identifies Jesus' dramatic address to the storm as a later interpretive embellishment. The language of exorcism involved may support such a judgment, but the quasi-anonymity Léon-Dufour attributes to Jesus in stilling the storm is not a characteristic of Jesus' exorcisms and healing.

In Luke's narrative v 22 sets the scene, v 23 introduces the problem, vv 24–25a describe the resolution of the problem, and v 25b indicates the impact made upon the disciples.

Comment

The remainder of the section 8:1–9:20 is strongly oriented to the question: Who is Jesus? (esp. 8:25; 9:9, 18–20; but also 8:28, 37, 39, 56). In this episode the extraordinary event that points to the unique identity of Jesus also challenges readers to recognize by faith the security of their lives in all danger (cf. 21:18 with Acts 27:34) if they are committed to, as Lord, the one who has shown himself able to exercise God's personal mastery over all the forces of destruction.

22 The phrase ἐγένετο (δὲ) ἐν μιᾷ τῶν ἡμερῶν καὶ αὐτός (lit., “it happened in one of the days and he”) has been formed by Luke already for 5:17 (see there). Luke refers here to one of the days in which the activities of 8:1 are taking place. The “disciples” here will be, then, the Twelve and the women of 8:1–4 (as Fitzmyer, 729). Mark's formulation in 4:35–36 is almost entirely recast (“let us go across to the other side” is kept; “disciples” comes from Mark 4:34). The Markan links to the context in chap. 4 are of no use to Luke; Mark's other boats play no role in the unfolding account (even Mark's) and are set aside; Mark's division of initiative between Jesus and disciples gives way to Jesus as sole initiator. Luke gives priority to Jesus and adds a touch of artistry by distributing the compound subject (“Jesus and his disciples”) between the beginning (“Jesus”) and end (“and his disciples”) of the clause (cf. Kirchschräger, *Exorzistisches Wirken*, 75). Luke makes clear that it is the lake (identified at 5:1) on which they are setting out. “They set off” (ἀνήχθησαν) is a frequent Lukan expression (cf. Acts 13:13; 16:11; 18:21; 20:3, 13; 21:1, 2; 27:2, 4, 12, 21; 28:10, 11).

23 Lukan reformulation continues. Only “a storm of wind” (λαίλαψ ἀνέμου) survives the editing. Luke achieves a nice flow in the narrative with an initial genitive absolute construction (“as they were sailing along”).

Mark's mention of Jesus' being asleep is repositioned to its chronologically appropriate position; it is stripped of all descriptive detail and represented by a rare word (ἀφύπνωσεν). Luke's “came down into the lake” reflects the

thrust of the wind down from the lakeside hills. Luke's description focuses more on the disciples than on the events (Léon-Dufour, *NRT* 87 [1965] 907) and becomes colloquial with its "they were being filled." The sleeping of Jesus probably represents his own confidence in God as the one who controls the wind and the waves, though this is clearer in Mark.

24 A little more of the Markan wording survives Luke's editing in this verse. Again, Luke smooths the transition with a participle ("coming to [him]"). The two participles ("saying" is the second) are arranged concentrically around the clause to which they are attached (Kirchschläger, *Exorzistisches Wirken*, 78). Luke's διήγειραν ("they woke") anticipates the use of the same verb later in the verse. ἐπιστάτα, "master," is Lukan (cf. at 5:5) and marks a personal recognition of Jesus' authority over their lives. It does not, however, recognize already the full power of Jesus. Luke deletes "do you not care that" from the disciples' address to Jesus, and thus transforms what in Mark is sharp and even disrespectful into a bringing of the disciples' problem to Jesus (cf. in v 25 the changes from Mark's v 40). To that extent the disciples are now exemplary, but they were in fact wrong to think that they were perishing (see further at v 25).

After making the change of subject explicit with a ὁ δέ construction, Luke now reproduces a string of Mark's words ("having been woken he rebuked the wind and"). But then he prefers to simplify by including the water (not Mark's "sea"; Luke does not use the term for the Lake of Gennesaret) under the same rebuke. This change leaves only ἐπερίμνησεν, "rebuked," of the terms in the Markan account that are reminiscent of exorcism language. Luke thinks no more of personal powers here than does the (admittedly mythological) language of Pss 104:7; 106:9; Nah 1:4. Generalization and application to the reader of the point of the pericope is facilitated by the widespread ancient metaphorical use of danger at sea as symbolic for a broad range of threats to human well-being (from the OT cf. Pss 69:2-3, 15-16; 65:7; 18:16-17). Wind and water are treated together also in Luke's abbreviated description of the effect of Jesus' rebuke: they stopped what they were doing! Luke allows Mark's final statement of the outcome to stand ("there was a calm") but with characteristic restraint shorn of its adjective ("great") as was Luke's rendering of the Markan reference to the original storm (v 23). An allusion to Ps 107:28-30 may be present.

25 As in v 24 the disciples are treated more gently than in Mark, but the implication is still that they have not shown faith. It is faith in God which they had failed to exercise, the faith to which Ps 107:23-32 should have called them, and which Paul was later to exercise (Acts 27:13-44, esp. 25, 34). The effective control God exercises over his world has taken concrete form for the disciples now in Jesus' act of stilling the storm. But for Luke it is not particularly the presence of Jesus that guarantees the safety of the disciples (though it is the concrete form of Jesus' act that should give them confidence for the future).

Luke makes it clearer than the Markan text that the fear language here indicates an encounter with the presence and activity of God (he deletes Mark's use of fear language in connection with the danger of the storm and links amazement language to that of fear [for the third time in the pericope Mark's "great" disappears]). Cf. at 1:13, 30; 2:9, 10; 5:9-10, 26. As at 5:9-10, 26 the divine is encountered in an activity of Jesus (cf. also 8:37).

Luke repeats much of Mark's wording for the final section of the verse. In the interests of generalization Luke uses the plural "winds"; as in v 24 "sea" becomes "water"; Luke makes explicit the activity of commanding (note the generalizing present tense) that calls the winds and water to obedience. The pressing urgency of the disciples' question "who then is this?" comes from the recognition that such power over the elements is the prerogative of God himself (Pss 65:7; 77:16; 89:9; 104:7; 107:23–29; Job 26:12; Jer 5:22).

While this pericope undoubtedly has links with Paul's journey to Rome, Léon-Dufour (*NRT* 87 [1965] 920) makes altogether too much of these in the way that he takes 8:22–25 as a proleptic journey to the Gentiles (on the basis of the Gerasene destination). Paul's journey to Rome is not in Acts his journey to the Gentiles. Nonetheless, in light of the Gadarene healing to come and the clear purposefulness of Jesus in v 22, we may indeed see here a foreshadowing of the mission to the Gentiles. Léon-Dufour's additional reflections on Jesus' journey across the waters of death to reach the Gentiles have no Lukan basis.

Explanation

Those who have been accompanying Jesus since 8:1 now experience an event that provides a major impetus to a probing of the identity of this man to whom they have linked themselves. This is the first of a series of four mighty works (8:22–9:17), the first and fourth of which are especially focused on the question of Jesus' identity, while the middle two also provide a pattern for the activity of the Twelve (9:1–2).

Despite a widespread ancient conviction that great kings and wise men could exercise power over the elements, there does not seem to have been preserved in Jewish, Greek, or Roman traditions of the period any actual account of such a figure using his own supernatural powers to still a storm. (There are accounts of storms stilled in answer to prayer.)

The problem posed for the disciples is not only the life-threatening storm but also the effective absence of Jesus in their time of crisis. In such a situation the disciples ought to have been able to trust God as the one who is able to control the elements (Ps 107:23–32). Jesus' own trust in God is reflected by his continuing to sleep. Paul would later exercise such a trust (Acts 27:13–44, esp. vv 25 and 34).

The disciples could not rise to such trust in God (see v 25), but they are exemplary in coming to Jesus with their problem. In using the term "Master," they recognize Jesus' authority over their lives. Their next statement, "we are perishing," however, expresses the inadequacy of their faith at this point.

Jesus deals at once with their problem. With immediate and direct authority he rebukes the rising of the elements and they are at once subdued. The likeness to Old Testament descriptions of God's action should not be lost on us (e.g., Pss 104:7; 106:9; Nah 1:4).

The fear and amazement with which the disciples respond is exactly what is to be expected in the presence of an act of God. God is being encountered in something that Jesus does, as at 5:9–10, 26. This situation presses the question of Jesus' identity. Such power over the elements is the prerogative of God alone (Pss 65:7; 77:16; 89:9; etc.), but here it is being exercised by Jesus.

The disciple of Luke's day is called upon to recognize in faith the security of his life in all danger. The effective control which God exercises over his world now finds its concrete expression in the activity of Jesus, the Lord. He exercises God's personal mastery over all the forces of destruction.

The Healing of the Gerasene Demoniac (8:26-39)

Bibliography

Annen, F. *Heil für die Heiden: Zur Bedeutung und Geschichte der Tradition vom besessenen Gerasener (Mk 5,1-20 parr)*. FTS 20. Frankfurt: Knecht, 1976. **Baird, M. M.** "The Gadarene Demoniac." *ExpTim* 31 (1919-20) 189. **Bauernfeind, O.** *Die Worte der Dämonen im Markusevangelium*. 35-56. **Best, E.** "The Gadarene Demoniac." *Biblical Theology* 7 (1956) 3-9. **Burkitt, T. A.** "Concerning Mk. 5,7 and 5,18-20." *ST* 11 (1957) 159-66. **Burkitt, F. C.** "Gergesa—A Reply." *JBL* 27 (1908) 128-33. **Cave, C. H.** "The Obedience of Unclean Spirits." *NTS* 11 (1964-65) 93-97. **Clapp, R. G.** "A Study of the Place-Names Gergesa and Bethabara." *JBL* 26 (1907) 62-83. **Craghan, J.** "The Gerasene Demoniac." *CBQ* 30 (1968) 522-36. **Cratchley, W. J.** "Demoniac of Gadara." *ExpTim* 63 (1951-52) 193-94. **Hawthorn, T.** "The Gerasene Demoniac: A Diagnosis." *ExpTim* 66 (1954-55) 79-80. **Kertelge, K.** *Die Wunder Jesu*. 101-10. **Kirchschläger, W.** *Jesu exorzistisches Wirken aus der Sicht des Lukas*. 91-130. **Kleist, J. A.** "The Gadarene Demoniacs." *CBQ* 9 (1947) 101-5. **Lamarche, P.** "Le possédé de Gêrasa (Mt 8,28-34; Mc 5,1-20; Lc 8,26-39)." *NRT* 100 (1968) 581-97. **Leenhardt, F. J.** "Essai exégétique: Mark 5.1-20: Analyse structurale et exégèse biblique." In *Essais d'interprétation*, ed. R. Barthes et al. Neuchâtel: Bibliothèque Théologique, 1971. 95-121. **Louw, J.** "De bezetene en de kudde." *NTT* 13 (1958-59) 59-61. **Martin, A. D.** "The Loss of the Gadarene Swine." *ExpTim* 25 (1913-14) 380-81. **Masson, C.** "Le démoniaque de Gêrasa, Marc 5:1-20 (Matthieu 8:28-34; Luc 8:26-39)." *Vers les sources d'eau vive*. 21-37. **Pax, E.** "Das Heidentum Palästinas in römischer Zeit." *BibLeb* 7 (1966) 278-92. **Pesch, R.** *Der Besessene von Gêrasa: Entstehung und Überlieferung einer Wundergeschichte*. SBS 56. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1972. ———. "The Markan Version of the Healing of the Gerasene Demoniac." *ER* 23 (1971) 349-76. **Sahlin, H.** "Die Perikope vom gerasenischen Besessenen und der Plan des Markusevangeliums." *ST* 18 (1964) 159-72. **Starobinski, J.** "An Essay in Literary Analysis—Mark 5:1-20." *ER* 23 (1971) 377-97. **Vencovský, J.** "Der gadarenische Exorzismus: Mt 8, 28-34 und Parallelen." *CV* 14 (1971) 13-29. **Zahn, T.** "Das Land der Gadarener, Gerasener, oder Gergesener." *NKZ* 13 (1902) 923-45.

Translation

²⁶They came to land in the district of the Gadarenes,^a which is opposite Galilee.
²⁷When he came ashore a certain man from the city met him, who had been possessed by^b demons for quite some time^c and did not wear clothing or live in a house, but spent his time among the tombs. ²⁸Seeing Jesus and screaming out, he fell down before him and said in a loud voice, "What good can come to me from contact with

you, Jesus, Son of the Most High God? I beg you, do not torment me.”²⁹ For Jesus had issued a command^a for the unclean spirit to come out of the man; because many times it had overcome him, and he was constrained and was bound with chains and fetters, but he would break the bonds and be driven by the demon into the wilderness places.³⁰ Jesus asked him, “What is your name?” He said, “Legion.” (For many demons had entered him.)³¹ Then they implored him not to order them to go off to the abyss.³² There was there quite a herd of pigs, being grazed on the mountain. They implored him to permit them to go into them, and he gave them permission.³³ The demons left the man and entered the pigs, and the herd rushed down the cliff into the lake and drowned.

³⁴The herdsmen, seeing what had happened, fled; and they let it be known in the city and in the countryside.³⁵ They came out to see what had happened; they came to Jesus and found the man from whom the demons had come out seated, clothed and in his right mind, at the feet of Jesus. They were frightened.³⁶ Those who had seen how the demon-possessed man had been saved made this known to them.³⁷ Then all the multitude of the surrounding district of the Gadarenes asked him to go away from them, because they were seized with great fear. He got into the boat and departed.

³⁸The man from whom the demons had come out begged him that he might be able to be with him. But Jesus^c dismissed him saying, ³⁹“Return to your house and recount the things that God has done for you.” He went about the whole city preaching what Jesus had done for him.

Notes

^aΓαδαραηνῶν is read by A W Ψ and the majority text. Γεργεσηνῶν is read by Ν Θ etc. In v 37 below the readings are supported by roughly the same texts.

^bLit., “having,” ὃς εἶχεν, “who was having,” is read by Ν^{corr} A D L W etc. and the majority text.

^cVarious wordings are witnessed here in the Greek, but with no real difference of sense.

^dΝ A C K etc. have the imperfect instead of the aorist.

^eThe subject “Jesus” is not expressed in the Greek text.

Form/Structure/Setting

Luke 8:26–39 reports the second of a set of four mighty works performed by Jesus, which culminate in the confession of 9:20. The present account and that following provide, as well, patterns for the coming mission of the Twelve (9:1–6). (See further at 8:22–25.)

There is no good reason to think that Luke has used anything beyond his Markan source in formulating his account (see esp. Annen, *Heil*, 22–29). At many points of detail he has placed his own stamp on the story, but he follows the Markan outline closely except for distributing the Markan description of the man’s state and history (Mark 5:3–5) between its original position (Luke 8:27) and a position (v 29) after the report of the exorcising command.

There is considerable agreement that Mark relayed the account essentially as he received it (e.g., Kertelge, *Wunder Jesu*, 101; Pesch, “Gerasene Dämoniac,” 352; Achtemeier, *JBL* 89 [1970] 275–76; some would attribute v 8 to Mark). Agreement is harder to find about the earlier history of the story. A number

of difficulties in the account have convinced most scholars that it could not have been an original unity, but the restoration of the tradition history takes quite varied forms.

Difficulties noted in the Markan account include the following. Gerasa is said not to have been near the sea (see further in *Comment*). The man who meets with Jesus in 5:2 is still coming from afar in v 6. The intervening description (vv 3-5) is suspected of being an expansion because (i) it could be omitted without damage to the flow; (ii) it uses a different term for tombs than that in v 2; (iii) its content is not utilized in v 15; and (iv) the tension between v 6 and v 2 may result from adjustments made to v 6 to incorporate vv 3-5.

The act of submission in v 6 is said to contradict the demons' defensive strategy in v 7 (e.g., Pesch, "Gerasene Demoniac," 357). V 8 is awkwardly placed: some would relocate it before v 7 (perhaps in place of v 6) or after v 10; others see it as a Markan or pre-Markan addition. The possessing spirit is spoken of in the singular until v 9 and then a change is made to the plural. This may suggest conflation or expansion (perhaps along with misunderstanding of the original sense of "Legion" [see *Comment*]). No further use is made of the extracted name, which is not what we might expect from comparison with ancient exorcism rituals: do we have an embellishment that (imperfectly) conforms the account to standard exorcism practices? The demons' request for a concession has ancient parallels, but Pesch ("Gerasene Demoniac," 365, 367) sees it as suspiciously distinctive that this request should concern where the demons are to go when expelled.

The role of the swine has disturbed many, and the material concerning them is frequently seen as a secondary addition. One support for this is the way that in v 16 the mention of the swine looks stylistically in the judgment of many like an afterthought or a later insertion (note the quite different ways in which the juxtaposed man and swine are referred to). The appearance of οἱ ἰδόντες in v 16 has also raised questions. In the Markan text, they can hardly be the herdsmen (though Luke seems to imply that they are [see at v 34]). The herdsmen have already told what they know (Mark 5:14). Only the accompanying disciples are clearly available for the task.

Vv 18-20 report almost as a separate episode the demoniac's request to accompany Jesus and the outcome of this request. This little episode clearly has a different set of interests from the earlier part of the pericope.

This raises what is the chief difficulty for the whole account: form-critical analysis has no place for stories with multiple purposes and must assume that they are secondary developments. Even mixed forms constitute a difficulty. For those of us who are convinced that the forms developed in close contact with continuing eyewitness memory, there is not the same degree of conviction that to produce purity of form and singleness of purpose is to come closer to the original story.

Only a limited discussion can be provided here of the noted difficulties, but the following points can be briefly made. (i) Vv 3-5 could well be a development from the earliest form of the story. (ii) The tensions between vv 2 and 6 have been exaggerated: without Mark's *εὐθὺς* ["immediately"] in v 2, we have only the common Semitic practice of providing at the commencement of a narrative a general statement or summary which is then "unpacked" in

the subsequent narrative. (iii) The mixture of submission and defensiveness (vv 6 and 7) is more pointed than, but not essentially different from, the juxtaposition in Mark 1:23–28 of the demon's recognition of Jesus' power (v 24) and the struggle (vv 24 and 26). (iv) The use in v 7 of the singular for the demon (though there are many demons) and in 1:24 of the plural (though there is only a single demon there) counts strongly against any common origin for the two exorcism accounts or even for this feature in them. (v) V 8 plays no necessary role and is likely to be an explanatory addition. (vi) The discovery of the name in v 9 is no step in a power struggle, reflecting belief in the advantage conferred by knowing another's name: while such may be the case in ancient exorcism rituals, here the point is that nothing can be held back from Jesus; the revelation that there were many demons involved becomes the basis for the role of the large number of swine. (vii) Annen (*Heil*, esp. 126) has demonstrated how limited is our base of materials for passing judgment on the possible formal content of NT exorcism narratives: we have insufficient material to claim that it is odd for the demons' request to be concerned about where they are to be sent (in fact the exorcism account on the Bantresch stele from the Persian period probably has, hidden in its Oriental prose style, an implied request by the demon to be allowed to go to a particular place [an English translation of the stele may be found in Pesch, "Gerasene Demoniac," 363–64; he is citing from H. Gressmann, *Altorientalische Texte zum Alten Testament* (Berlin/Leipzig: de Gruyter, 1926) 78–79]). (ix) "And concerning the swine" is not an infelicitous addition providing for the insertion of the role of the swine: in the present text the unevenly expressed parallelism between the man and the swine reflects the shift of focus from the fate of the swine (vv 11–14) to the fate of the man (vv 15–16; the townsfolk came to find out about the swine [and they did], but what they found out much more importantly is what had happened to the man). (x) It is not unlikely that the whole of v 16 is an explanatory addition, designed to indicate that the action of v 17 was by well informed and therefore culpable people. (xi) There is a certain appropriateness in having the active role of the demoniac at the beginning of the account (vv 2 and 6) paralleled by an active role at its end in vv 19–20.

It seems, then, that there are no adequate grounds for tracing the story back to a reduced original lacking any of the major features of the present account. Only vv 3–5, 8, and 16 are likely to be expansions. The formal "messiness" of the story can be taken as indicative of proximity to eyewitness memory, rather than as accretion to a simple original.

The account defies normal form-critical analysis. Pesch ("Gadarene Demoniac," 354–55) rightly identifies features from an exorcism narrative form and a miracle story form, as well as elements of exorcism ritual not elsewhere attested in the NT. Mark 5:18–20 is described by Kertelge (*Wunder Jesu*, 107) as a missionary narrative, but at least in Luke (vv 38–39) it is more of a confession narrative.

For a more general discussion of the exorcism accounts in Luke and of exorcism in the ancient world see at 4:31–37. The central place of exorcism in the ministry of the historical Jesus is beyond dispute.

Luke changes the Markan structure very little. The arrival language in vv

26–27 is balanced by the departure language of v 37. Luke (v 27) abbreviates Mark's description of the man (vv 3–5) which follows the opening general statement of the meeting between Jesus and the demoniac (Luke: v 27; Mark: v 2). This smooths the transition to the elaboration of the encounter beginning in v 28. Vv 28–29a report the first phase of the encounter. Here as in Mark, the exorcism command is introduced as an explanatory aside. Luke now uses the features of Mark's description of the man passed over earlier to indicate how the pitiable state of the man had moved Jesus to action (v 29b). In a second phase of the encounter (v 30), Jesus asks for and is told the demon's name, which reveals the plurality of the possession. A third phase of the encounter is initiated by the demons (vv 31–32), who seek a concession from Jesus which is subsequently granted to them. V 33 recounts the departure of the demons and the resulting fate of the swine. V 34 introduces the herdsmen, and from this point on the story is dominated by a series of comings and goings. The herdsmen's departure brings the curious townsfolk and farmers. They become acquainted with what has happened (vv 35–36), and insist on Jesus' departure (v 37). By contrast the healed man seeks to go with Jesus (v 38) but is sent back to his home to tell his story (v 39). More than is the case in Mark, Luke makes a separate episode out of the healed man's desire to be with Jesus by the apparently illogical reporting of Jesus' departure before the interchange between the healed man and Jesus (this is in fact an identifiable Lukan literary technique: cf. at 1:56 and *Form/Structure/Setting* at 3:19–20).

Comment

In this episode Jesus' intention in 8:22 becomes clear: he and his disciples journey because he has an appointment to meet a demoniac at his point of pressing need. Jesus' power and authority over demons and disease is demonstrated here and in the following episode as pattern for the coming mission of the Twelve (9:1–6,10).

26 Luke here takes us from the high seas to the scene of the next manifestation of Jesus' might. For Mark's ἦλθον, "came," Luke uses the more colorful κατέπλευσαν, which refers to making the transition from the high seas to a coastal landing point. As he did at Mark 4:35, he omits Mark's εἰς τὸ πέραν, "to the other side," and here its following "of the sea." For this he compensates with the geographically more precise "which is opposite Galilee." This may be to make explicit the gentile context of the episode. ἀντιπέρα, "opposite," is found only here in the NT and is probably (with κατέπλευσαν, which is also found only here in the NT) a mark of Luke's somewhat more pretentious use of language.

Gerasa was a prosperous Hellenistic city located in Transjordan, midway between the Dead Sea and the Sea of Galilee. Like other cites of the Decapolis, Gerasa had a considerable area of attached territory. But the territory cannot have reached the Sea of Galilee. It is presumably this difficulty which lies behind the variant readings here and in the parallel texts. In each of the synoptic accounts there are variants that read τῶν Γαδαρηνῶν, "of the Gadarenes," and τῶν Γεργεσηνῶν, "of the Gergesenes." For Mark and Luke τῶν Γερασηνῶν, "of the Gerasenes," is the best-attested reading; in Matthew "Ga-

darenes" has the strongest attestation, but this may only reflect the greater popularity of Matthew, which has led to a more consistent "correcting" of the Matthean text. The territory of Gadara probably did extend to the lakeside, and this is likely to be the basis of the "correction." There is, however, at least some difficulty in having the herdsmen make the more than twelve-mile round journey to the city and back while Jesus remains with the cured demoniac (Pesch, "Gadarene Demoniac," 353). "Of the Gergesenes" was the reading championed by Origen because of the lakeside cliffs it offered. This reading is normally said to have originated with Origen, but Fitzmyer, 736–37, disputes this, asserting that numerous MSS antedating Origen attest this reading.

No solution has been proposed that is obviously to be preferred. Does the difficulty come from a confusing transliteration into Greek of the name of a non-Hellenistic lakeside city, no clear evidence of which survives (cf. Cranfield, *Mark*, 176; the modern name of Gergesa [Kersa or Kursi] may be suggestive)? Was the name added at a stage and place where there was no longer any clear awareness of the geographical difficulties (e.g., Kertelge, *Wunder Jesu*, 107)? Or has the story grown in a way that makes the location no longer suitable (e.g., Pesch, "Gadarene Demoniac," 353)?

27 Though Luke follows Mark in talking about the man coming to Jesus (rather than vice versa), it is clear from v 22 that Luke wants us to understand that Jesus is there specifically to be met (see at 4:23 for references to Jesus' uncanny awareness of others). Luke deletes the Markan "immediately," improves Mark's grammar for the participial construction, and uses his own preferred *άνήρ*, "man," for Mark's *άνθρωπος*, "man"/"person." Curiously, he here adds *τις*, "a certain," which he does not elsewhere use with *άνήρ*, though it is a favorite of his and is used by him a number of times with *άνθρωπος*. Mark's "from the tombs" is eliminated (for Luke, this is out of place before he identifies the demonized state that lies behind it); Luke compensates with "from the city"—which means, however, not that he is now coming from the city to meet Jesus, but simply that he belongs to the city (cf. v 39). Conjectures (Cave, "Obedience," 95; cf. Torrey, *Our Translated Gospels*, 88–89) about a misreading of an Aramaic original here (and cf. in v 31), while ingenious and not unattractive in themselves, have the defect of accounting for a detail in a manner that runs contrary to the most plausible explanation of the relationship of the larger narratives. In line with Luke's preferences Mark's *έν πνεύματι άκαθάρτω* (lit., "in [i.e., with] an unclean spirit") becomes *έχων δαιμόνια* ("having demons"; see the discussion at 4:33). Unlike Mark, Luke alerts us already to the plurality of the possession (but after this anticipation he allows the fact to be "discovered" in the unfolding story line).

Luke totally reformulates Mark 5:3–5. "For quite some time [*χρόνω ικανώ*] he had not worn clothes" is Luke's own touch (based on Mark 5:15). Luke uses his preferred idiom *έν οίκω μένειν* ("to abide in a house"; see 9:4; 10:7; 19:5; Acts 16:15) for Mark's *κατοίκησις*, "dwelling," which does not occur elsewhere in the NT. To stay overnight among tombs is a mark of madness in Jewish tradition (Str-B, 1:491). Luke terminates the description after Mark's 5:3a. He will use more in v 29, but for the moment the abbreviation helps smooth the transition from the general statement at the start of v 27 to the description of the meeting coming in v 28. (The earlier omission of Mark's

“immediately” [v 27] and the coming omission of Mark’s “. . . from afar, he ran” [v 28] also contribute to the same goal.)

28 To compensate for the loss of Mark’s dramatic “he ran up,” Luke brings forward Mark’s “cried out” and strengthens it by using the intensive form *ἀνακράζας*. Luke uses *προσέπεσεν* for Mark’s *προσεκύνησεν*, “worshiped”/“bowed the knee.” Fitzmyer (732, 738; following Hauck, 113; Grundmann, *Markus-evangelium*, 108) wants to translate this “lunged at,” i.e., as an act of violence. But Luke does not use the verb in this way elsewhere (5:8; 8:47; Acts 16:29), and such a rendering hardly fits the picture of Jesus’ total control over the demonic which Luke carefully edits into his account in 4:31–37 (see esp. at 4:35). Luke’s change here to “to fall down before” is probably because *προσεκύνησεν* for Luke would indicate religious reverence: the demons are submissive but hardly reverent! Luke follows Mark closely for the rest of the verse except for softening the demons’ adjuration by God into a simple request. As to some modern readers, it may have seemed to Luke that the Markan text made it sound too much as if the demons were taking upon themselves the role of exorcist. For Luke the demons express distress, dread, and entreaty.

On *τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοὶ* (lit., “what to me and to you”) see at 4:34 (but note that the plural “us” is used there, and the singular “me” is used here). The expression indicates that no good (for the demons) can come from this contact with Jesus: “What good can come to me from contact with you?” The stance of the demons is well captured by Schürmann, 483: “conquered but not converted.” The identification of Jesus is best taken with what precedes (but in Mark it may well belong with what follows: “Jesus, Son of the Most High God, I adjure you”; cf. Burkill, “Concerning Mk. 5,7,” 161 n. 3). *βασανίσης*, “torment,” probably carries here something of its literal sense of torture in judicial examination (cf. BAGD, 134), which Matthew effectively glosses with his “before the time,” i.e., before the time of eschatological judgment. The request is, then, that they should not be brought (yet) to judgment. The request in v 31 is essentially the same (cf. Kleist, “Gadarene Demoniacs,” 103).

Various claims are made about the designation “the Most High God” reflecting a gentile environment. At least for Luke, this can hardly be true in light of his other uses of “Most High” (e.g., 1:32, 35, 76; 6:35). As in 4:34 (but differently expressed) the demons, themselves members of the supernatural order, are aware of Jesus’ supernatural identity. On “Son” see at 1:32, 35; 3:21–22.

29 The aorist tense *παρήγγειλεν* is best given a pluperfect sense (“he had commanded”). The threat already represented by Jesus’ very presence is accentuated when he begins to speak. Luke keeps here Mark’s “the unclean spirit,” but he changes the grammar to make clear that Jesus addresses the demon and not the demoniac. Luke also changes a quoting of the command (“come out”) into a reporting of the command (“he had been commanding . . . to come out”) by using an infinitive construction.

Luke grounds Jesus’ verbal intervention in the fact of the man’s sorry plight. He here makes use of material passed over from Mark 5:3–5, but with almost none of the Markan language. The vocabulary is reasonably Lukan (see Annen, *Heil*, 24–25). Luke describes the possession or at least its manifestation as episodic (cf. 9:39). *συνηπάκει*, “being guarded, constrained,” may imply that

he was also kept under guard, but it is perhaps best taken to mean that the bonds were the intended means of keeping him constrained and under control during his bouts of manifest possession. The demoniac's strength, indicated by the failure of the constraining efforts, prepares us for the plurality of possession and perhaps even for the military might reflected in the term "legion." The demons drove the man out from his place in human society. Note how the very presence of Jesus is already much more effective in restraining the man than all the efforts of his fellow countrymen. The being driven into the wilderness has its antithesis in Jesus' later sending the man back to his home. Luke does not give us the full horror of Mark's account of the wretched man's state.

30 Only here in the Gospel materials does Jesus engage in a dialogue with a demon. Luke switches to the aorist for "asked" (Mark has the imperfect); he specifies Jesus as speaker (but deletes Mark's later "to him"); he follows consistently with a second aorist ("he said") where Mark changes to the present; he makes the explanation of the name a narrator's comment and not part of the demon's speech as in Mark; and he makes other minor changes ($\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ for $\kappa\alpha\iota$ ["and"]; $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ ["is"] added; "[is] my name" deleted; emphasis changed to "your" from Mark's "what is your name").

There is not the slightest sign here that the possessing power accidentally lets his name slip (boasts of the number of demons involved and thereby inadvertently gives the name away). In the Lukan account there is no trace of any idea that possession of the name is the key to exorcism (contrast Hellenistic belief of the period in the power of possessing somebody's name [Annen, *Heil*, 152–53]). The possessing power is already at the mercy of Jesus. He can do no other than answer the question and would gain nothing from frantic attempts to conceal the name. The name is to be part of the information upon which Jesus will base his response to the demons' entreaty. A legion was a unit of the Roman army containing normally five to six thousand men. This man was much more severely disturbed than had been Mary with her seven demons (8:2; Haenchen, *Weg*, 193). The brutalized state of the man, especially in the Markan account, may reflect via the name "Legion" the harshness of the Roman occupation. The psychological speculation, however, which this possibility has released offers no positive contribution to the understanding of the pericope. At a literary level, the multiplicity of the possession prepares for the role of the herd of swine (Schürmann, 483).

Jeremias (*Promise*, 30 n. 5; following A. Meyer, *Jesu Muttersprache*, 49) suggests that in Aramaic "legion," as a loanword from Latin, represented either the commander of a legion or the legion itself; that the Greek texts have taken "legion" in the wrong sense; and that this has opened the way to the development of the present form of the text with its herd of swine to accommodate the multitude of demons. The linguistic observation, which may be accepted, does not at all lead to the proposed analysis. It is overimaginative to take the continuation in Mark, "for we are many," as an implied threat against Jesus (as, e.g., Lamarche, "Possédé," 584). In any case, such is impossible in Luke, where the explanation of the name is now offered by the narrator.

31 Luke has alerted us to the plurality of the possession already in v 27, but only now as this emerges in the action of the story does he begin to use

plural forms to refer to the demons. From now on he will regularly use plural forms. (Mark is less consistent. His first plural is used in his equivalent to v 30 at the moment of the revelation of the plurality of the possession, but then he reverts to the singular for the verb at the beginning of the following verse, after which there is a consistent use of plurals. Mark does not distinguish at all clearly between the man and the demons: he may think of the man as pleading on behalf of the demons; in any case, the underlying awkwardness has presumably to do with the fact that the demons speak through the mouth of the man and with his voice [Annen, *Heil*, 152].)

Mark's demons do not want to be displaced from the region; Luke's do not want to be directed to depart into the abyss. Schwarz's conjecture ("Aus der Gegend," 214–15; cf. A. Meyer, *Muttersprache*, 166, and Nestle, *Philologica Sacra*, 22–23) that the difference goes back to a confusion of תְּהוֹמָה, *têhômā* ("abyss"), and תְּחֻמָּה, *têhûmā* ("district"), is hardly necessary. Lohmeyer's view (*Markusevangelium*, 96) that Luke takes "out of the land" to mean "into the sea" and paraphrases this as "into the abyss" is attractive, but artificial in the sense that it gives to ἐξω τῆς χώρας, "out of the district." Luke appears to have taken his lead from v 28 (see there). Mark's regional attachment of demons probably lacks any particular force for him, convinced as he is that more must be at stake than attachment to the familiar. The demons can be connected with the abyss in a number of different ways. The abyss may be viewed as the place of origin or permanent home of the demons; it may be seen as the place of containment of the rebellious spirits; or it may be conceived of as the place of ultimate judgment of the demonic powers (see Rev 9:1–2, 11; 11:7; 17:8; 20:1, 3; 2 Pet 2:4; Jude 6; cf. Jeremias, *TDNT* 1:9–10).

Requests for concession by a confronted demon are to be found in the Bentesch stele (see *Form/Structure/Setting*) and in *Test. Sol.* 1.6 (a Jewish work of the early Christian centuries, written in Greek). In both cases the demon's interest is in striking a bargain. In the former case there is a veiled demand to be honored with a feast before giving up possession of the victim, along with a claim to specify the destination after departure. In the second case the demon offers to be of special service in return for a measure of freedom. In the former case the concessions are granted and in the latter denied.

32 Mark's "there by the mountain . . . feeding" becomes "there . . . feeding on the mountain," which better prepares for the coming plunge over the cliff. "Great herd of swine" becomes the more modest (and Lukan) "herd of quite a lot of [ἱκανῶν] swine." As with the speech in v 29, Luke expresses the entreaty here in indirect speech and changes from the language of sending (πέμψον) to that of permission (ἐπιτρέψῃ [Luke anticipates the verb Mark will use in the following verse]) and in the process compacts the Markan formulation.

The uncleanness of swine (Lev 11:7; Deut 14:8) would make them in Jewish perspective a totally appropriate residence for unclean spirits. (This is clearer in Mark's account with his preference for "unclean spirit[s]" as designation for the demon[s].) The sending of demons into animals is well attested in Hellenistic demonology (Annen, *Heil*, 152).

The agreement of Jesus to this arrangement has been a puzzle to many. Kertelge (*Wunder Jesu*, 102) takes it as a certain indicator that we have here a pre-Christian story transferred to Jesus, on the basis that such a deal with

demons is incompatible with early Christian views of the Son of God's dignity and power. Others have claimed that the concession is only apparent: the demons are in this way lured to their fate in the sea (Lamarche, "Possédé," 586). The account certainly does not suggest that this was the only way Jesus could get the demons out of the man. In the situation he is clearly portrayed as a plenipotentiary. The underlying difficulty is that of any theodicy in the face of the fact of continuing evil (cf. Rev 20:3). Schürmann, 486, points to the continuing activity of the demonic during the gentile mission (Acts 13:6–11; 16:16–18; 19:13–16). Luke 11:24–26 presumes that an expelled spirit will still have the possibility of continuing to work mischief. The perspective of our pericope is that though Jesus is actively engaged in rescuing those who have become the victims of the Devil's minions (cf. 11:5–22), for whatever reason the time is not yet for bringing to ultimate judgment and destruction these forces of evil. Only in an anticipatory way do the demons come up against, in Jesus, the one who means their ultimate demise.

In the perspective of the story, the pigs are of no value. To put the demons in the pigs is to put them safely out of the way.

33 Luke follows his Markan source closely here. He has *δέ* for Mark's *καί*, "and," as link between sentences, uses his preferred "demons" for Mark's "unclean spirits," expands with "from the man," uses his preferred "lake" for Mark's "sea," and drops Mark's "about two thousand" (cf. v 32) and his repetition of "[in] the sea." Finally, he rather loosely says that the herd drowned (Mark refers the verb to the swine and uses the simple verb in the imperfect ["proceeded to choke"], whereas Luke has the compound verb [which is more idiomatic for drowning (BAGD, 97)] and puts it in the aorist).

This part of the story has been understood in three main ways. (i) The pigs go to the abyss after all, because they go into the sea: Jesus has got the better of them (e.g., Lamarche, "Possédé," 586). (ii) The demons take their revenge on Jesus by ensuring that he will be unpopular with the residents of Gerasa (Bauernfeind, *Die Worte der Dämonen*, 38–45). (iii) The demons unleash the same destructive powers upon the pigs that have up to that point brought misery to the possessed man. Beyond the destruction of the pigs we lose sight of the demons.

The first suggestion works best for a conflation of Mark and Luke: Mark does not mention the abyss; Luke has not the sea but the lake, which generally has no mythological role (but see Rev 19:20; 20:10, 14, 15; 21:8) and certainly has no such role in Lukan usage. The second suggestion may be defensible in Mark but is quite impossible in Luke. Even for Mark, the structuring of the account with its shift of interest from the fate of the pigs to the fate of the man tells against this view (see *Form/Structure/Setting* above). The third view is to be preferred. The dramatic turn of events also marks visibly the departure of the demons, but this does not at all appear to be the focus of concern.

It is sheer pedantry to raise objections to the credibility of the story on the grounds that pigs can swim (so can people, but they drown too when they plunge down a precipice into a body of water).

34–35 Luke gives an explicit eyewitness role to the herdsmen by adding "seeing what had happened" (the "seeing" probably comes from Mark 5:16

[see at v 36]). The herdsmen flee in fear and tell what they have seen to those who were out and about in the town and to those they see working in the fields. (That Luke, following Mark, thinks of the *people* in the town and in the fields is clear from the “they” that emerges undefined at the opening of v 35.) In this way a group forms. No doubt we are meant to think of a frightened but curious group, who have gathered just enough courage from their group solidarity tentatively to make their way back to the scene of these strange events.

Luke varies Mark’s repetitive verbs with his “they went out.” He clips out Mark’s *τί ἐστίν* (“what it is”) and with it the distinctly interrogative note from the quest. He eliminates Mark’s switching of tenses and makes the verbs consistently aorist (simple past tense). “See” becomes “found” (Luke introduces the verb “find” in 5:19; 6:7; 7:10[?]; 9:12; etc.). “The one being demon-possessed . . . the one having had the legion” becomes “the man from whom the demons had come out.” This echoes the language of v 33, but at the same time inadvertently introduces the same kind of verbal repetition Luke has avoided from his Markan source. Luke adds “at the feet of Jesus,” which is undoubtedly an image of discipleship. The peaceful scene is for these new arrivals a gentle display of great power (contrast v 29b). They are terrified, as in the presence of the supernatural power of God (cf. at 1:12).

36 By virtue of the change above in v 34, Mark’s unspecified “the ones who have seen” are identified with the herdsmen in a Lukan exercise of economy of characters. Luke rewords what it is that the witnesses report and makes use of his favorite language of salvation: such a healing is, for Luke, an expression of the salvation that Jesus brings. Luke has no place for Mark’s separate item, “and concerning the swine”: the “how” of the man’s salvation includes the fate of the pigs.

Presumably in the Lukan picture the thrust of the explanation at this point will be to identify Jesus as the “culprit”: this Lord of the demons transferred the demons from the man to the pigs.

37 Unlike Mark, Luke does not apply to the crowd the same verb as that used of the demons (“besought”; cf. v 32). Luke involves the whole population of the district of the Gerasenes in the request that Jesus depart. (Is this because Luke, true to his schematic representation of salvation history, wants it to be seen that it is not yet the time for the gentile mission?) Luke reiterates the note of fear from v 35 and makes this the basis for the request.

Rather curiously, Luke rounds the verse off by saying that Jesus “returned” (a favorite Lukan word [see Annen, *Heil*, 28]). The sentence anticipates v 40, but leaves vv 38–39 oddly detached. We seem to have here the same literary technique that led to his having John the Baptist arrested before the baptism of Jesus (see *Form/Structure/Setting* for 3:19–20). The visit to the territory of Gerasa has run its course: Jesus had come and now he has gone. The man’s desire to go with Jesus is another episode in its own right. (The departure here also prepares for a parallel between Jesus’ return to Jewish Palestine and the man’s return to his own people [v 39].)

38 As he reports the man’s request Luke once again moves away from the verb used for the demons’ request. The imperfect *ἐδεῖτο*, “he was begging,” prepares us for the request to be turned down. Curiously, Luke replaces Mark’s

ὁ δαίμονισθείς, “the one having been demon-possessed,” which he has himself introduced in v 36. The man is described as in v 35, but with *ἄνθρωπος* instead of *ἄνθρωπος* for “man” and with a perfect tense rather than an aorist. Luke speaks not of a refusal but of a dismissal: the man is not turned down but redirected.

39 Luke’s use of *ὑπόστρεφε*, “return,” establishes a parallel between Jesus’ return to Jewish Palestine (v 37) and what this man is to do. Mark’s mention of the man’s family is trimmed away. This has the effect of leaving quite general the directive to tell people what has happened. The man who returns now to his house is the man unable to stay in a house in v 27. Luke uses here *διηγοῦ*, “tell,” a verb which he replaced in v 36 with the verb that Mark has at this point (*ἀπαγγέλλειν*): *διηγείσθαι* seems for Luke to be preferred for believing report. Luke has “God” for Mark’s “Lord”: “Lord” for Luke tends to mean Jesus himself, and here God as the power source behind Jesus is intended (cf. 5:17). Luke speaks simply of what “God did,” whereas Mark has “the Lord has done and has had mercy on you.” Luke uses the verb “to have mercy” only in the fixed expression “have mercy on me/us” (16:24; 17:13; 18:38, 39).

Luke also abbreviates the rest of the verse. Notably, he takes Mark’s “in the Decapolis” not generally but as referring only to the specific city (the *καθ’ ὅλην*, “through the whole,” is surprising as Luke elsewhere uses *καθ’ ὅλης* for this). Luke omits Mark’s account of the amazement of all: for Luke the people’s response to these events has already been given earlier and culminates in v 37. The man is called to demonstrate his faith, but the report of what he does also provides echoes for the coming missionary endeavor to the Gentiles.

Explanation

The complexity of the story and the, to a modern mind, undeserved fate of the pigs have led to much questioning of the historicity of the account. While, however, there does seem to have been some development during the transmission of the story, there is finally no adequate ground for tracing the story back to an original that lacked any of the main features of the present narrative. The most difficult problem is that the only Gerasa known from the period was well away from the Sea of Galilee (see above for possible explanations).

The scene now moves from the high seas to the place for the next manifestation of Jesus’ might. Here and in the following episode he provides patterns for the coming mission of the Twelve (9:1). His plan to cross the sea (v 22) has its purpose now revealed in this apparently chance encounter with a demoniac. Luke’s Jesus has perceptions we might term psychic.

The man appears dehumanized in a number of ways. He is naked, as a beast would be; he does not fit in human society; and he keeps company with the dead, not with the living. We will soon learn of earlier futile attempts to constrain him. But the sheer presence of Jesus subdues the troubled man, and we find him prostrated before this figure of power and authority.

The conversation, as Luke reports it, is entirely between Jesus and the possessing demons. The demons know who Jesus is and do not consider that any

good can come to them from contact with him (v 28). They fear that he will begin the end-time judgment proceedings against them, even before the expected time. This fear is provoked by the move Jesus makes to exorcise the man.

Luke makes it clear that Jesus acts on the basis of the man's pitiable state (v 29). The man's bouts of manifest possession were episodic, and when he was so troubled, all attempts to constrain him were in vain. No such difficulty stands in the way of Jesus. In reply to the demons' request, Jesus asks for the demon's name. The name "Legion" reveals now in the flow of the story the fact that the man is troubled by a whole multitude of demons. The name reflects the military might of the Roman occupying forces and perhaps the cruelty of their practices.

The demons renew their plea, expressing it this time in terms of the abyss to which they fear removal. The abyss is here the place of containment and ultimate judgment of the rebellious spirits (cf. Rev 9:1–2, 11; 11:7; 2 Pet 2:4; etc.). It is clear that Jesus is intent on having the demons leave the man and that they are powerless before his will. To the demons, the best alternative to the man that offers itself is the herd of swine. In Jewish thought these swine partake of the same uncleanness as the demons themselves (Lev 11:7; Deut 14:8). Exorcism into animals is well documented in ancient Hellenistic demonology.

Jesus' agreement to the request has troubled modern readers of the text, especially in light of the fate of the animals. In the (Jewish) perspective of the story, the pigs are of no value: to put the demons there is to put them safely out of the way, at least for the moment. Jesus' agreement to having the demons remain on the loose to work their mischief is more difficult. But continuing evil is a fact, despite all that has been achieved by Jesus, and this was evident in the early missionary endeavors of the church as portrayed in Acts. The demons meet in Jesus the one who means their ultimate demise, but for whatever reason the time for their ultimate judgment and destruction has not yet come. Released into the pigs, the demons unleash the same destructive forces upon them that they had used to so torment the man. The pigs stampede to a watery grave.

The herdsmen see it all and flee. They report to all they see the fate of their herd and gather a crowd of people who are prepared to venture with them to investigate further. In view of the failed efforts to subdue the man, the peaceful scene that awaits them is a gentle display of great power. The man's humanity is quite restored, and he has adopted the pose of a disciple. The crowd is terrified, as in the presence of the supernatural power of God (see at 1:12). The herdsmen confirm the link between the restored man and the destroyed herd, and establish the role of Jesus in the events. The request that here sends Jesus away is not unlike that of Peter in 5:8, but here it is not countermanded by Jesus: the time of the Gentiles has not yet come.

Luke at once reports Jesus' departure. This makes quite a separate episode out of the request in vv 38–39, but in the process introduces a kind of awkwardness we have at times seen earlier in Luke's style. The man wishes to follow through with discipleship in the only manner that has been patterned to him. Jesus does not refuse him but rather redirects him. Jesus returns to Jewish Palestine,

and this man—a Gentile—is to return to his native place. He is to demonstrate his faith by proclaiming to his fellows what God in Jesus has done for him.

Jairus' Daughter and the Woman with the Flow of Blood (8:40–56)

Bibliography

Cummings, J. T. "The Tassel of His Cloak: Mark, Luke, Matthew—and Zechariah." *StudBib* 2 (1978) 47–61. **Kertelge, K.** *Die Wunder Jesu*. 110–20. **Kreyenbühl, J.** "Ursprung und Stammbaum eines biblischen Wunders." *ZNW* 10 (1909) 265–76. **Loos, H. van der.** *The Miracles of Jesus*. 509–19, 567–73. **Marxsen, W.** "Bibelarbeit über Mk 5, 21–43/Mt 9, 18–26." *Der Exeget als Theologe*. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1968. 171–82. **Pesch, R.** "Jairus (Mk 5, 22/Lk 8, 41)." *BZ* 14 (1970) 252–56. **Potin, J.** "L'Évangile (Mt 9, 18–26): Guérison d'une hémorroïse et résurrection de la fille de Jaïre." *AsSeign* 78 (1965) 25–36. **Robbins, V. K.** "The Woman Who Touched Jesus' Garment: Socio-rhetorical Analysis of the Synoptic Accounts." *NTS* 33 (1987) 502–15. **Roloff, J.** *Das Kerygma und der irdische Jesus*. 153–55. **Schmithals, W.** *Wunder und Glaube: Eine Auslegung von Markus 4:35–6:6a*. BibS(N)59. Neukirchen: Neukirchener, 1970. 69–91. **Stallmann, M.** *Die biblische Geschichte im Unterricht*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963. 55–88.

Translation

⁴⁰As^a Jesus returned, the crowd welcomed him, for they were all waiting for him. ⁴¹Now,^b a man whose name was Jairus came. This man was a ruler of the synagogue, and yet^c he fell at the feet of Jesus and implored him to come into his house, ⁴²because he had a daughter, an only child,^d who was twelve years old; and she was dying.

As he set off, the crowds crushed in on him. ⁴³A woman who had had a flow of blood for twelve years, and^e was not able to be healed by anyone, ⁴⁴came up behind him and touched the edge of his garment. Immediately the flow of her blood stopped. ⁴⁵Then Jesus said, "Who is it that touched me?" As everyone denied it, Peter^f said, "Master, the crowds are pressing you hard and pushing upon you."^g ⁴⁶But Jesus said, "Someone touched me; for I was aware that power had gone out from me." ⁴⁷Seeing that her action had not escaped notice, the woman came, trembling, and falling down before him, she openly declared before all the people the reason for which she had touched him, and how she had been healed immediately. ⁴⁸Then Jesus said to her, "Daughter, your faith has saved you; go in peace."

⁴⁹While he was still speaking somebody came from the synagogue-ruler's place saying, "Your daughter has died; don't bother the teacher anymore."^h ⁵⁰Having heard this,ⁱ Jesus responded to him, "Don't be afraid; only believe, and she will be saved."^j ⁵¹When he went into the house he did not allow anyone to go in with him, except Peter and John and James, and the father and the mother of the child. ⁵²They were all weeping and beating their breasts for her. He said, "Don't weep: she did

not die; she is sleeping.” ⁵³ They laughed at him, knowing that she had died. ⁵⁴ But he took her by the hand and called out, saying, “Child, rise.” ⁵⁵ And her spirit returned and she got up at once. He commanded that something be given her to eat. ⁵⁶ Her parents were astonished; but he directed them to tell nobody what had happened.

Notes

^a ἐγένετο, “it happened,” is added by \aleph^{*2} C A D W Θ etc.

^b Lit., “and behold.”

^c Greek καί, “and”/“but.”

^d Or “an only daughter.”

^e ἱατροῖς προσαναλώσασα ὅλον τὸν βίον “having spent all her livelihood on doctors,” is added by \aleph^{*} A K L P W Δ Θ Ξ etc. \aleph C X Ψ and much of the Latin tradition have something similar. This conforms the thought to the Markan text, with language influenced by Mark 12:44.

^f καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ (“and those with him”) in \aleph A D W Θ etc. brings the text into line with Mark.

^g καὶ λέγεις, τίς ὁ ἀψάμενός μου, “and he says, ‘who is the one who touched me,’” is added by A (C) K P W X Δ Θ Ξ Π etc. to align with the text of Mark. Other texts achieve the same by having something like the above displace “pushing upon [you].”

^h “Any more” is missing from A C K L P W X Δ Θ Ξ Π etc.

ⁱ “This” added for sense.

Form/Structure/Setting

As a double miracle account, Luke 8:40–56 occupies position three in a set of four reports of mighty works leading up to the confession of 9:20. The power that Jesus manifests, he will subsequently share with the Twelve (9:1–6; see further at 8:22–25).

Luke has only had his Markan source, which he does not seriously alter beyond his usual degree of reexpression. Whether Mark has been as conservative is more open to dispute, but those who find major development in the account usually attribute it to a pre-Markan redactor (e.g., Kertelge, *Wunder Jesu*, 111–13; Pesch, *BZ* 14 [1970] 256; but cf. Sundwall, *Die Zusammensetzung*, 32–35, who is followed by Schürmann, 492, 497). Mark himself could have contributed 5:34, 37 and 43a. Roloff, *Kerygma*, 154–55, argues forcefully, however, that v 34 belongs to the oldest layer of the account since it reflects a profile on faith which is distinctive to the historical Jesus. Furthermore, the “messianic secret” is no Markan construct (cf. Pesch, *BZ* 17 [1973] 183–84, who argues that most of the commands to silence including the present one are traditional), whether or not we attribute some of its occurrences to Markan redaction (for an important collection of recent essays on this topic see *The Messianic Secret*, ed. C. Tuckett [Issues in Religion and Theology 1; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983]). Finally, the major difficulty with v 43a is cleared away once we recognize that the command is not to silence about something that plainly could not be hidden, but rather to silence about exactly what took place in the privacy of the secluded room. The scoffers are to be left to believe that he was right after all to suggest that the girl was not dead but sleeping (Schürmann, 496; Schmithals, *Wunder*, pronounces this explanation “artificial”). Mark certainly uses v 37 as part of his presentation of Peter and James and John as an inner circle, but there is nothing distinctly Markan about it, and no awkwardness

in the flow of the text at this point. Vv 38b–40 pose more difficulties (see Roloff, *Kerygma*, 154 n. 172), but in Mark ἐρχονται εἰς can surely mean “they come to” and not only “they come into” (cf. Turner, *Grammar* 3:256). So it is not at all certain that Mark has after all contributed any significant element to the account.

The more serious question is whether the account of the healing of Jairus’ daughter could ever have circulated as an independent account before being fused with the account of the woman with the flow of blood. The latter is more or less self-contained and could easily have circulated separately, but it has been argued (by, e.g., Kertelge, *Wunder Jesu*, 111–12) that the Jairus account (i) needs the delay provided by the inserted account, (ii) has borrowed many of its motifs from the inserted account (the dependence is this way because [some of] the motifs are used in a more pervasive manner in the account of the meeting with the woman), and (iii) could not exist without the borrowed motifs. The argument is not decisive, since (i) the need to explain, convince, and travel already provides a delay motif; (ii) the salvation motif (on which Kertelge places special weight for demonstrating the direction of dependence) is only more pervasive in the inserted account if we include Mark 5:34, which is regarded by Kertelge himself as secondary; and (iii) in the case of the shared motifs, once we distinguish between those motifs which are very common in the Jesus tradition and therefore are likely to have been independently present in the two accounts (and may be partly responsible for the uniting of the accounts [Schürmann, 492]) and those which are not common and therefore lie under suspicion of having been transferred from the one account to the other, it becomes quite clear that transfer is likely to have occurred only in cases where the motif is not basic to the account.

If we may, then, assume the independent transmission of the two accounts, the question of historicity may be taken back one stage further. For the account of the woman with the flow of blood, it is the rather magical view of power implicit within the account which has most consistently been raised against its historicity. But this view of power is not the late Hellenistic development it is often made out to be (cf. Nolland, “Grace as Power,” *NovT* 28 [1986] 26–31). And even if it is somewhat Hellenistic, it is exactly what we might expect in some of the popular piety that surrounded Jesus. What is more, the view of power is modified in the account (Mark 5:34) in terms that have a good claim to reflect Jesus’ distinctive use of the vocabulary of faith (see Roloff above).

For the Jairus account, once we move beyond the question of the independent transmission of the account, the problem is simply that of the genuine historical possibility of the restoration of a dead person to life. The account is certainly not adequately explained by suggesting a development from something like Matt 8:5–13 (as Kertelge, *Wunder Jesu*, 113), nor from Acts 9:36–43 (as Kreyenbühl, *ZNW* 10 [1910] 267), nor from OT accounts of the raising of the dead (1 Kgs 17:17–24; 2 Kgs 4:18–37). Marxsen (“Bibelarbeit,” 176) is entirely correct to maintain that the account is reported for what it says in the present about the need for an unbounded faith, which the boundary of death does not bring to a halt. But this kind of early Christian confidence in Jesus bases itself in part on the conviction that precisely in his own life history Jesus has anticipated

the believed-in future resurrection, both in such events as this and in his own resurrection.

While both stories are clearly miracle stories and contain all the elements of the miracle-story form, each contains further elements which go beyond the form. Mark 5:34 is reminiscent of a pronouncement story, while the privileged role accorded to Peter, James, and John is separately motivated, as is the injunction to secrecy at the end of the account. In the account of the woman with the flow of blood, not only the healing but also Jesus' awareness is a wonder.

In the Lukan form, the opening verse links the events here with Jesus' dealings with the amassing crowd in vv 4–21. The mention of the crowd's presence here prepares for their role in the encounter with the woman. The report of this encounter is sandwiched into the Jairus account and functions as a means of heightening the dramatic tension of that story. The account of the woman's healing moves from initial anonymous healing contact to full disclosure by means of the report of a multi-sided conversation which increasingly threatens the woman's anonymity. The account climaxes with Jesus' pronouncement of peace and his revelation of the central place of faith.

Anxiety about the delay that has been caused proves fully justified with the arrival of a messenger from Jairus' home. The momentum of the story is at this point shattered, but it is provided with a fresh beginning by Jesus' call for faith. The mother appears without proper introduction and an adequate setting in v 51, as do the weepers in v 52. It would seem that v 51 jumps ahead in time with its introduction of the privacy motif, while vv 51–53 underline the reality of the child's death. By contact and address Jesus restores the child's life; he then sees to her need for food. The note of amazement we expect to complete the account is supplemented with a renewal of the privacy motif by means of the call for secrecy about what exactly had transpired.

Comment

Luke 8:40–56 reports the healing of the hemorrhaging woman (vv 42b–48) as an interruption within the account of Jesus' restoration of the daughter of Jairus. This sandwiching technique both heightens the suspense of the narrative and provides a crescendo which moves from healing to restoration to life. Like the preceding pericope, the present account provides exemplary patterns for the later healing ministry of the apostles (cf. Acts 5:15; 9:36–43; 19:11–12; 20:7–12), which is about to be anticipated in the mission of the Twelve (9:1–6). The account also takes its place in the series of accounts of Jesus' mighty works which culminates in the confession of 9:20. (See further at 8:22–25.)

40 Luke totally reformulates Mark here (the verbs used are typically Lukan), for the most part in the interests of establishing a closer link to the materials of vv 1–18: Jesus now returns to the crowd he had earlier left behind (the verb is repeated from v 37). Their waiting and welcoming point us back to vv 4 and 19: this is a crowd of those who are eager to be with Jesus, and who still have before them the challenge of hearing the word of God and *doing* it.

41 The level of reformulation remains high, but with little change of meaning: Luke introduces preferred vocabulary, eliminates historic presents, and creates a more sophisticated syntax.

The preservation of the name Jairus without a specified location for the episode is unusual, but Pesch (*BZ* 14 [1970] 252–55) has argued convincingly against Markan or Lukan insertion of the name into the tradition. Separated from his wider argument, there is some attractiveness in Pesch's view that the name is symbolic (p. 255). If the underlying Semitic form is יָעִיר, *yā'ir*, as in 1 Chr 20:5, then the name will mean "he [God] will awaken," which fits so well with Jesus' words in v 52: "She did not die; she is asleep." It is, however, as likely that the name is historical reminiscence.

Each synagogue had a "ruler" whose chief task was to see to the physical arrangements of the worship service (cf. 13:14; 18:8, 17), though the term seems also to have had a less precise sense which embraced all the leading figures of synagogue life (Acts 13:15). Luke stresses Jairus' dignity and place in the Jewish "establishment," rather than any particular office. It is an official representative of Judaism who here prostrates himself before Jesus. As in v 35, "at the feet" is the position of a would-be disciple.

The imperfect tense for "implored" signals uncertainty about the outcome of the request. Luke has considerably subdued the temper of Jairus' approach from that of the report in Mark. All attempt to persuade or direct is gone. Only the simple request to come to his home and the mute gesture remain (cf. Schürmann, 490). Luke gives the active role entirely over to Jesus. The idiom "enter into his house" is borrowed by Luke from Mark 5:38–39.

42 In the Lukan form the narrator and not the father (as in Mark) tells of the plight of the daughter. Luke underlines the poignancy of the situation by adding the word "only" ("only" could indicate here either an only child or an only daughter). The mention of the age he brings forward from Mark 5:42: the girl is approaching the age for marriage, so the imminent flowering of her womanhood is under threat. The vocabulary for dying is from Mark 5:35. ἐν δὲ τῷ ὑπάγειν (lit., "in the to depart") is formed to parallel the opening words of v 40. Luke changes Mark's verb to the colorful συνέπιπτον (lit., "[crowded together] and choked").

43 The opening of the verse follows Mark 5:25 closely with only a change of idiom for the time expression. The affliction is presumably a menstrual disorder. She would be ritually unclean from her condition (Lev 15:19–27; Ezek 36:17) and should not have been anonymously in the crowd.

Mark's elaboration of her unhappy experiences with the medical profession is curtailed. For Luke, the point is that nobody could help her.

44 Luke agrees with Matthew (9:20) in limiting the touch to the κράσπεδον of the garment. This probably comes ultimately from Mark 6:56. The word is used for the tassels the Israelites wore on the four corners of their garments (Num 15:38–39; Deut 22:12), but here, where the idea is of *only* the periphery of the garment, the more general sense "edge, hem" is called for. Luke deletes from his Markan source the woman's private expression of confidence in this move, as also the report of the woman's subjective knowledge of healing after the contact has been made. Similarly, the report of Jesus' inner awareness that power had gone forth from him is omitted: Luke will make use of it in

Jesus' public interchange with Peter. Luke conforms the idiom of his report of her healing to the language in which the condition was first made known (cf. v 43).

45 Luke no longer speaks of Jesus as turning in the direction of the touch (Mark 5:30). After the more specific "edge of the clothing" in v 44, Luke now in Jesus' words makes Mark's touching of the clothing into a touching of Jesus; already the move away from the superstitious form of the woman's faith is being prepared for: it is contact with Jesus that is significant. Luke completes the logic by reporting that all deny having touched Jesus. Peter becomes spokesman in place of Mark's less specific "the disciples." Luke probably deduces this from the role to come in v 51 and from the pervasive role of Peter as spokesman for the Twelve in the tradition that he has. Luke places the word "Master" on Peter's lips as it has been in 5:5. The personal recognition of Jesus' authority which the word denotes in Luke is part of Luke's rendering more respectful the Markan report of a rather sarcastic outburst by the disciples. In their softened form, Peter's words invite clarification from Jesus. Once again Luke displaces Mark's word for the pressing of the crowd; this time he chooses two replacement synonyms: *συνέχειν*, "to press hard," of which Luke-Acts has nine of the twelve NT occurrences, and *ἀποθλίβειν*, "to press upon," which is not found again in the NT.

46 Luke turns Mark's report of Jesus' inner state of awareness (v 30) into a public explanation by Jesus of his strange question. Schürmann, 492, is right to see the transcendent power of God as present here in a way that goes beyond Jesus' own action, but it is unlikely that Luke thinks further of a going beyond Jesus' permission. The Lukan Jesus will not be unaware of the woman's situation as she comes to him in her need (see at 4:23). The procedure adopted by Jesus is not intended to identify the woman for himself, but to have her own her action and also to clarify to the crowds what has occurred. Luke is quite happy to see spiritual power in a quasi-substantial manner (see 5:17; 6:19; and the discussion of *κάρπς* at 4:22); but as becomes clear in this episode, this is never isolated from religious categories of a relational and ethical kind.

47 In various ways Luke modifies his tradition here to focus his editorial concerns. He makes specific the woman's recognition that her action has not escaped notice. He elaborates on the woman's confession: she bears public witness to the cause of her action and its consequence. Her action here is nothing less than religious testimony.

48 Luke here reproduces his source almost verbatim: he changes one verb and finds no use for the "be healed" directive with which the Markan verse ends. Only in the personal turning of the healed one to Jesus does this event reach its goal, and only then does Jesus speak of her faith (cf. Roloff, *Kerygma*, 154). The woman's salvation here goes beyond her physical healing, embracing as it does the peace now being eschatologically bestowed by Jesus. On "faith" and "peace" see at 7:50. Schürmann, 492, rightly notes that faith is not the psychosomatic cause of healing, but only the subjective condition that opens one to the working of God's power.

49 Only slight changes are made to the Markan text in this verse, the most obvious of which is the change from plural to singular in speaking of

the messenger(s). Luke also softens Mark's seemingly harsh "why are you still bothering the teacher?" to "don't bother the teacher anymore." Only here does Luke allow one of Mark's historic presents to remain in the text.

The opening phrase underlines the fact that the delay caused by the episode with the woman is the immediate cause of Jesus' not reaching the sick girl before she dies. *παρὰ τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου* (lit., "from the ruler of the synagogue") seems to be idiomatic for "from [his] house" or "from [his] family" (Mark uses *ἀπό* for the same idiom). The basis for the journey begun in v 42 now collapses. Death steps forward as the final barrier to all action.

50 Luke cuts away unnecessary words from his source. He has Jesus hear, not overhear. As not infrequently, Luke introduces *ἀποκρίνεσθαι* here with the meaning "to respond," not "to answer." Luke switches "believe" to the aorist imperative, probably to indicate that here an entirely new kind of faith is demanded of Jairus. The addition of "and she will be saved" provides a juxtaposition of faith and salvation parallel to that recently encountered in v 48 (and note further 8:12): she will be saved just as the needy woman has been. Now with the presence of Jesus, the eschatological abolition of the death barrier begins to take effect. Kertelge (*Wunder Jesu*, 116) rightly insists here that it is a view of Jesus which is affirmed, and not the resurrection of the dead as such.

51 Luke abbreviates and smooths out some difficulties in the Markan account. Unlike Mark, Luke apparently allows the crowd to come on the journey to the ruler's house. A meeting with the mother outside the house is left to be implied (also in Mark the mother slips into the story). The private party is composed at once, rather than in Mark's two stages. Luke reorders the names to fit in with the order he consistently uses (perhaps because John is elsewhere linked with Peter in a way that James is not). It is not clear whether *εἰς* should be rendered "to" or "into," but the resulting difference is slight. The presence of the three core apostles is connected with the confession to come in 9:20 and also with their later role as witnesses (cf. at 1:2). The secrecy motif is clearly of less importance to Luke than it was to Mark. It may be only that a crowd of strangers is not appropriate in such a situation.

52 Luke severely trims his source here and in particular deletes the ejection of the mourners. In Mark the mourners are clearly inside the house, but for Luke they may be outside, and the action of vv 52–53 may precede that of v 51. If this is not the case (and Luke does not especially encourage such a reading), then the mourners, for all their ridicule of Jesus, are allowed to witness the restoration of the girl to life. (Schürmann, 494, is unduly influenced by the Markan text when he speaks of a secluded inner room as established for God's mighty working.)

Jesus' remark is directed toward the future and not the past. It is prognosis, not diagnosis. Her state is sleep and not death because of what Jesus intends to do for her. Since the advent of Jesus, the ultimacy of death is broken (Kertelge, *Wunder Jesu*, 117).

53 Luke makes specific the basis for the mocking ridicule leveled at Jesus: they know she is dead; he has just turned up and without even seeing her pronounces her asleep and not dead.

54 Unlike Mark, Luke provides no change of scene for the restoration of the girl. For Mark's "says," Luke uses the more forceful "called out, saying" (cf. the change at 8:8). As usual, he omits the transliterated Aramaic and thus the need to translate it. *κοράσιον*, "little girl," becomes *παῖς*, "child"/"servant." The rhetorical flourish, "I say to you," is omitted. It would be attractive to consider the choice of *ἐγείρε*, "rise," as signaling the anticipation here of the eschatological resurrection (as Potin, *AsSeign* 78 [1965] 32), but the word is so general that it is perhaps best to take it as meaning no more than "get up." She is asked to do what a dead person cannot do, but the powerful word of Jesus enables what it demands. See *Form/Structure/Setting* at 4:38–39 for a discussion of the different ways in which Jesus is reported to heal.

55 Luke's added "and her spirit returned" may be influenced by 1 Kgs 17:21–22 from the account of Elijah's restoration to life of the widow's son. It is not clear to what degree we should read out of such a verse the more Hellenistic view of the spirit (or soul) as a separable part of a person which survives death (cf. 23:46; Acts 7:59). Such a view is certainly to be found in some Jewish sources (e.g., *1 Enoch* 22; 39.4–8). The more Hebraic view, which is the main view expressed in the NT, insists that (significant) survival of death depends upon resurrection. (Some shadowy survival of death may be allowed for, and this appears to have been developed in some Jewish circles by means of the more Hellenistic ideas.) "Spirit" here in Luke may be nothing much more than the life force, which is what is intended by the use of *πνεῦμα*, *nepeš* (Greek: *ψυχή*), in 1 Kgs 17:21–22.

Luke makes Jesus more insistent about the giving of food by changing "said" to "commanded." He brings this clause forward to bring together all that concerns Jesus' dealing with the girl. The life that is restored and affirmed by Jesus is the life that is rooted in the materiality of the world, the life in which we need food for our bodies. It is this full life which has been restored, not merely the life of a ghostly apparition (cf. 24:37–43; Acts 12:15[?]).

56 Luke identifies the parents as the astonished ones: Peter, John, and James have already experienced one such restoration (7:11–17). There is no reason (with Schürmann, 495–96) to treat the parents' response as inappropriate. The father has believed and the daughter has been saved (v 50).

Luke reproduces the command to silence in a softened form. He seems to retain something of Mark's sense that the broadcasting of certain levels of awareness of Jesus' identity is inappropriate before the cross and resurrection. Perhaps for Luke there is something provisional and proleptic about Jesus' eschatological status before his transition to glory. In the absence of a report of what happened, people would be able, if they wished, to see Jesus as only the healer of a sick and sleeping (unconscious[?]) girl.

Explanation

This double miracle account is the third in a linked set of four which culminate in Peter's confession in 9:20. The preceding account (vv 26–39) and this one are especially linked to the coming mission of the Twelve in which Jesus will begin to share with the apostles the power which he here manifests.

Jesus returns to Jewish Palestine and to the crowd with which he had been dealing earlier (see vv 4 and 19). Out of the crowd emerges a certain synagogue-ruler. He is a Jewish "establishment" figure, probably responsible for the setting up of synagogue services. The Pharisees and teachers of the law have been critical of Jesus, but this man in his need humbles himself before Jesus. It is just possible that the name Jairus is symbolic: it means "he [that is, God] will awaken," which is just what is to happen for this man.

The man's daughter is at the age where she is about to flower into the full potential of her womanhood, but all that potential is on the point of being snuffed out. Jesus moves at once to meet the need, but he is immediately interrupted.

Another needy person has made an anonymous approach to Jesus. She feels that she has what she needs when contact with the hem of Jesus' garment brings the relief she had sought in vain for so long. But Jesus sees things quite differently. She needs to see that it is contact with Jesus himself that she needs and not simply anonymous access to his power. Power in religion without personal relationship and public commitment is little better than superstition or magic.

The woman is not anonymous to Jesus; what he wants is not to expose her but to have her come before him face to face and own up to her actions in a public confession of faith. He wishes for her wholeness in a more comprehensive sense than simply healing. After Jesus reveals his awareness of what has happened, the woman comes, fearful but now ready to meet Jesus on his own terms. Jesus now bestows upon her that peace which he came to bring to a world out of touch with its God.

The delay caused by this interruption soon seems to be irretrievable, but things are not so in the economy of God. Jesus is by this stage a well-established healer, but death now steps forward as the final barrier to all action. To believe that in Jesus the end-time abolition of the death barrier is beginning to take effect requires quite a new kind of faith. To this new kind of faith Jairus is now called.

Jesus takes only the inner core of his disciples into the home of the grieving family. He assures the mourners that they mourn unnecessarily. They are unimpressed by his claim that she is sleeping, because they do not reckon with the fact that he is offering prognosis, not diagnosis: he speaks in terms of what he intends to do.

Jesus tells the dead girl to do what she cannot do, and by the power of his word she does it. Her life force returns to her dead body and up she gets! Now that she is hale and hearty again, her first need is for a good meal. The father has believed and the daughter has been saved.

Jesus directs the parents not to tell others what has happened. Clearly they are not expected to try to keep the daughter's restoration a secret, but they are not to reveal exactly what has happened and Jesus' actual role in it. Before the cross and resurrection it is inappropriate to broadcast publicly too much about Jesus' identity and actions. Outside that larger context they are too readily misunderstood and misused.

Sharing in Jesus' Ministry (9:1-6)

Bibliography

Barrett, C. K. *Holy Spirit*. 127-30. **Beare, F. W.** "The Mission of the Disciples and the Mission Charge: Matthew 10 and Parallels." *JBL* 89 (1970) 1-13. **Bohemen, N. van.** "L'institution et la mission des douze." *La formation des Évangiles*. 116-50. **Cadbury, H. J.** "Note XXIV: Dust and Garments." In *Beginnings*, ed. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake, 5:269-77. **Caird, G. B.** "Uncomfortable Words." II. Shake off the Dust from Your Feet." *ExpTim* 81 (1969) 40-43. **Cerfaux, L.** "La mission apostolique des Douze et sa portée eschatologique." In *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant*. Città del Vaticano, 1964. 1:43-66. **Degenhardt, H.-J.** *Lukas Evangelist der Armen*. 60-68. **Delebecque, É.** "Secouez la poussière de vos pieds": Sur l'hellénisme de Luc IX,5." *RB* 89 (1982) 177-84. **Ford, M.** "Money 'Bags' in the Temple (Mk 11, 16)." *Bib* 57 (1976) 249-53. **Grant, C.** "The Mission of the Disciples, Mt. 9:35-11:1 and Parallels." *JBL* 35 (1916) 293-314. **Hahn, F.** *Mission in the New Testament*. SBT 47. Naperville, IL: Allenson, 1965. 41-46. **Hengel, M.** *The Charismatic Leader and His Followers*. 73-80. **Kirchschläger, W.** *Jesu exorzistisches Wirken aus der Sicht des Lukas*. 191-203. **Legrand, L.** "Bare Foot Apostles? The Shoes of St Mark (Mk. 6:8-9 and parallels)." *ITS* 16 (1979) 201-19. **Moessner, D. P.** "Luke 9:1-50: Luke's Preview of the Journey of the Prophet like Moses of Deuteronomy." *JBL* 102 (1983) 575-605. **O'Toole, R. F.** "Luke's Message in 9:1-50." *CBQ* 49 (1987) 74-89. **Schott, E.** "Die Aussendung Mt 10. Mc 6. Lc 9.10." *ZNW* 7 (1906) 140-50. **Schürmann, H.** "Mt 10,5b-6 und die Vorgeschichte des synoptischen Aussendungsberichtes." *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. 137-49. **Spitta, F.** "Das Verbot von Schuhen und Stöcken für die Sendboten Jesu." *ZWT* 55 (1914) 39-45, 166-67. **Wilkens, W.** "Die Auslassung von Mark. 6,45-8,26 bei Lukas im Licht der Komposition Luk. 9,1-50." *TZ* 32 (1976) 193-200.

See also at 5:1-11; 6:12-16; 10:1-16.

Translation

¹He called together the Twelve^a and gave them power and authority over all the demons, and to heal diseases. ²Then he sent them to preach the kingdom of God and to heal.^b ³He said to them, "Take nothing on the journey, neither staff, nor bag, nor bread, nor money. Do not have two garments each."^c ⁴Into whichever house you enter—stay there and go on^d from there. ⁵And wherever^e they do not receive you, go out of that city and shake off the dust from your feet as an act of witness to them."^f ⁶So, they went out and traveled around, announcing the good news from village to village, and healing everywhere.

Notes

^aThere has been some suspicion that "the Twelve" has come into Luke here from the Markan text. μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, "his disciples," is read by 1242 and two lectionaries. "The Twelve" is supplemented by μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ in C³ 1010 1216^{mg} 1344 as well as lectionary texts and some of the Latin witnesses. It is supplemented by ἀποστόλους, "apostles," in B C* L X Θ etc.

^bThe shorter text followed is read by B syr^{cs} Marcion and Adamantius; τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς, "the sick," is added by B A D L Ξ Ψ etc.; τοὺς ἀσθενούντας, "the ones being sick," is added by C K W X Δ Θ Π etc., and supplemented with πάντας, "all," b 407 435 etc.

^c"Each" is not found in B B C* L Ξ etc., and may not be original.

^dLit., "go out."

^eLit., "as many as."

Form/Structure/Setting

9:1–6 is to be read in close connection with the two preceding accounts—the healing of the Gerasene demoniac (8:26–39) and the double healing of the woman with the flow of blood and Jairus' daughter (8:40–56)—but also with the linked sections in 8:1–21. The preceding episodes exemplify the exorcising and healing which the Twelve are now called to perform; the preaching of the kingdom of God has been the dominant focus of the earlier linked sections. See further at 8:1–3 and 9:7–9. (O'Toole [*CBQ* 49 (1987) 75] is not wrong to see links between 9:1–6 and 9:46–50, but he fails to see that the latter has stronger links with 10:1–12. 9:46–50 does not belong in the same section with 9:1–6; rather it is part of the transition piece that binds the material before 9:21 to the material that comes after the major turning point of 9:51 [see further at 9:21–22 and 9:51–56].)

Luke here follows his Markan source and its order (allowing for the relocation of the visit to Nazareth which in Mark stands between this episode and the account of the healing of Jairus' daughter). He also has, however, a closely related mission account in 10:1–20, which has slightly influenced him in the editing of this account.

The discussion of the relationship in the earlier tradition between the two mission accounts (and Matthew's, which contains elements from each of Luke's accounts) will be deferred until 10:1, when all the material will be before us. Scholarly opinion is nearly unanimous that the accounts go back to a single tradition, but there is sharp division over the basic historicity of that tradition. In the historical ministry of Jesus, such a mission may be expected to have a meaning somewhat different from the role it comes to occupy in the light of the post-Pentecost mission of the church (see at 10:1–20).

Despite the prominence of the instructional content of the account, it is not to be classed as a pronouncement story (in which the narrative exists to frame the teaching). It is, rather, a story about Jesus (Fitzmyer, 752).

Luke adopts the Markan structure with some slight improvement to the logic of Mark's presentation. Having (i) called the Twelve together, Jesus (ii) empowered them and (iii) sent them off with instructions about (a) equipment for the journey, (b) receiving hospitality, and (c) dealing with rejection. The Twelve, (iv) having made their departure, (v) undertook their itinerant ministry. A measure of parallelism between (i) and (iv) divides the account into a major part concerning Jesus' action and a minor part dealing with the activity of the Twelve.

Comment

Now the fishing "associates for Jesus," who were called for their task in the section 5:1–6:16, are specifically set to work by Jesus. Luke is making use in 8:1–9:20 of the call of the Twelve "to be with Jesus" and "to be sent out to preach," which he earlier passed over in his version of Mark 3:14 (see at 8:1–3). Being with him, they have witnessed his preaching of the kingdom of God (8:1) and his healings and exorcisms (8:26–39; 8:40–56). Now they are sent as delegates of Jesus to do the same. Luke here anticipates the post-

Pentecost mission, in which the apostles (and others) will on a much grander scale be empowered by the exalted Lord to be his witnesses to the ends of the earth (Acts 1:8). As the rejection in Nazareth is a kind of dress rehearsal for the passion of Jesus, so this mission is something of a dress rehearsal for the post-Pentecost role of the Twelve.

1 Luke replaces Mark's *προσκαλείται*, "calls to [him]," with *συγκαλεσάμενος*, "having called together," perhaps because this verb suits better Luke's sequencing in which Peter and John and James are already with Jesus (8:51). More logically, Luke speaks of the commissioning before the sending (Mark probably uses the sending language to mean a directive to go, rather than an actual sending off; he has in mind a commissioning in pairs in which each pair was empowered and directed separately; his use of tenses allows for the authorization and the directive to depart to occur in the logical rather than the reported order). Luke adds "power and" to Mark's "authority." The immediate link here will be 8:46 (see there), but there may also be an anticipation of postresurrection empowering (cf. Acts 1:8). The Twelve will be carriers of Jesus' own power. Luke prefers "demons" to Mark's "unclean spirits" (see at 4:33 for Luke's use of language in relation to demons). Luke's added "all" will highlight the failure of the disciples which Luke will later report in 9:37-43. In Mark's account healing comes in as an afterthought at the point where the conduct of the mission is reported in 6:13. Luke makes this good by adding "and to heal diseases" to that for which the Twelve are empowered and authorized. This addition is grammatically awkward (cf. Fitzmyer, 753).

2 Only now does Luke tell us that the Twelve are sent by Jesus. He drops Mark's mention of pairs (as does Matthew), but will use this pairing in 10:1. Unlike Mark, Luke makes explicit at this point what the Twelve are sent to do (once again Mark leaves the reader to discover later [in v 12] that preaching [as well as healing] and not only exorcism is involved in this sending). In contrast to Mark 6:12 the content of the preaching is not repentance, but now the kingdom of God (it is likely that Luke's other source spoke about the kingdom of God [cf. Matt 10:7; Luke 10:8, 11]). This has been Luke's favored designation for the preaching of Jesus (see 8:1; etc.), and now it is this preaching which is understood to provide for the Twelve the content of their preaching. Luke uses *ἰᾶσθαι*, "to heal," regularly of Jesus' healing activity (most recently in 8:47), and in v 11 he will juxtapose this verb and "the kingdom of God" with reference to Jesus' ministry, as a reminder of the equivalence between Jesus' own ministry and that which the Twelve here undertake. Some have found difficult the fresh mention of healing here after v 1 (e.g., Fitzmyer, 753), but Luke quite reasonably separates the empowering and authorization from the actual sending.

3 Luke softens Mark's "commanded" to "said," and moves the account into direct speech. Mark's general *εἰς ὁδόν*, "on a journey," becomes *εἰς τὴν ὁδόν*, "on the journey [which they are now about to make]." Mark has staff and sandals as specifically not subject to the general directive to take nothing with them as they travel. Luke drops the mention of sandals (carrying them [presumably a second pair] will be prohibited in 10:4, and they are proscribed in Matt 10:10) and prohibits the staff (not mentioned in Luke 10, and also prohibited in Matt 10:10). He is influenced here by his second source. Such variations

demonstrate the way in which such an account straddles between reporting a unique event and providing a pattern for ongoing missionary endeavor. Luke is attempting to be more historically accurate here than Mark, because he knows he will have the opportunity to qualify the continuing relevance of the injunctions later in the Gospel (see at 22:35–38). Concerning the hermeneutical issues raised by such variations, Legard (*ITS* 16 [1979] 214–19) has a helpful discussion.

ῥάβδος, especially in company with the sandals of Mark 6:9, is likely to be a walking aid rather than a defensive weapon. πήρα could be a traveler's knapsack or a beggar's bag, and is probably the former here: this is where the bread and spare garment would have been. Luke's "silver"/"money" is up-market from Mark's "copper [money]." Luke's added ἔχειν, "to have," is difficult. Is it to be linked only with the two garments, or does it cover all the mentioned items? Does it do duty for an imperative (so: "do not have") or does it express purpose (so: "take nothing . . . so as not to have . . .")? If the link is to the garments, then it is more likely that Luke sees the second garment as a spare rather than as worn at the same time as the first (as Mark may intend).

Several suggestions have been made as to the point of these restrictions. Is the matter so urgent that there is no time to get properly equipped (contrast the standard picture of the equipped traveler in Josh 9:3–6)? The prohibitions seem to be more positively intended than this would allow. More likely and still somewhat along the same lines is the possibility that we have here a deliberately staged prophetic sign of eschatological urgency. Identification with the poor could also be involved: "Good News to the poor . . . must be so in the very way of announcing it" (Legard, *ITS* 16 [1979] 210). Or is the point to express in the conduct of the mission an utter dependence on God, so that the Twelve may discover the amazing providential care of God as they live out in this unique context the directive of 12:31 (see Schürmann, 502)? Less likely suggestions are based on the rabbinic prohibition, recorded in *b. Ber.* 9.5b, of going onto the temple mount with staff, shoes, money-belt, or dust on the feet. It is then suggested that the Twelve are engaged in a sacred undertaking (Manson, *Sayings*, 181) or are on a pilgrimage (Grundmann, *Markus*, 123). The suggestion that the knapsack and staff are prohibited to distance the Christian mission from the wandering Hellenistic philosophers of the Cynic tradition is more attractive, until we see that the distinction then becomes obscured again in 22:35–38.

4 Luke deletes Mark's fresh introduction ("and he said to them") and changes Mark's syntax, partly under the influence of his second source, but probably without significant change in meaning. Both forms of the text are obscure until illumined by 10:7: the disciples should not try to upgrade on hospitality once accepted. Traveling without means, the Twelve will be totally dependent on hospitality extended to them by people they meet on the way. No matter how humble, each such provision is God's provision for them, adequate to meet their needs.

5 Luke clarifies Mark's "whichever place" from his second source (10:10; Matt 10:11): the text is about coming and going from towns. Luke's ὅσοι ἄν, "as many as," is still under the influence of the Markan form of the text; the expression has become plural in anticipation of the population of the "town"

about to be mentioned, and now it refers to people and not to places, but it has no proper antecedent. For Luke, receiving implies hearing/listening to the message (cf. 8:13), so he dispenses with Mark's "and does not hear/listen to you." Luke uses a different prepositional prefix for the verb "to shake off," and repeats this preposition to give "from the feet" in place of Mark's "under the feet." Luke changes Mark's "witness to" to "witness upon" (*μαρτύριον ἐπὶ*; cf. 1 Thess 1:10; Acts 14:3), with no clear change of meaning.

Luke envisages a whole town making a response corporately to the message. Acts provides various examples of corporate response to the missionaries. The fuller form in 10:8-11 deals specifically with the case of a town accepting the message (conversely the parallel to v 4 allows [implicitly] for hospitality not being extended). Shaking off the dust is a fairly transparent image for separation. It probably has no relationship to the rabbinic tradition of carefully removing the dust of foreign lands before returning to the Holy Land (see at Str-B, 1:571; criticized by Cadbury, "Dust and Garments," 270-71). As emissaries of the kingdom of God, the apostles are to threaten unresponsive towns with exclusion from what God is now doing. The act is a final witness to the town of the seriousness of failing to respond to the message. We may take the account in Acts 13:50-51 as a gloss indicating the kind of thing Luke means by nonreception of the messengers.

6 Luke has spoken more expansively of the activity of the Twelve in prospect; here he is content with "announcing the good news and healing," vocabulary which at once points to the parallel with Jesus' own activity (8:1-2). Luke has only "from village to village" for the Twelve, whereas in Jesus' case the wording had been "from town to town and from village to village," but in view of the word "town" in v 5 we should not consider the difference as significant (against Grundmann, 185; cf. Schürmann, 504). The activity in 10:1 embraces towns. "Everywhere" balances "from village to village." The former applies to the "healing" and the latter to the "announcing the good news." The Twelve heal everywhere that they preach.

Explanation

From 8:1 Luke has focused his readers' attention on the fact that the Twelve are with Jesus, witnessing his exorcising, healing, and preaching of the kingdom of God; this has been a final readying for the task to which they had already been called in 5:1-6:16. While Luke is reporting here a relatively brief interlude during the ministry of Jesus (it began and ended and after it the ministry of Jesus continued), he constantly has in mind the mission of the post-Pentecost church, for which this earlier experience is foundational. We have here something of a dress rehearsal for the post-Pentecost role of the Twelve.

The Twelve have a special place in the mission of the church, but they do not have an exclusive claim upon Jesus' call to take the good news out to the ends of the earth. Luke makes this clear by reporting in 10:1-20 a second mission, conducted by others on much the same terms as the present mission. The church's need for mission continues in every generation, and in every generation these accounts inspire a fresh taking up of the missionary mandate.

Mission is carried out through emissaries of Jesus, authorized by him and bearing his power. It is, in effect, an extension of Jesus' own ministry.

The Twelve are sent out entirely without resources. It is perhaps fitting that those who come with good news for the poor should be identified with the poor by being made vulnerable in this way. Their dependence can only be on God, who will in fact come through with the hospitality they will need; they are learning on the job that "these things will be added to you" if you "seek his kingdom" (12:31).

The tension between responsible provision and trust in God alone is already evident when we turn in Luke to 22:35–38, where Jesus seems to abrogate these directives, at least somewhat. Both approaches have their place, but trust in God is much more straightforwardly exercised when the resources for life are not in our hands and must come to us from God.

V 4 is a little obscure until we compare the fuller form in 10:7. The mission is all-important. What comes to hand in the way of provision of hospitality is to be accepted as adequate for the need. It is God's provision, and a better should not be sought.

Our text thinks in terms of people making a group response to Jesus, much in the way we see repeatedly in Acts. Not every town welcomes the news of God's rule. Some will violently oppose the mission (Acts 13:50–51 gives us a good illustration of this teaching put into practice). These rejecters need to be shown graphically what they are doing to themselves in turning away the emissaries of the kingdom of God: they are separating themselves off from God's new initiative; they will be left to God's judgment. Not even the dust of their streets will move on with the plan and purpose of God.

Preaching and healing go hand in hand in the unfolding of the mission. Those who are healed experience in their own bodies the power and reality of the rule of God.

Who Then Is This? (9:7–9)

Bibliography

Blinzler, J. "Zur Syntax von Markus 6, 14–16." *Philologus* 96 (1943–44) 119–31. **Ellis, E. E.** "The Composition of Luke 9 and the Source of Its Christology." In *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Interpretation*, FS M. C. Tenney, ed. G. F. Hawthorne. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975. 120–27. **Fitzmyer, J. A.** "The Composition of Luke, Chapter 9." In *Perspectives on Luke-Acts*, ed. C. H. Talbert, 139–52. **Gils, F.** *Jésus prophète d'après les évangiles synoptiques*. 20–23. **Hoehner, H. W.** *Herod Antipas*. 184–97. **Ljungvik, H.** "Zum Markusevangelium 6, 14." *ZNW* 33 (1934) 90–92. **Schnackenburg, R.** "Die Erwartung des 'Propheten' nach dem Neuen Testament und den Qumran-Texten." *SE* 1 [TU 73] (1959) 622–39.

Translation

⁷*Herod the tetrarch heard about all the things which were happening; and he was perplexed, because it was being said by some that John had been raised from*

the dead, ⁸by others that Elijah had appeared, and others that a certain prophet of the ones from ancient times had risen. ⁹Herod said, "John I beheaded; who is this, about whom I hear such things?" So he sought to see him.

Notes

There are no important textual variants.

Form/Structure/Setting

The subsection 8:22-9:20 has a double thrust: that concerning the Twelve being with Jesus and being sent out by him has been particularly in focus in the most recent pericopes; now Luke uses this brief piece to refresh the motif introduced in the first pericope of the subsection by 8:25 ("who then is this, that he commands even the winds and the water and they obey him?"). This motif, anticipated already in 7:49 at the end of the previous section, will now be dominant to the end of the section in 9:20. The connections, already in the Markan form, between the materials of vv 7-9 (Mark 6:14-15) and vv 18-19 (Mark 8:28) will have suggested to Luke this use of vv 7-9.

Subordinately, Luke makes a second use of the pericope by appending to v 9 "and he sought to see him." With these words the reader is prepared for the role of Herod to come in 13:31-33 and 23:6-12.

Luke continues to follow the Markan sequence here, though his omission of Mark 6:17-29 and his editing of this pericope means that the material plays a considerably different role for Luke. Only Luke's Markan source is evident here, with just a slight influence from the tradition in Luke 23:6-12.

There is no clear basis for deciding what traditional material Mark had available for the formation of this pericope. For Mark it is mainly a transition piece used to introduce his account of Herod's arrest and execution of John in vv 15-29 to follow. The opinions expressed have no particular importance for Mark. Each in its own way simply underlines the fact that people found it necessary to offer some explanation for the unusual things that were happening in connection with Jesus: an ordinary man cannot do what Jesus clearly can do. In contrast to Mark 3:22 these are positive opinions of Jesus, but, nonetheless, Mark treats them as wrong opinions about him.

There does not seem to be any other instance in Jewish or Hellenistic sources of a belief that being raised from the dead can confer supernatural powers (cf. Goguel, *Life*, 352; Taylor, *Mark*, 309). It is, however, not intrinsically an unlikely idea to be found in the popular imagination. More difficult is the particular equation of John and Jesus. It is true that the ministry of the one only really got under way after the other was off the scene, but if both figures became as widely known as the tradition suggests, then we would need to invoke the idea of a return in another form (cf. Mark 16:12) to allow for any wide currency for such a view. The return of Elijah poses no difficulty. "A prophet like one of the prophets" (Moses, Elijah, Elisha) is also without problems. But if with D it should read in Mark simply "one of the prophets," as Luke in effect does and as finds support in Mark 8:28, then this becomes a more difficult view (but in a vision, Jeremiah is a helper in 2 Macc 15:11-16, and he and Isaiah are to be sent to help in 4 Ezra 2.18). Herod may have

been influenced by the popular views (and a bad conscience?); it is also possible that removed from its present context the view expressed means only that no sooner had he executed John than John's place as a disturber of the peace had been taken by this newcomer.

Popular opinions of Jesus must have existed, and some will have been remembered, but it is difficult to find a specific setting for the formal oral transmission of such materials.

Luke follows the general Markan ordering of the material. He introduces, however, a distinction between Herod's hearing about the events pertaining to Jesus and his being told the various popular opinions about Jesus. And most importantly, he unifies the Markan materials by introducing in v 7 the idea of Herod's perplexity about Jesus' identity, which he then uses to control the unfolding of the pericope. Herod's comment, which in Mark is the expression of Herod's own opinion chosen out of the popular set, now becomes a reference back to those opinions followed by a direct statement of his own continuing uncertainty. Luke provides resolution for the pericope by adding the statement of Herod's desire to see Jesus (in order to resolve his uncertainty about Jesus' identity). Finally, Luke somewhat standardizes the way in which the three opinions are introduced (a single verb of saying followed by "by certain ones . . . by certain ones . . . and [by] others").

Comment

Luke treats as especially significant keys to the identity of Jesus the stilling of the storm (8:22–25; see *Comment* above on v 25) and the feeding of the five thousand (9:12–17; Luke does not repeat Mark 8:14–21, but he is guided by it in the sequencing of 9:12–17, 18–20). To these the Twelve have an insiders' access not granted to Herod or to the masses. In the subsection 8:22–9:20 the question of Jesus' identity begins as a question of the Twelve (8:25) and reaches its (initial) resolution for the Twelve (9:20). Herod never successfully resolves his question (see further at 23:6–12), but the present pericope refocuses attention on this question, which is the question above all other questions.

7 Luke corrects Mark's "King Herod" to "Herod the tetrarch": this Herod never had rights to the royal title (see further at 3:1). Luke drops Mark's "his [i.e., Jesus'] name had become known" and in compensation expands Mark's vague "heard" with *τὰ γινόμενα*, "all the things which were happening." This allows for a smoother transition from the mission of the Twelve, because it can embrace also this manifestation of the "Jesus movement." (In 24:18 *τὰ γενόμενα*, "the things that have happened," sums up the totality of Jesus' ministry, death, and [reported] resurrection, with a focus on the climax in Jerusalem.) Luke derives his "he was greatly perplexed" (*διηπόρει*) from Mark 6:20 ("he was perplexed" [*ἠπόρει*]). (See Schürmann, 509, for other indications that Luke had access to Mark 6:17–29.) But he links it to opinions about Jesus rather than to the quandary Herod was in about dealing with John the Baptist. Luke may have omitted Mark's "and because of this these miraculous powers are at work in him" with the sequence from 9:1–6 still in mind. It is also the only opinion graced with an explanatory clause and may have been

deleted in Luke's tidying up of the structure (see *Form/Structure/Setting* above). Despite the omission, the idea that this new "John" is all the more extraordinary for having come back from the realms beyond death is probably to be carried over into the Lukan text. For Luke this identification with John highlights the connections between John and Jesus (see the section 7:1–50, and esp. vv 29–30, 31–35). Only in this incidental way do we learn in Luke of the death of John (Herod's role is identified in stark terms in v 9).

8 Luke's "Elijah has appeared" alludes to the expectation of a coming of Elijah (Mal 3:21 cf. v 1; Sir 48:10). Elijah does make an appearance in quite another way in v 30. This view connects Jesus with current eschatological hopes. Luke aligns the third opinion with the other two and makes it too a view that Jesus is one who has returned from the realm of the beyond. There is just a slight possibility that the Qumran community expected their own Teacher of Righteousness to make such a return (Schnackenburg, *SE* 1 [1959] 633–36). Otherwise there is only a small amount of evidence for such beliefs (see above in *Form/Structure/Setting*).

9 Where Mark's Herod takes up the first of the listed opinions, Luke's alludes to the first with a (dismissive?) "John I beheaded," and proceeds to express his own continuing perplexity about Jesus' identity. He will try to see Jesus to make up his own mind.

Explanation

The healing of the Gerasene demoniac (8:26–39) and the restoration of the woman with the flow of blood and Jairus' daughter (8:40–56) have prepared the Twelve by example for their mission in 9:1–6; but their being with Jesus (8:1) has its greater culmination in their realizing the true identity of Jesus in 9:20. This episode brings that question back sharply into focus: "Who then is this, concerning whom I hear such things?"

Herod can ask the question and the people can express their opinions, but only the Twelve are close enough to such crucial events as the stilling of the storm (8:22–25) and the feeding of the five thousand (9:10–17) to be able to come to the conviction that this Jesus is none other than the very Christ of God (9:20).

Word reaches Herod of all that is happening in connection with Jesus, and so do the various opinions about Jesus that were going the rounds. A similarity between John and Jesus was evident to people. The suggestion that John had been raised from the dead both "brings him back" and allows for him to be that much more a larger-than-life figure than was John: he comes back with something of the mystery of the realm of the dead still clinging to him.

Elijah was expected to appear in connection with the end times (Mal 3:1; 4:5). But in Luke's account, while both John and Jesus are Elijah-like figures, Elijah makes an appearance only in 9:30.

In Jewish tradition there was some expectation that other prophets, notably Isaiah and Jeremiah, might be sent again to the aid of this world. Each of the popular opinions connects Jesus with the realm beyond and links him to prophetic tradition. While Luke takes them all to be wrong, they all have elements of genuine insight into Jesus' nature and identity.

Luke's Herod is rather less confident than Mark's about the possibility of resurrections from the dead. He comments on the popular opinions only to the extent of implicating himself in the death of John. For him the question of the identity of Jesus remains unresolved. He wants to see for himself. Though he eventually does see for himself, his question remains unanswered (23:6–12). Herod lacks the disciples' privileged observation point, and in any case he is not open to the true answer to his own question.

Feeding the Multitudes (9:10–17)

Bibliography

- Becker, U.** *Wundergeschichten*, ed. U. Becker and S. Wibbing. Handbücherei für den Religionsunterricht 2. Gütersloh: Gütersloher, 1965. 55–74. **Boobyer, G. H.** "The Eucharistic Interpretation of the Miracles of the Loaves in St. Mark's Gospel." *JTS* (1952) 161–71. ———. "The Miracles of the Loaves and the Gentiles in St. Mark's Gospel." *SJT* 6 (1953) 77–87. **Brock, S. P.** "A Note on Luke IX. 16 (D)." *JTS* 14 (1963) 391–93. **Buse, I.** "The Gospel Accounts of the Feeding of the Multitudes." *ExpTim* 74 (1962–63) 167–70. **Cangh, J.-M. van.** "Le thème des poissons dans les récits évangéliques de la multiplication des pains." *RB* 78 (1971) 71–83. **Cerfaux, L.** "La section des pains (Mc VI,31–VIII,26; Mt XIV,13–XVI,12)." In *Synoptische Studien*, FS A. Wikenhauser, ed. J. Schmid and A. Vögtle. Munich: K. Zink, 1953. 64–77. **Clavier, H.** "La multiplication des pains dans le ministère de Jésus." *SE* 1 [TU 73] (1959) 441–57. **Denis, A.-M.** "La section des pains selon S. Marc (6,30–8,26), une théologie de l'Eucharistie." *SE* 4 [TU 102] (1968) 171–79. **Derrett, J. D. M.** "Leek-beds and Methodology." *BZ* 19 (1975) 101–3. **Farrar, A. M.** "Loaves and Thousands." *JTS* 4 (1953) 1–14. **Friedrich, G.** "Die beiden Erzählungen von der Speisung in Mark, 6,31–44; 8,1–9." *TZ* 20 (1964) 10–22. **Hebert, G. H.** "History in the Feeding of the Five Thousand." *SE* 2 [TU 87] (1964) 65–72. **Heising, A.** *Die Botschaft der Brotvermehrung: Zur Geschichte und Bedeutung eines Christusbekenntnisses im Neuen Testament*. SBS 15. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1966. ———. "Exegese und Theologie der alt- und neutestamentlichen Speisewunder." *ZKT* 86 (1964) 80–96. **Hiers, R. H., and Kennedy, C. A.** "The Bread and Fish Eucharist in the Gospels and Early Christian Art." *PRS* 3 (1976) 20–47. **Iersel, B. M. F. van.** "Die wunderbare Speisung und das Abendmahl in der synoptischen Tradition." *NovT* 7 (1964) 167–94. **Jenkins, L. H.** "A Markan Doublet." In *Studies in History and Religion*, FS H. W. Robinson, ed. E. A. Payne. London: Lutterworth, 1942. 87–111. **Kertelge, K.** *Die Wunder Jesu*. 129–45. **Knackstedt, J.** "Die beiden Brotvermehrungen im Evangelium." *NTS* 10 (1963–64) 309–35. **Lester-Garland, L. V.** "The Feeding of the Five Thousand." *Theology* 36 (1938) 87–92. **Montefiore, H. W.** "Revolt in the Desert? (Mark IV.30 ff.)." *NTS* 8 (1961–62) 135–41. **Neirynck, F.** "The Matthew-Luke Agreements in Mt 14,13–14/Lk 9,10–11 (par. Mk 6,30–34): The Two-Source Theory beyond the Impasse." *ETL* 60 (1984) 25–44. **Pettem, M.** "Le premier récit de la multiplication des pains et le problème synoptique." *SR* 14 (1985) 73–83. **Potterrie, I. de la.** "Le sens primitif de la multiplication des pains." In *Jésus aux origines de la christologie*, ed. J. Dupont et al. BETL 40. Gembloux: Duculot, 1975. 303–29. **Richardson, A.** "The Feeding of the Five Thousand." *Int* 9 (1955) 144–49. **Robinson, D. F.** "The Parable of the Loaves." *ATR* 39 (1957) 107–15. **Schenke, L.** *Die wunderbare Brotvermehrung: Die neutestamentlichen Erzählungen und ihre Bedeutung*. Würzburg: Echter, 1983. **Shaw, A.** "The Markan

Feeding Narratives. *CQR* 162 (1961) 268–78. **Stauffer, E.** “Zum apokalyptischen Festmahl in Mc 6, 34 ff.” *ZNW* 46 (1955) 264–66. **Stegner, W. R.** “Lukan Priority in the Feeding of the Five Thousand.” *BR* 21 (1976) 19–28. **Wanke, J.** *Beobachtungen zum Eucharistieverständnis des Lukas auf Grund der lukanischen Mahlberichte*. ETS 8. Leipzig: St. Benno, 1973. 45–54. **Ziener, G.** “Die Brotwunder im Markusevangelium.” *BZ* 4 (1960) 282–85.

Translation

¹⁰When the apostles returned they related to Jesus^a all they had done; and Jesus^a took them [with him]^b and retreated privately to a town called Bethsaida.^c ¹¹The crowds, realizing^d [what he was doing],^e followed him. So Jesus^a welcomed them and spoke to them concerning the kingdom of God and healed those who had need of healing.^f ¹²Now the day began to wear away, and the Twelve came and said to him, “Dismiss the crowd,^g so that they may go into the villages and the farms^h around about and get a place to rest and find provisions, because we are in a wilderness place here.” ¹³He said to them, “Youⁱ give them something to eat.” They said, “We have no more than five loaves and two fish, unless we go and buy food for all this People.” ¹⁴For there were about five thousand men. He said to his disciples, “Sit them down in groups of about fifty each.” ¹⁵So they did so and sat them all down. ¹⁶He took the five loaves and the two fish, and looking up to heaven,^j he said the blessing over them and broke [them] and gave [them]^k to the disciples to distribute to the crowd. ¹⁷They ate and all were satisfied. What remained over to them was taken up: twelve baskets of fragments.

Notes

^aThe name “Jesus” is not expressed in the Greek text.

^b“With him” is added for sense.

^cThe scribes were conscious of the difficulties created by reading “Bethsaida” here. *εἰς τόπον ἐρημον*, “to a wilderness place,” is read by *℣*2* (1241) *sy^c* *bo^{ms}* etc. Many texts have some combination of the two readings (A C W *Ξ^{ms}* Θ *r*¹ etc.). D has *κώμην λεγομένην Βηθσαιδα* (“a village called Bethsaida” [a different verb for “called” is used]).

^dLit., “knowing.”

^eSupplied to complete the sense.

^fD adds *αὐτοῦ πάντας* (“his [healing],” “all”).

^gThe plural is read here by *℣⁷⁵* *℣²* 28 565 *lat* etc. (perhaps to agree with Matthew or more likely to agree with the other plural uses in Luke’s narrative).

^hLit., “fields.”

ⁱMost texts conform the word order here to the Markan, in which the “you” is not quite as emphatic.

^jD adds “prayed and” and thus a note that is conspicuously absent in accounts of Jesus’ miracles.

^kAdded for sense.

Form/Structure/Setting

Lukan omissions of Markan material cause the feeding episode to be framed by the question of Herod (vv 7–9) and the answer of Peter (vv 18–20). In this way the feeding becomes in a special way the key to Jesus’ identity. (In this Luke is following a Markan impulse, which in Mark is especially evident in 8:14–21 and 6:45–52, part of the block of materials that Luke passes over in the “great omission” of Mark 6:45–8:26.) In the larger setting, the feeding now provides the culminating basis for the disciples to be able to formulate

an answer to the question they themselves have put in 8:25: provoked to the question by the stilling of the storm, they are to be brought to the answer by the experience of the feeding of the five thousand.

There is no strong basis for thinking that Luke had a second source beyond his Markan source, but a series of overlapping minor agreements between Matthew, Luke, and John suggest that (oral) tradition variants may have had some influence on the form of the narrative (see Schramm, *Markus-Stoff*, 129–30; and cf. Buse, *ExpTim* 74 [1962–63] 167–69; against Stegner, *BR* 21 [1976] 19–28, who uses these agreements to argue for Lukan priority).

Luke has only one of the two feeding narratives reported by Mark (6:32–44; 8:1–10). Scholarship is almost unanimous that these two are variants of a single report. The general similarity of the accounts and the psychological difficulty of having disciples address the question of 8:4 after the experience of 6:32–44 are the main bases for this confident judgment. Knackstedt (*NTS* 10 [1963–74] 309–35) has, however, argued for two separate underlying episodes. He points to the use in Mark 8:1–10 of a number of words that are rare or used only here in the NT. This suggests that the accounts came to Mark as separate traditions, but takes us no further back. He also points to the parallel with the disciples' lack of perception in connection with the passion predictions (Gould, *Mark*, 142, had earlier suggested that Mark 8:4 was intruded into the second feeding account from the first; one could go further and attribute this intrusion to Mark on the basis of his interest in highlighting the disciples' uncomprehending response to Jesus). Given the degree of symbolism in the accounts, it may not be possible to come to a clear decision about whether the two accounts have ultimately a separate origin. In any case, a separate origin only has any kind of sense if the question of fundamental historicity is to be answered positively.

A range of views has been taken as to what kind of actual event might lie behind such an account. H. E. G. Paulus considered that Jesus had shared with the disciples his own meager supplies and so provided for the rich an example of hospitality (the view sits very loosely to the text and has had no continuing influence). Strauss objected that the text was inescapably concerned with the miraculous and should rather be understood in the light of the exodus feeding and that by Elisha in 2 Kgs 4:42–44 as a “mythological deduction”—that is, as an expression of early Christian ideas in the guise of a narration of events (this in outline is not far from many present scholarly views, but where modern views focus on Christology, eschatology, and sacramental theology, Strauss saw the early Christians as promoting an understanding of humanity).

C. H. Weisse, on the basis of the symbolic use of bread language in Matt 16:11, argues that the basis of the account is a parable of Jesus (the suggestion has nothing to commend it). J. Weiss (*Schriften* 1:131) is guilty of reductionism when he transmutes the event into a festive meal at which Jesus presided. Wellhausen (*Marci*, 50) deserves the same comment for his restriction of the event to the sharing with a small crowd of food brought for Jesus and his disciples. A. Schweitzer considered that the meal was from the beginning a sacramental meal, designed not to satisfy hunger (the statement that all were sated is the one piece of the account which is not historical), but rather to consecrate those who participated in it to be future participants in the coming

messianic banquet (this interpretation of the account, if not Schweitzer's reconstruction of the historical basis, continues to have a good deal of support; Stauffer, *ZNW* 46 [1955] 264-66, takes up Schweitzer's view in the form of a Passover meal celebrated by Jesus in Galilee in A.D. 31). Montefiore (*NTS* 8 [1961-62] 135-41), clearly influenced by the Johannine account (John 6:15), believed that Jesus came to the brink of leading an uprising in the desert on this occasion and that the men had gathered to foment revolt, not to listen to the teaching of Jesus (while Montefiore can point to details in the account which work well for his hypothesis, he does in the end entirely denature the story as told).

Heising (*Brotvermehrung*, 56 n. 71) helpfully lists the main views and may be consulted for bibliographical details not supplied above.

If there is anything of a more recent consensus, it is that the symbolism of the account and the degree to which it is concerned to affirm the present significance of Jesus are such that the tradition can actually provide no usable evidence as to what, if any, event in the life of Jesus lies behind the present narrative (e.g., Schürmann, 524; Schenke, *Brotvermehrung*, 90; Heising, *Brotvermehrung*, 56). Schürmann, 525, buttresses this view by maintaining that the difficulties posed for any attempt at an imaginative reconstruction of such an event would have been as obvious to the evangelists as to us, and that this shows that they did not understand the story in concrete terms, any more than we should so understand it. (Where could the five thousand have come from? How would the Twelve have managed to get the crowd so arranged? How much time would it have taken to distribute so much food? Could all this have been done in an evening? How many tons of bread would have been needed? How did they get the scraps from among the people?)

These questions, while certainly posing problems, are, however, not so difficult as Schürmann thinks. The accounts have not the slightest interest in answering them, but each could be provided with an adequate, even if quite speculative, answer. While it is quite true that the narratives are not at all interested in getting the details of the historical event as accurate as possible, it is only the aftereffects of Christian views one-sidedly dominated by existentialism that so easily allow for a radical disjunction between early Christian conviction about the present significance of Jesus for faith and their belief that in his lifetime he performed wonders that went beyond normal possibilities and expectations. No doubt we need to allow generously for the symbolism of the account and for that reason can no longer ascertain exactly what might have happened, but the core content of a feeding of a large number of people by Jesus with a very small quantity of food should not be understood to have been spun out of the symbolism or to be merely a vehicle for the expression of the early church's understanding of the significance of Jesus.

It is altogether more difficult to decide what significance such a feeding might have had for Jesus, for the disciples, or for the crowd. There is much that is quite attractive about suggestions of an anticipatory celebration of the messianic banquet, and one would like to correlate the feeding with the general eschatological tone of Jesus' ministry. The synoptic accounts do, however, emphasize the ad hoc nature of the occasion, and perhaps the only firm connection with the kingdom of God that should be drawn is that it involves miraculous and abundant provision for people's needs.

The present form of the feeding narratives is clearly influenced (Luke 9:16) by the Last Supper narrative tradition and early church eucharistic practice. (Boobyer, *JTS* 3 [1952] 161–71, has argued that this is not so, on the basis that all the elements are part of normal Jewish meal patterns and also are to be found in the meal of Acts 27:35, which is clearly not eucharistic; but that meal is, in Luke's structure, a quite deliberate parallel to the Last Supper of the Gospel, and while Boobyer is quite right to identify the individual elements as part of Jewish practice, he cannot point to any Jewish text that assembles these elements into an actual account of a meal. For a Jewish meal they would be assumed; here they are reported because they parallel eucharistic practice.)

Van Iersel (*NovT* 7 [1964] 167–94) has argued that the awkward structure of Mark 6:41 (specifically the way in which the “and he shared out the two fish among [them] all” at the end seems to be tacked on as an afterthought—Luke and Matthew both drop it) points to the eucharistic interpretation being an addition to the text that originally ran “and taking the five loaves and two fish he shared [them] out among [them] all.” Originally there was simply a miracle story patterned on 2 Kgs 4:42–44.

Though some awkwardness of Mark 6:41 is not to be denied, there are difficulties in the way of van Iersel's explanation. (i) The “insertion” includes the mediating service of the disciples, which is a motif from 2 Kgs 4:42–44; (ii) the looking up into heaven is not part of any of the early eucharistic forms; (iii) v 43 also has an awkward placing of the mention of the fish (considerably more difficult than that in v 41), and this cannot be explained in any parallel manner (see especially Kertelge, *Wunder Jesu*, 136).

The text of Mark 6:41 evidently intends ἐμέρισεν, “he divided/shared out/distributed,” to cover for the fish a procedure that parallels that which has been spelled out for the bread (that is, it covers “broke,” “gave,” and “place before”). This is not unlike the ὡσαύτως, “in the same way,” of the 1 Cor 11:25 Last Supper narrative (cf. the claim of Hiers and Kennedy, *PRS* 3 [1976] 32, that “structurally, in the Markan feedings fish have the same function that wine has in the Last Supper”). The eucharistic illusion would seem to have always been a feature of the account; the awkwardness simply reflects the fact that one does not break fish as one does bread and perhaps flows also from a desire not to detract from the eucharistic focus by supplying an elaboration for the fish which would find no parallel in the eucharistic tradition.

Does the awkwardness in v 43 require further explanation? Kertelge (*Wunder Jesu*, 136) thinks it is a piece of later interference with the text of Mark (therefore not known by Matthew and Luke). Van Cangh (*RB* 78 [1971] 72, 80–81) argues that it is (pre-)Markan editing to (once again) put the accent on the miracle of the feeding (after the displacement of accent to eucharistic concerns). Van Cangh tells us that this development was encouraged by the tradition that at the messianic banquet the flesh of Leviathan would be distributed to the elect and also by the traditions that expected a heightened reiteration of the exodus in the eschatological period (some of these traditions made a connection between the quail provided in the wilderness and the fish of Egypt).

Kertelge's explanation of the failure of Matthew and Luke to reproduce Mark's reference to the fish seems less likely than the alternative that Matthew and Luke simply wanted to spare their readers the evident awkwardness of the Markan text. Van Cangh's suggestion needs to be subdivided into a view

on the symbolic significance of the fish (this will be discussed in *Comment* below) and a view on the development of the Markan text form. In this latter aspect, van Canghai seems to be making altogether too much of four words that seem simply to want to say that fish was left over as well as bread.

The sentence does appear to have been originally formulated without reference to the fish. The addition completes the broad logic of the account with its emphasis on an overabundant provision. Abundant provision would hardly be recognized if the (more costly) fish was only just sufficient and people had had in effect to fill up on bread.

It is difficult to be sure what of Mark 6:30–33 was already attached to the feeding account when it reached Mark, and whether attached or not, what of it came to Mark from the tradition. V 30 only completes the logic of the mission and requires no separate traditional basis; the note of excessive busyness is prepared for in Mark by 3:20, which may be the basis in tradition for the present motif; the invitation to a wilderness retreat is less likely to be solely Markan (but cf. 1:35, 45 for the same expression, and the evident redactional interest of Mark). The explanation for the coming together of the crowd raises more questions than it answers. Mark is presumably saying that Jesus and the apostles had tried to make an unnoticed departure. Not only, however, had they been seen leaving, but seen by many who knew who they were. These ascertained the destination of the boat (contracted for the occasion or on a regular route?) and found for some reason that they could get there more quickly on foot than the boat could. (The coming from the *towns* is left entirely unmotivated by Mark.) Comparison with 1:37 is invited, but the very difficulties probably suggest that there is some traditional basis.

The place of Mark 5:34 in the tradition has also been questioned. Kertelge (*Wunder Jesu*, 130) points to Mark's propensity for speaking of Jesus as teaching in texts where no teaching content is identified and concludes that Mark is responsible here for this motif. If that is correct, then it becomes difficult to deny to the earlier tradition the remainder of the verse (as, e.g., Bultmann, *Synoptic Tradition*, 217).

Bultmann's categorization of the narrative as having the form of a miracle account (*Synoptic Tradition*, 217) has not generally been found convincing but (cf. Fitzmyer, 763), nor Dibelius' categorization as a "tale" (*Tradition*, 71, 73, 75, etc.). Heising (*Brotvermehrung*, 20, 51) argues for kerygmatic miracle story and suggests that the story functions as an attestation wonder for Jesus as the new Moses of the eschatological period. This does better justice to the deeply theological nature of the account, but it involves overinterpretation and does not really escape the difficulties of the miracle-account view. Since it only really makes sense to speak of a form in cases where a number of items of the tradition share the features of the form, it may be better here to be content with inquiring rather into what may have been the context of use for which such an account could have been formulated. Answers here focus, with good reason, on the potential usefulness of such an account at the eucharistic fellowship meal of the early church (cf. Schürmann, 524; Schenke, *Brotvermehrung*, 114–16; Heising, *Brotvermehrung*, 64; Kertelge, *Wunder Jesu*, 136).

Luke follows the main sweep of the Markan structuring of the account. He keeps the link between the mission of the Twelve and the feeding account,

but since he drops Mark 6:31, the relationship is no longer based on the disciples' need for recuperation after the efforts of the mission. The withdrawal motif remains (cf. 5:16), but now alongside this (this motif is in effect delayed for 9:18–20) and perhaps more prominent because of the Lukan deletion, the connection is that Jesus is taking the Twelve with him into the next situation in which they will be called upon to act: they have been sent out to deal with people and have received from them hospitality; now they are to be confronted with people who have taken the initiative to come and will be challenged to extend hospitality.

Jesus welcomes the uninvited crowd and preaches the kingdom of God to them and heals the sick, just as he had sent the Twelve to do in 9:2 (Luke prefers this to Mark's much more Christologically focused v 34).

As the day spent in such activity stretches on, the disciples anticipate a crisis: hungry people too long without food and too far away from resources adequate for such a huge number. Their proposal that Jesus send the crowd off to fend for themselves is countered by Jesus' own proposal that they, the disciples, should feed the crowds. Luke does some reorganizing in the continuing dialogue between Jesus and the disciples: the perhaps disrespectful suggestion of Mark 6:37b disappears, to be used in a different way in v 13b; with it goes the investigation into how much food is available (Luke keeps only the quantities, which he makes use of in his reformulation in v 13b). Luke's disciples respond to Jesus' suggestion by pointing out how little food they have unless they go off and purchase for the crowd: "How are we to do what you have asked us to do?" Luke underlines the difficulties by bringing forward from its late position in the Markan account (6:44) the reference to the size of the crowd.

Instead of directly answering the implied question, Jesus gives directions for the disciples to organize the people for a meal. He then handles the food in a manner evocative of the Last Supper and therefore of eucharistic practice. (Luke handles differently from Mark the difficulty of paralleling the bread and the fish: he drops separate description of the distribution of the fish and of the fragments left over; at the same time he adds "them" to Mark's "blessed," probably intending that the following language, despite being better suited to the bread, should, nevertheless, be applied equally to the fish.) The role of the disciples in feeding the people turns out to be (i) organizing them for the meal and (ii) receiving the food from the hands of Jesus to distribute to the people.

All were satisfied and twelve baskets of fragments were gathered up.

Comment

Luke stresses the Christological importance of the feeding by means of the pericopes that frame it (vv 7–9, 18–20), which are artistically paralleled and focused on the putting and answering of the question, "Who is Jesus?" Jesus can be recognized in the breaking of the bread (Luke 24:30–31; cf. Schenke, *Brotvermehrung*, 164). Thus far in this section (8:1–9:20) the disciples have observed Jesus preaching the kingdom (esp. 8:4–21) and bringing restoration (esp. 8:26–56), or they have themselves, as authorized and empowered by Jesus, preached the kingdom and brought restoration to the sick and demon-

possessed (9:1–6). Only in this distinctive “joint activity” of feeding the multitude does it become dramatically clear how immediately dependent on Jesus the disciples are as they seek to act on his behalf and to do his bidding.

10 Luke is particularly partial to the verb *ὑποστρέφειν*, “to return,” which he uses in place of Mark’s *συνάγεσθαι*, “to gather together.” *δηγείσθαι*, “to relate/narrate,” replaces *ἀπαγγέλλειν*, “to announce,” as in 8:39. Luke abbreviates Mark by deleting “to Jesus,” an “all,” and “and what they had taught.” Luke is concerned only to round off the mission account, to have the Twelve back with Jesus, and to allow for a link between their mission and a new activity which Jesus will now call on them to perform. Mark 6:31 is dropped completely (see comment above in *Form/Structure/Setting*). On “apostles” see at 6:12–16.

Only *κατ’ ἰδίαν*, “alone,” survives of Mark 6:32 (no boat journey or wilderness place). The main thrust of its Markan purpose is represented by Luke’s use of *ὑπεχώρησεν* (“retreat/withdraw”; Matthew here has the related *ἀνεχώρησεν*, “go away/withdraw/retire/take refuge”) and is carried forward in v 18 (cf. 5:16). In the immediate context the privacy is only a foil for the arrival of the huge crowd. Jesus’ “taking [the disciples] along” is in anticipation of later putting them to work, but perhaps already also a preparation for their role in vv 18–20.

No really satisfactory explanation has yet been offered for Luke’s relocation of the feeding to Bethsaida. In Mark, Bethsaida is the boat’s next intended port of call (6:45; and cf. 8:22). Streeter (*Four Gospels*, 176) suggests that Luke makes a deduction from Mark 6:45 that Bethsaida was near where the feeding had taken place. Conzelmann (*Luke*, 55) tentatively suggested that the relocation lays the foundation for 10:13, and this has persuaded Schürmann, 512, for whom the healings of v 11 then become those implied by 10:13 (there is some tension in Schürmann’s view, since he also has Luke assume that Jesus was at that point unknown in Bethsaida, which suggests that the crowds are from elsewhere). Bethsaida was just inside Gaulanitis, and so would marginally qualify as being “opposite Galilee,” as was the district of the Gerasenes in 8:26. Luke should not be criticized for not saying so (as, e.g., Schürmann, 512), since he (quite rightly) thinks of Bethsaida as part of Jewish Palestine (cf. John 1:44; 12:21; there was some ancient tendency even to think of it as part of Galilee: John 12:21; Josephus, *Ant.* 18.23 cf. 18.4). Whatever Luke’s reason, the change of location has produced difficulties for his own account: getting food would presumably be much less of a problem in a town, but the suggestion in v 12 is to scatter the crowd through the countryside; that verse describes the location as a wilderness place (in language that seems to reflect an influence from the wording of the displaced Markan location).

11 Luke totally reformulates here. He thinks in terms of the crowds that have been with Jesus since 8:4 (most recently 8:42, 45). The intrusiveness of the crowd has some parallel in 4:42. Without Mark’s boat journey they can only follow Jesus (Matthew has identically, but not in the same word order “the crowds followed him”), who arrives, therefore, before them and consequently is there to welcome them (“as a friendly head of a household who extends hospitality” [Schenke, *Brotvermehrung*, 166]). Luke makes no use of Mark’s statement of Jesus’ compassion nor of the linked likening of the crowd

to sheep without a shepherd (6:34). As Schürmann, 513, notes, Luke also loses a series of possible allusions in the continuing Markan text to Ps 23. Luke prefers, with his distinctive focus here on speaking about the kingdom of God and healing (Mark has a healing in Bethsaida in 8:22–26), to establish continuity with the central motif for this section (see 8:1) and to underline the continuity between Jesus' ministry and that of the Twelve (see 9:2). Luke will concentrate the Christological focus of the pericope onto the feeding itself, and in particular onto its eucharistic connections. The imperfect form of the verbs for speaking and healing may point to the extended and intermingled carrying out of the teaching and healing.

12 Luke changes the Markan time expression to *ἡ δὲ ἡμέρα ἤρξατο κλίνειν* (lit., “the day had begun to decline”). When the day had fully “declined,” the people would need overnight hospitality and an evening meal (see 24:29–30, where Luke uses the same idiom). Luke uses “the Twelve” for Mark’s “the disciples,” probably in the interests of the link with 9:1 (and behind that 8:1). Luke saves for the end (in a slightly different form) the introductory part of Mark’s form of the disciples’ words: “This place is a wilderness and already the hour is late.” Mark’s “dismiss them” becomes the more specific “dismiss the crowd” (here singular, but it is extravagant [as Wanke, *Eucharistieverständnis*, 51] to make this a pointer to Jesus’ activity having formed this loose assembly into a community). To express coming and going, Luke prefers *πορεύεσθαι* and its compounds to Mark’s uses of *έρχεσθαι* and its compounds (cf. Neirynck, *Minor Agreements*, 256). Luke inverts Mark’s order in the mention of villages and fields, probably because he thinks of the farms attached to each village (cf. 8:34). Luke adds what is most easily taken as the need for overnight hospitality (cf. 24:29). Only he in the NT uses the verb found here to mean “to stay/rest/find a place of lodging” (*καταλθεῖν*, here and 19:7). Possibly here, because any idea of overnight hospitality needs has no further place in the unfolding of the account, the verb only means to find a place to stay for a rest and a meal. Vv 14–17 would then be seen as meeting this need fully. Luke may, indeed, be trading on the ambiguity of the word for the sake of the link with 24:29–31. Commentators point out that it would be difficult (to call it impossible is to judge too much from a modern Western culture) for the surrounding villages to extend hospitality on such a scale. Unlike Mark, Luke restricts the language of buying to his (deferred) mention of the impracticality of the disciples so doing for the needs of such a huge crowd. His euphemism “find” is probably more polite than Mark’s “buy,” and his “provisions” is certainly more sophisticated than Mark’s “something to eat.”

13 As he frequently does, Luke drops Mark’s *ἀποκριθεῖς*, “having answered”; the use of *πρός* in “said to” is also characteristically Lukan. Mark’s already emphatic “you” gains an even more emphatic position. Luke reorganizes and abbreviates the Markan pattern of interchange between Jesus and the disciples: sending the disciples off to see how much bread there is detracts from one’s seeing of Jesus as totally controlling the situation; the Markan form of the suggestion that the disciples themselves buy bread for the crowd can easily be read as sarcasm on their part (see further above at the end of *Form/Structure/Setting*). Luke drops Mark’s two hundred denarii (does he realize that it would not be nearly enough, or is it rather that it belongs to the sarcasm Luke has

wanted to avoid?). There are a number of similarities in Matthew's editing here.

"You give them something to eat" is the first of a series of links between this feeding account and 2 Kgs 4:42–44 where Elisha feeds one hundred men with an inadequate supply of bread and has some left over. See Heising, *Brotvermehrung*, 19–38, for an overelaborate interpretation of this link. Heising is probably correct, however, to see that account as something of a repetition or reactualization of God's promise and provision of food in the wilderness. But since Luke reduces the possible Moses connections of the account, this fact probably plays no part in Luke's understanding of the episode (against Schürmann, 520). Jesus challenges the disciples to return the favor of hospitality which has recently been extended to them while on their mission, but they do not know how to. Jesus is to show them how.

There has been extensive discussion of the significance of the fish in the feeding account (see especially Hiers and Kennedy, *PRS* 3[1976] 20–47; van Canghai, *RB* 78 [1971] 71–83). As discussed above, the prominence of the fish in the telling seems to have variously increased and decreased in the history of the transmission of the account.

Fish can be tenuously connected with the tradition of the exodus feeding with manna and quail (Exod 16; Num 11). The Israelites' desire for the fish of Egypt provoked the sending of the substitute, quail meat (Num 11:4–5, and cf. v 22). An overliteral reading of Num 11:31 ("quail from the sea") produced speculation about the marine origin of these quail (Wis 19:10–12). *Sipre Num.* 11:22 even has fish coming from the rock that accompanied the Israelites in the desert and from which the water flowed. Fish can also be connected with the eschatological banquet via the expectation of eating the flesh of Leviathan, or even perhaps of the two Leviathans (2 *Apoc. Bar.* 29.3–8; 4 *Ezra* 6.49–52; *b. B. Bat.* 74b–75a). A connection with any of these traditions is rather tenuous for any of the Gospel accounts and especially so for the Lukan text. Rather more likely is a connection between these traditions and the role of the fish in early Christian eucharistic art.

14–15 Luke brings forward Mark's statement about the size of the crowd (and makes the count approximate, as does Matthew). Here it underlines the impracticality of the only way forward that the disciples can suggest. Having displaced "the disciples" from v 12 with "the Twelve," Luke now adds Mark's mode of reference. Mark's "them" was the crowd, who are seated by Jesus, but Luke is intent on following through on the initiative to be taken by the disciples in the feeding of the crowd: it is now the disciples who must seat the crowd. Luke softens Mark's "commanded" to "said," as part of a change from indirect to direct speech. He simplifies Mark's seating arrangements and places them all in the directive, rather than leaving details of the directive to be discovered only in the description of its execution. Luke's verb for "sit [them] down" (*κατακλίνειν*) is used only in Luke in the NT. It literally means "cause to lie down," with reference to the reclining posture used in festive meals with guests; something of this sense may be intended in the Lukan text, but we cannot be sure because such words gradually gained a wider currency and were applied to all kinds of sitting at all kinds of meals. His word for "groups" (*κλωσίας*) is found only here in the NT: it is used of groups

gathered specifically for a meal (BAGD, 436). It is doubtful whether Luke sees any symbolic significance in the meal arrangements: the disciples are serving the needs of the people as Jesus directs them; the people's hospitality needs of refreshment and nourishment are to be met.

16 Luke is here much more conservative in his redaction than at any other point in the account: here is the heart of the matter. The main Lukan changes and the reasons for them are noted above in the discussion of the Lukan structure at the end of *Form/Structure/Setting*. To these may be added Luke's change of Mark's "to them," this time to "to the crowd," and an infinitive rather than a *wa* clause to express Jesus' intention for the disciples to distribute the bread and the fish. Luke's introduction of an object "them" (i.e., the bread and the fish) for "blessed" seems to turn a blessing of God into a blessing of food (the same idiom is found in Mark 8:7 in Mark's second feeding account), and so into a consecration (which may be taken technically in a sacramental sense or nontechnically in connection with an understanding that food is sanctified by the saying of grace [see 1 Tim 4:4–5]; *Pseudo-Clement* 1.22.4 uses this idiom). It is just possible, however, that what we have is not an object, but an accusative of respect (so Marshall, 362): Luke wants to avoid handling the fish separately, because of the Markan awkwardness, and so he makes the blessing (and all that follows) refer to both bread and fish by specifying "he said the blessing with respect to them [both]."

The sequence of verbs here, "having taken," "he blessed," "he broke," "he gave" is to be compared with that at the Last Supper (22:19): "having taken," "he gave thanks," "he broke," "he gave" (the verb forms are not in every case identical: one verb is different, one is in a different Greek tense and one has a prefixed preposition in the feeding text). Comparison is also called for with the Emmaus meal (24:30): "taking," "he blessed," "having broken," "he gave" (again, some details are different). Schürmann, 517, notes the way that these verbs give a formality to the account which hides from sight the particular features of the occasion: Does Jesus take all the food up at once? Is the fish broken in the way the bread would traditionally be broken? The main purpose of the eucharistic link would seem to be, not to ground the later Eucharist, nor to suggest that Jesus celebrated a proto-Eucharist with this crowd, but rather to indicate that in this experience the disciples became aware of the identity of Jesus in much the same way that the Christian of Luke's day knew Jesus in the eucharistic meal (cf. 24:30–31).

There are two distinctive features of the present text. First, there is the looking up to heaven. This finds its closest and most helpful parallel in Job 22:26–27 (LXX: MT is not quite as close): "Then you shall have boldness before the Lord, looking up cheerfully to heaven. When you pray to him, he will hear you" (cf. also Sus 35; Isa 8:21; Luke 18:13). While this may seem to fit well with the Lukan emphasis on the praying Jesus, it is quite unique in comparison with any other of Luke's accounts of Jesus' performing of wonders (healings, exorcisms, stilling the storm). As discussed at 4:38–39, the significance of the wonders is eschatological and Christological; they are not a matter of piety and answered prayer. Why, then, this exception? We cannot be certain. He does simply take this over from Mark (though the pericope Mark 8:31–37, which uses the same expression, is not carried over, nor is 9:28–29 with

its apparent implication that Jesus exorcised in that case by prayer). Since everything has encouraged us to find a Christological focus here, we should expect the answer to our question to be a Christological one. When the confession comes in Luke, it refers distinctly to “the Christ of God” (Mark has simply “the Christ”). Is it this reference back to God that Luke allows to be expressed with “looking into heaven”? In this case, it will not be exactly that the miraculous adequacy of the food is achieved in answer to prayer, but rather that Jesus embarks on this activity (as presumably all others) with reference to God, whom he represents as his Christ: “the looking up witnesses to the freedom and openness of the Son to the Father” (Grundmann, *Markusevangelium*, 182).

The second distinctive feature is the mediating role of the disciples (again reproduced from Mark, but as we have seen above in vv 14–15, attracting considerably more attention in the Lukan text). The feature in Acts corresponding to this is not that of a prominent role for the Twelve in the eucharistic breaking of bread, but rather in the poor-relief distributions to the widows of the Christian community (Acts 6:1–2). When Jesus gives the food to the disciples they are then able to do what he had challenged them to do in v 13.

The miraculous provision remains private to Jesus and the Twelve. There is no suggestion that the people have any awareness of where the food comes from, nor does the event have any impact upon them beyond satisfying their needs of the moment. Even for the disciples there is no interest in a “multiplication of the loaves,” only in the fact that despite the scanty resource base of five loaves and two fish, Jesus keeps on being able to provide food (the imperfect tense of ἐξίδου, “was giving,” may underline this) that the disciples can in turn give to the people. The focus is on what Jesus can enable them to do.

As this narrative was used at the early church’s eucharistic breaking of bread the following faith perspective would be evoked: we recognize who Jesus is through what he makes possible in our midst; he is the ultimate host at our eucharistic meals; at the breaking of the bread we recognize him for who he is; there in a wonderful way we are nourished in our inner needs; there as well we are challenged about the meeting of the needs of others and made to recognize the resources that through Jesus we actually have.

The basis provided here for the Christological confession to come is much more personalized (left in a realm of distinctly religious experience?) and much less focused on possible identities than we might have expected from the sharp Christological focus provided by the setting of the pericope. Jesus is not identified as the eschatological prophet, nor as the new Moses; nor is he identified on the basis of an Elijah or Elisha typology, nor on the basis that he is the one who repeats the exodus wilderness feeding. He is not labeled as Messiah by anticipating the messianic banquet in the wilderness. Much more generally we may say something like this: the feeding experience enables the disciples to know that Jesus is the one in and through whom God has now decisively intervened in this world.

17 Luke moves the “all” to a more emphatic position that puts stress on all being satisfied. He uses the passive verb to speak of the gathering of the fragments (Mark’s “they” is unclear as to its reference) and drops Mark’s separate mention of the fish fragments (cf. the similar change in v 16). Mark’s idiomatic “basketfuls” (lit., “fullnesses of baskets”) is given up for better Greek (with

some similarity to the way Matthew introduces change here). Luke has already used the information about the size of the crowd and does not repeat it here.

The food left over has its antecedent in 2 Kgs 4:44, but there no amount is specified. The number twelve is probably symbolic: food for all Israel. Schenke (*Brotvermehrung*, 111) is right to see in the gathering of the fragments a pointing on into the future: "if from five loaves and two fish five thousand people can be nourished, how many people can be satisfied with the remainder that has been gathered up?"

Explanation

The question of Jesus' identity is put by the disciples in 8:25. It is taken up afresh by the Herod episode in 9:7–9 and answered in a particularly important manner by Peter in 9:18–20. Framed as it is by Herod's puzzlement and Peter's confident assertion, the feeding account is intended by Luke to make a special contribution to the disciples' insight into the identity of Jesus. It is, however, not at all easy to work out precisely how it is meant to do this.

The disciples' ability to identify Jesus is not based only on this episode. It is rather the culmination of their being with Jesus from 8:1. They have watched him in action and have extended his ministry by means of their own mission. They have witnessed the stilling of the storm. But here the process culminates as they in this "joint activity" with Jesus experience their own immediate dependence on him as they seek to carry out his will.

There is much scepticism about the possible historicity of such an account. While it is true, however, that we need to make generous allowance for the symbolism involved in the telling of the story, we should not be content to think that the theology and the symbolism have created the account.

While we can no longer know exactly what happened, we can with good reason think in terms of Jesus feeding a large number of people with an impossibly small quantity of food.

The account is regularly linked with the exodus provision of the manna and the quail (Exod 16; Num 11), and this does seem to have affected some of the forms of the narrative (especially the account in John 6). We may have rather less confidence that the original event made such a connection explicit, and Luke seems to have removed features of the account that would naturally cause us to think of Moses and the Israelites in the wilderness.

The account is also frequently interpreted in connection with the idea of the messianic banquet of the end times. This approach once again has its most natural links with the Johannine form of the narrative. In the other Gospel forms of the narrative, however, the action of feeding is clearly something prompted by the needs of the occasion and in that sense "accidental" rather than something specifically arranged by Jesus. The crowds do not even seem to be aware that anything out of the ordinary is happening: Jesus (with his disciples) simply manages to be a rather good host to them in this wilderness setting. Only the disciples seem to be aware that something extraordinary is happening. As on other occasions, the disciples can see here that the preaching of the kingdom of God involves miraculous and abundant provision for people's needs, but they are presented as providers of food rather than as participants

in a meal that is in any sense, or anticipates in some way, the messianic banquet.

The form of the narrative of the feeding is clearly based in part on the account in 2 Kgs 4:42–44 in which the challenge is given by Elisha to feed a large number of people with an inadequate supply of bread and in which there is also bread left over. Luke does not seem, however, to make anything of this link, so it probably should play no role in interpreting his account.

Luke seems to focus all the importance of the narrative on two things. First, he emphasizes that it is the disciples who, as challenged by Jesus, give the people something to eat (here the focus is on what they can achieve in immediate dependence on Jesus). Second, by stripping away elements of the Markan account, Luke brings into special prominence the links between this feeding and the eucharistic activity of the church. Jesus' actions in v 16 are particularly to be compared with the meal scene that concludes the Emmaus road encounter with Jesus (24:29–31, 35), and both are to be compared with the Last Supper account (especially 22:19). Luke does not create this link, but he does accentuate it.

Even without the Lukan accentuation, the importance of the link with the Lord's Supper is such that it is quite likely that the narrative was first formulated to be used at the eucharistic meals of the early church. If this is so, such a setting provides important information on how we should interpret elements of the story.

Luke seems to be suggesting that the disciples come to a conviction of Jesus' identity here in a manner analogous to the way that in the eucharist the Lord Jesus is made known to the believer in the breaking of the bread (see 24:30–31, 35). The perspective of faith from which Luke speaks would involve the following. We recognize who Jesus is through what he makes possible in our midst. He is the ultimate host at our eucharistic meals. At the breaking of bread we recognize him for who he is. There in a wonderful way we find the nourishment that we need. There also we are challenged to meet the needs of others and to recognize the resources that through Jesus we actually have to meet needs. In our eucharistic meeting with the Lord we renew our conviction that he is indeed the one in whom God has decisively intervened in the world.

Luke rounds off the disciples' mission and has Jesus take them with him, ostensibly on retreat (this will happen in fact in vv 18–20), but in terms of the actual development, so that they will be there to do what Jesus will call upon them to do in the situation with which they will be confronted: this is in effect the next stage of their mission role. On their recent mission they had been the recipients of hospitality; now in a way that seems impossible to them Jesus will challenge them to be the ones who extend hospitality.

Jesus welcomes the uninvited and intrusive crowd and most graciously plays host to them. He does for them what he had sent the Twelve to do on their mission (which had been in turn modeled on his own activity).

The disciples anticipate a crisis at the end of the day when people will be hungry and tired and far from sources of provisions and hospitality. Their solution is to send the crowd off to "find" (a euphemism for "buy for themselves") food and a place to recuperate. Jesus' view is rather that the hospitality extended to them in the name of the kingdom of God should be complete. He challenges the disciples to be themselves the ones who feed the crowd.

The disciples do not see how this could be possible. They have only five loaves and two fish unless they go off and buy food for this huge crowd. Their laying of this before Jesus is a questioning of how they might do what Jesus has asked them to do. Luke underlines their concern by giving at this point the number of people in the crowd.

Instead of a direct answer, the disciples get directions for organizing the crowd into dinner parties of fifty apiece. Jesus then takes the food, and as he says the grace over the bread and the fish he looks up to God: what he does, he does with reference to God, whom he represents as his Christ (to put it in the terms in which Peter will soon confess it). "Taking . . . he blessed . . . and broke and gave" deliberately evokes the action of the Last Supper. Now the disciples can feed the crowd with what Jesus gives them.

All eat and are satisfied, and twelve baskets of excess are gathered up. Twelve baskets is probably symbolically food for all Israel. It points into the future: if five loaves and two fishes go so far, what can now be done with twelve baskets of food?

“[We Say You Are] the Christ of God” (9:18–20)

Bibliography

Brown, R. E. *Peter in the New Testament*. Minneapolis/New York: Augsburg/Paulist, 1973. 64–69, 111–12. **Bultmann, R.** “Die Frage nach dem messianischen Bewusstsein Jesu und das Petrus-Bekenntnis.” *ZNW* 19 (1919–20) 165–74. **Corbin, M.** “Le Christ de Dieu: Méditation théologique sur Lc 9, 18–27.” *NRT* 99 (1977) 641–80. **Cullmann, O.** “L’Apôtre Pierre instrument du diable et instrument de Dieu.” In *New Testament Essays*, FS T. W. Manson, ed. A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester: University Press, 1959. 94–105. ———. *Peter: Disciple, Apostle, Martyr—A Historical and Theological Study*. 2nd ed. London: SCM, 1962. **Dietrich, W.** *Das Petrusbild der lukanischen Schriften*. 94–104. **Dinkler, E.** “Peter’s Confession and the Satan Saying: The Problem of Jesus’ Messiahship.” In *The Future of Our Religious Past*, FS R. Bultmann, ed. J. M. Robinson. New York: Harper & Row, 1971. 169–202. **Ebeling, H. J.** *Das Messiasgeheimnis und die Botschaft des Markusevangeliums*. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1939. 204–20. **Goppelt, L.** *Theology of the New Testament*. Vol. 1. *The Ministry of Jesus in Its Theological Significance*, ed. J. Roloff. Tr. J. Alsup. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1981. 169–72. **Haenchen, E.** “Die Komposition von Mk. VIII 27–IX 1 und Par.” *NovT* 6 (1963) 81–109. **Meyer, B. F.** *The Aims of Jesus*. 185–97. **Mundle, W.** “Die Geschichtlichkeit des messianischen Bewusstseins Jesu.” *ZNW* 21 (1922) 299–311. **Pesch, R.** “Das Messiasbekenntnis des Petrus (Mk 8,27–30): Neuhandlung einer alten Frage.” *BZ* 17 (1973) 178–95; 18 (1974) 20–31. **Saunders, D. J.** “The Confession of Peter.” *TS* 10 (1949) 522–40. **Vögtle, A.** “Messiasbekenntnis und Petrusverheissung: Zur Komposition Mt 16, 13–23 Par.” *BZ* 1 (1957) 252–72; 2 (1958) 85–103. **Willært, B.** “La connexion littéraire entre la première prédiction de la passion et la confession de Pierre chez les synoptiques.” *ETL* 32 (1956) 24–45. **Wrede, W.** *The Messianic Secret*. The Library of Theological Translations. Tr. J. C. G. Greig. Cambridge/London: Clarke, 1971. 115–24, 176–77, 238–43.

Translation

¹⁸When he was praying^a alone, and the disciples were with^b him, it transpired^c that he asked them,^d “Who do the crowds say that I am?” ¹⁹They replied:^e “‘John the Baptist’; others say,^f ‘Elijah’; others, ‘That a certain prophet from among the ancient ones has risen.’” ²⁰He said to them, “Now^g you, who do you say that I am?” Peter replied:^h “The Christⁱ of God.”

Notes

^a“Praying” is omitted by D a c e sy^c (after having been included by D at v 16).

^bB reads *συνήντησαν*, “they met.”

^c*ἐγένετο* has generally be translated “happened.”

^dLit., “asked them, saying.”

^eLit., “having answered, said.”

^f“Say” is added for sense.

^g“Now” is added for sense.

^hLit., “having answered, said.”

ⁱ“Son” is added here by D and some other texts, under the influence of the Matthean text.

Form/Structure/Setting

The climax and end of this section, 8:1–9:20, is reached when Peter voices the disciples’ recognition that Jesus is the Christ of God. This is the culmination of the being-with-Jesus motif of the section beginning in 8:1; more specifically it is the conclusion of a development which is first set in motion with 8:22–25 and which then comes to sharp focus in 9:7–9 (verses which with 9:18–20 enclose Luke’s account of the feeding of the five thousand and give his rendering of it its sharp Christological focus; see further at 8:1–3; 8:22–25; 9:7–9; 9:10–17).

To end the section at 9:20 demands some explanation and defense in light of the obvious continuation of the same scene in vv 21–22 and then the close connection between these verses and vv 23–26(27). 9:21–50 will be identified as a transitional section preparing the reader for the “Travel Narrative” which begins in 9:51. In 9:51 Jesus sets his face to go to Jerusalem; 9:21–22 is the beginning point for the explanation of what that involves. By contrast 9:18–20 represents a culmination, in the first instance a culmination of the section 8:1–9:20, but in a more general sense also of the sweep of Jesus’ ministry thus far from its beginnings in 4:14. Peter’s confession creates the necessary platform upon which are to be founded the startling developments that begin in 9:21–22. A threshold is to be found at this point, so that vv 18–20 have their natural connections with what has come before, while vv 21–27 clearly have a forward orientation.

A number of scholars have been impressed by the continuing Christological focus which unites what, here it is being suggested, we should separate. But we need also to notice (i) that it is “Son of Man” and not “Christ” which carries the new thrust beginning in 9:21–22 and (ii) that when in the transfiguration account we do get reinforcement of the identification as Christ (v 35: “This is my Son, the chosen one”), the thrust is toward his coming fate in Jerusalem (v 31) and the call is to “listen to him” (v 35) precisely as the one

who is now insisting that although he is the Christ, he must go to suffering and rejection (before ever there is vindication and the glory of enthronement).

Nothing beyond Luke's Markan source is visible here. The historicity of the tradition behind the Markan account has been hotly disputed. A major sticking point has been the judgment that in the lifetime of Jesus such a confession could only have been understood in terms of the current Jewish political messianism with its expectation of a Davidic messiah who would restore the kingdom to Israel and rule over it in righteousness (e.g., Dinkler, "Jesus' Messiahship," 180, and the authors he cites). With good reason, it has been claimed that Jesus' ministry offers precious little to encourage any link with political messianism (see esp. Pesch, *BZ* 18 [1974] 24–25). Precisely this point is met by those who have taken Mark 8:33b ("Get behind me, Satan. For you think not the thoughts of God but of men") to be the original answer Jesus gives to Peter's proposal (Hahn, *Titles of Jesus*, 223–25; Dinkler, "Jesus' Messiahship"). This suggestion has, however, its own Achilles' heel, in that no feasible suggestion has come forward as to how such a tradition from the life of Jesus would have been transmitted in the early life of the church.

If the confession tradition were only to have emerged in the post-Easter setting, then the difficulty as to the meaning of "Christ" at once disappears, because in the life of the church the meaning to be given to the title is not the Jewish one, but the one that emerges in Christian reflection under the constraints imposed by the death and resurrection of Jesus. It is not surprising, then, that in various forms a post-Easter origin for the confession has been suggested, most notably the proposal made by Bultmann (*ZNW* 19 [1919–20] 165–74) to identify Mark 8:27b–29 coupled with the Matthean expansion (Matt 16:17–19) as an early church formulation of its conviction that its messianic faith was built upon the Easter experience of Peter. Bultmann's form analysis has not generally been found persuasive, even by those who share his main conviction that the confession is a post-Easter phenomenon.

Other reasons have been put forward as a basis for denying that Jesus in his lifetime saw himself as the messiah. (i) The focus of Jesus' message on the kingdom and not on his own special role in it is said to be incompatible with a Jesus who saw himself to be the messiah. There is, however, considerably more self-reference in Jesus traditions that can with some confidence be traced back to the historical ministry of Jesus than this suggestion really allows for. (ii) The early Christian struggle for adequate terms in which to understand and with which to identify Jesus is said not to make sense if Jesus had accepted the Christ title and simply imposed silence. But if Jesus' activity and teaching suggested links also with other strands of Jewish expectation, there need be no sense that Christ is the "authorized" title. And in any case Easter faith did inevitably mean that there was a larger reality now to be interpreted than what was fully manifest during the historical ministry of Jesus.

There are some positive difficulties in locating the origin of the confession in a post-Easter period. Prime among these is the question of whether the post-Easter commitment to Jesus' messianic identity can be adequately accounted for without some pre-Easter counterpart. If Jesus' execution as a messianic pretender had its basis only in political expediency, then nothing more than the inscription on the cross (Mark 15:26) remains as any preresurrection

basis for the postresurrection confession (and this too is still part of the charade). It is a matter of judgment, but the present writer finds it difficult to believe that the deeply entrenched and variegated use of “Christ” in the NT can be adequately explained on this basis.

We come back finally to the initial difficulty: the need to understand the title in connection with Jewish political messianism. Is this in fact so clearly the case? Pesch (*BZ* 17 [1973] 178–195; 18 [1974] 20–31) has mounted an elaborate argument that the confession is not at all to be connected with royal messianism; it is rather to be understood in connection with prophetic anointing: Jesus is confessed during his ministry, by Peter, as the eschatological prophet anointed with the Holy Spirit.

Pesch’s case is open to criticism on a number of fronts. (i) The contrast between popular opinion and the disciples’ recognition of who Jesus is, is not adequately maintained by Pesch’s view. (ii) Pesch too easily dismisses as later reflection all the other connections in the tradition suggesting a royal role for Jesus. (iii) Pesch fails to give sufficient weight to the connection in the Christian tradition between the “Christ” title and place of Jesus as Lord. Pesch’s study does, however, identify an area of importance for investigation.

Pesch is able to mount his case because *χριστός* (“Christ”; the underlying Hebrew is מָשִׁיחַ, *māšīaḥ*) can also be used in connection with a prophetic anointing or a high-priestly anointing, and its force can be quite metaphorical, extending from the anointing with the Spirit for a preaching task which characterizes the figure of Isa 61:1–2 (here the verb, not the noun is used) to the role that the pagan king Cyrus plays as God’s instrument for his own purposes in Isa 45:1 (see de Jonge, *NovT* 8 [1966] 132–48; Berger, *NTS* 17 [1970–71] 391–425—Pesch depends heavily on the latter).

The evidence base for the possibility that “the Christ,” as a figure of expectation, could be other than the anticipated Davidic ruler is sparse. There is, however, a well-attested expectation at Qumran of a high-priestly messiah alongside the expectation of a Davidic messiah (see van der Woude, *TDNT* 9:517–20). As well, 11QMelch 18 appears to read וְהַמְבָּרֵךְ הוּא מְשִׁיחַ הָרוּחַ, *whmbśr hw’h mšyḥ hrwḥ* (lit., “and the herald, he [or this herald] [is] [the] one anointed of the Spirit”). The Qumran expectation of a high-priestly messiah is the expectation of another ruler and is to be seen in the light of the postexilic and Maccabean role of the high priest in the absence of a Davidic prince. A messiah who is the eschatological prophet would be something quite different. 11QMelch 18 in the first instance identifies the figure of Isa 52:7 (which is quoted) with the figure of Isa 61:1–2. Also, the linked “of the Spirit” gives a quasi-verbal force to “[the] one anointed.” These two considerations make it doubtful whether we can deduce any titular use of the term from this text. Perhaps the most that can be said from this line of inquiry is that “Christ” does not immediately conjure up images of Davidic royalty.

A more promising related line of inquiry is the phenomenon of the merging of different strands of eschatological expectation, which was certainly widespread in the NT period and beyond. In contemporary Jewish speculation we know of competing messianic expectations and patterns of eschatological hope. Even within single documents these are often not in pure form. The early Christians could never have commended their totally apolitical belief in Jesus as messiah to their Jewish contemporaries if Jewish political messianism

is all that such a claim could have meant to them. The merging of different strands of eschatological expectation in the development of early Christian views of Jesus is only a more elaborate case of what was also true of Jewish eschatological thought of the day. We are increasingly aware of the degree to which the true diversity of first-century Judaism has been largely obscured to us both by the devastation of Palestine in the latter part of the first century and by the later rabbinic control of the Jewish tradition.

With the fact of this variety and merging in view, it may be best to say that the "Christ" confession points to an expectation that in this one the hopes associated with the Davidic dynasty will be put into effect, but with no specificity about the actual mode of implementation. The messianic program remains yet to be revealed. While one cannot demonstrate that Peter made such a confession in the lifetime of Jesus, such does seem to be the most likely point of origin for the present pericope.

The discussion of the form-critical category to which we should assign this pericope is clearly dependent in the first instance on what form the materials took in the pre-Markan tradition. Certain views have already been criticized above. The opening part of Mark 8:27, which deals with the location of the event, has been thought to be an addition, partly on the basis of general scepticism about place names in the gospel tradition, but also because of the awkwardness caused by the repetition of "his disciples." Its presence or absence makes no difference to the form. Altogether more important is the view that v 30 is a Markan addition. Without this verse the story could function easily as a pattern for faith (cf. Luke 19:1–10). With the verse the story is much more tied to its preresurrection context and functions as what Pesch calls (*BZ* 17 [1973] 187) a nonindependent unit of the macrocontext "passion-story." Beyond the specific arguments he offers for the retention of v 30 (183–84), Pesch argues convincingly that in relation to a reading of the story in connection with a Christological-didactic goal, there are just too many unnecessary elements in the narrative (188), and that we have here a narrative whose concern is to describe events and to provide information concerning factual opinions (186). These considerations in turn weigh in favor of retaining v 30 for the original narrative (and also in favor of the retention of v 27a). The form, then, fits no standard form-critical category.

Luke's major changes to the Markan shape of the narrative are to replace the concern about location at the beginning of the Markan form with a notice of Jesus' being engaged in prayer and to separate off the command to silence by linking it syntactically with the following introduction of the theme of the suffering of the Son of Man. In between the Markan shape is reproduced with changes of detail. There is a two-stage dialogue. An opening question is provided with a threefold answer in which each answer is syntactically dependent on the question: the first two as simple objects and the third as a *ὅτι* ("that") clause. The second question contrasts the varied opinions of the crowds with that of the disciples and attracts a single answer, again expressed in syntactical dependence on the grammar of the question.

Comment

With Peter's confession we get, for the first time since the beginning of Jesus' ministry, human participants in the story attaining to something like

the levels of insight into the role and identity of Jesus that characterized the infancy gospel (1:4–2:52). The “who then is this” motif of the section reaches its culmination, and the foundation is established from which Jesus can begin to elucidate the extraordinary messianic program to which he is committed. Every bit as much as in the Gospel of Mark, Peter’s confession is a watershed in the Lukan narrative.

18 Mark’s indication of location is displaced by another statement of Jesus’ being at prayer (cf. 3:21; 6:12; 9:28–29; 11:1; 22:41). With the disciples’ confession, yet another threshold is crossed in the context of Jesus’ prayer. The prayer notice may depend on Mark 6:46, which Luke has had no occasion to use (though 6:12 may have the stronger claim on such a source). The construction is similar to that in 11:1. Luke’s verb “to be present” is found in the NT only here and at Acts 22:11. Mark’s location on the way to the villages of Caesarea Philippi contributes nothing in the Lukan frame; but Luke does keep the implied privacy from the crowds. In effect the *κατὰ μόνας*, “alone,” provides the change of scene from the feeding account: the aloneness anticipated in v 10, but disturbed by the crowds, is now achieved. Luke smooths out Mark’s double mention of the disciples and changes Mark’s verb from imperfect to aorist, as he often does. Mark’s *οἱ ἄνθρωποι*, “the people,” becomes *οἱ ὄχλοι*, “the crowds.” This creates continuity with the crowd(s) who have been around Jesus throughout this section (and indeed earlier). In no way, however, should we see Jesus as here seeking to identify the crowds’ response to the feeding miracle.

19 Luke replaces Mark’s pleonastic “saying” with the equally pleonastic “answered.” Mark’s *εἰς τῶν προφητῶν* (“one of the prophets”) becomes *προφήτης τις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη* (lit., “a certain prophet of the ancient ones has arisen”), which is identical to the form Luke created in v 8. While Luke keeps Mark’s abbreviated form for the other two popular views, the changes he introduces here and earlier in vv 7–8 mean that, in contrast to the Markan account, exactly the same popular views are listed in the two episodes. This reinforces the bracketing role Luke gives to the accounts. See at 9:7–9 for a discussion of the views involved. Luke would not have us see the views as entirely wrong; each corresponds to something that has been validly perceived in the ministry of Jesus. Luke may even think that there is a happy anticipation of Jesus’ own resurrection in the views (so Schürmann, 530). But at the same time the question that hangs over the questioning is whether the disciples will distinguish themselves from the crowds and make what is ultimately a radically different assessment of who Jesus is.

20 Luke uses an *εἶπεν*, “he said,” in place of Mark’s repetition of the questioning verb used for the first question. The question itself is identically worded; but for the answer Luke conforms the syntax pattern used in the answer to the earlier question, and expands “Christ” to “Christ of God.”

This question, as was the one before, is addressed to the disciples collectively. However, where in that case it is the collective “they” who answer, now Peter acts as spokesman and leader of the band. Luke consistently attributes a certain primacy to Peter (cf. esp. 22:31–34). The reader knows from the infancy gospel that Peter has now rightly intuited the identity of Jesus (see 1:32–33, 69; 2:11, 26): here there is a human response which for the first time corresponds to

the presentation that God has made of his envoy (Corbin, *NRT* 99 [1977] 648), and from the infancy gospel we know as well that Davidic messianic categories are the correct ones for understanding this confession. At the same time, already there these categories are made use of in ways that do not fit neatly into a standard Jewish political messianism. Further, the dominance of Isaianic categories of thought in the eschatology that emerges in the intervening chapters (rather than any development that depends upon Davidic messianic categories) prepares us for a surprising development of these primary Davidic categories.

"Christ of God" is closest to "Christ of the Lord" of 2:26 (cf. also Acts 3:18; 4:26). In the body of the Gospel Luke reserves "Lord" for Jesus. The exact form "Christ of God" may recur in 23:35, if 9:35 should be our guide in deciding whether to take "of God" there with "Christ" or with "the chosen one." "Of God" places stress on the fulfillment of God's purposes to be achieved by the Christ. Dietrich (*Petrusbild*, 99–102) is quite wrong to find already here included the suffering fate of the Messiah. Luke's notes of noncomprehension in 9:45 and 18:34 make this quite clear. The most that can be said is that the "of God" here prepares for the role of the voice of God in the transfiguration account (vv 28–36), where the voice confirms that Jesus has correctly identified the place of suffering in his own messianic role.

Explanation

The section 8:1–9:20 now reaches its final goal: now at last for the first time there is a human response that corresponds to the presentation God has made of his envoy ahead of time in the infancy gospel (1:4–2:52). This is to be the platform on which Luke will erect the remainder of his narrative, with its new focus from this point on the coming suffering in Jerusalem.

In the section, the question of the identity of Jesus is particularly to be connected with two of his miraculous deeds: the stilling of the storm (8:22–25) and the feeding of the five thousand (9:10–17). The former raised the question; the latter, surrounded as it is by the two rehearsals of popular opinion about Jesus, makes a special contribution to the answer, as it bridges from the perplexity of Herod to the readiness of Peter to voice the confession of faith of the disciples.

Many questions have been raised about whether such a confession was ever made during Jesus' lifetime. And there certainly are difficulties. Jesus would not have welcomed any suggestion that he was a Jewish political messiah who would liberate his people from Roman domination by military exploits surpassing those of King David. There existed, however, a range of Jewish hopes about the nature of God's ultimate intervention on their behalf, and different views or fragments of views were often mingled together. To say that Jesus was the Christ would almost certainly have committed one to the view that when established as the Christ, he would rule as Lord in some way, but it need not have represented any particular commitment about the nature of Jesus' messianic program.

If there is no place somewhere in the ministry of Jesus for the emergence of the view that he was the messiah, it is difficult to see how that title came

to play such a basic role in the early church. It does not seem enough to build it out of the skulduggery of those who managed to have Jesus executed as a messianic pretender, purely as a political ploy.

As is a recurring feature of Luke's telling of the story, here also an important threshold is crossed in the context of Jesus' prayer. The recognition that now separates the disciples from popular opinion has not come without the intercession of Jesus.

The popular opinions that the disciples rehearse have been discussed at 9:7–9. They are not entirely wrong, in that each one of them responds to what can be genuinely observed in the ministry of Jesus. The idea of a resurrected prophet may even be for Luke a happy anticipation of the resurrection of Jesus to come. The views are, however, inadequate.

When it comes to their own opinion, it is not expressed by the vague "they" of all the disciples, but by Peter who speaks as their representative and leader. This role for Peter emerges repeatedly in Luke's account (see especially 22:31–34). The Christ title links at once with the material in the opening chapters of the Gospel which connected the infant Jesus so closely with the Davidic expectations, with ideas of kingship and rule. These ideas are transformed by the total unfolding of the Gospel account. This has already occurred to a significant degree through the focus thus far in the body of the Gospel on materials from Isaiah in forming a picture of the end-time intervention of God. It will happen more dramatically in Jesus' introduction from this point on of the place that suffering and death will play in his own role.

Luke has "Christ of God" as the actual form of the confession. The "of God" emphasizes that it is the purposes of God that come to fulfillment in the role of the Christ. This addition prepares for the role of the voice of God in the coming transfiguration narrative, in which the voice will confirm Jesus' identification of the place of suffering in his role as Christ.

Luke 1–9:20

Until recently, the Gospel of Luke, along with the other synoptic Gospels, Matthew and Mark, has been understood as a biography of Jesus rather than as a fountainhead of theological content.

Now, modern study has demonstrated that the evangelists who wrote the synoptic Gospels were theologians in their own right. Just as important to them as preserving and propagating the memory of Jesus, says Dr. John Nolland, was “the need to interpret him and all that his coming implied. . . . The evangelists were engaged in proclamation and not just reporting; their concern was so to tell the story of the historical Jesus that their readers might encounter the living Christ.”

In this first of two volumes of commentary, Dr. Nolland covers Luke 1:1 to 9:20, helping us to a rich and insightful engagement with the text through discovering what we can about how Luke actually produced his Gospel—its intended audience, purpose, and setting; its sources, language, and form. The *Introduction* includes essential background on the perspectives of modern gospel scholarship, with special attention to modern parables research; relationships between Luke and Acts and among the Gospels and other writings of the period; questions on authorship, date, and quality of surviving text. Dr. Nolland’s fresh *Translation* of the text is undergirded by technical *Notes* on the textual witnesses, and an extensive *Bibliography* accompanies the verse-by-verse *Comment* in which his well-tempered emphasis on scholarly discussion supports perceptive and practical interpretation of the biblical writing in terms meaningful for late twentieth-century faith.

JOHN NOLLAND is Course Leader and Head of Biblical Studies as well as Lecturer in New Testament Studies at Trinity College, Bristol, England. He holds the B.Sc. (Hons.) from the University of New England (Australia), the Th.L. from the Australian College of Theology, the B.D. from the University of London, the Ph.D. from the University of Cambridge, and the Dip. Th. from Moore Theological College. He is author of numerous articles in *Revue de Qumran*, *The Journal of Theological Studies*, *Vigiliae Christianae*, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, *Novum Testamentum*, *New Testament Studies*, and *The Journal for the Study of Judaism*.

A New Repository of Biblical Learning

From a team of international scholars comes the Word Biblical Commentary, a showcase of the best in evangelical critical scholarship for a new generation.

The 46 contributors to this 52-volume resource offer a thorough scrutiny of the evidence produced during the current generation of major discoveries in the historical, textual, and archaeological fields, presented with a firm commitment to the authority of Scripture as divine revelation.

The Word Biblical Commentary seeks to serve the needs of professional scholars and teachers, seminary students, working ministers—anyone who seeks to build a theological understanding of Scripture upon a solid foundation of scholarship.

ISBN 0-8499-0234-7



9 780849 902345