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The work is presented as a contribution to the case for understanding Luke/Acts as addressed not primarily to Gentiles but to people who will assess Christianity with norms provided by first-century Judaism.

Part 1 sets out to show that there is in Luke/Acts no turning of God's interest away from the Jews and to the Gentiles. A detailed exegesis of Lk 4.22-8 reveals that vv 25-7 are not concerned to make this point (chapter 1). Luke works with a pattern of God's twin concern that both Jews and Gentiles should be reached with the gospel. Acts 13.46; 18.6 and 28.28 do not overturn this pattern: Acts 28.28 exhibits the pattern; Acts 13.46 is based on a commitment to the priority of the Jews which for Luke remains in force; all three verses take their place as part of a complex apologetic designed to keep the widespread Jewish unbelief from being used as a means of discrediting Christianity (chapter 2).

Part 2 offers a case for understanding Lk 21 as Luke's refutation of a Jewish use of the saying about the destruction and renewal of the Temple as a polemic castigating Christianity as insurrectionist and violently opposed to main-stream Judaism.

In significant contrast to Mk 13, the content of Lk 21, and its context, make for a Lukan Jesus who, though he had to announce the destruction of the Temple (as did Jeremiah), held it in highest honour. Editorial deletions and the form of Acts 6.14 encourage the reader to connect the accusation there with Lk 21 (chapter 3). There is evidence for a Jewish polemical use of the Temple saying in the form which mentions both destruction and renewal. The sense of the polemic is best understood against the background of Qumran thought: Christians are fomenting a violent take-over in Jerusalem. Acts 6.14 exhibits a somewhat developed form of the polemic (chapter 4). A perspective for discovering the unity of Lk 21 and the development of its thought is provided by the realization that Luke is concerned there with a distancing of Christians from any interest in insurrection and in particular from any interest in seeking to realize their eschatology by means of an armed attack on Jerusalem (chapter 5).
Preface

This study is the result of independent research, using various primary and secondary sources, both in their original languages and in translation. The work has not been done in collaboration.

Works cited are referred to by abbreviated titles throughout. Only when a work is cited for the first time is the year of publication given (except in the case of the two commentaries on Acts by F.F. Bruce, which are distinguished by reference to the year of publication).

Unless otherwise indicated the edition of the Greek New Testament used is that of the United Bible Societies (1966), the Hebrew Bible is quoted from the text edited by R. Kittel (1937), the Qumran documents are quoted from the text edited by E. Lohse (1971), the Classical sources (including Philo and Josephus) are quoted from the Loeb Classical Library, the translation of the Bible used is the Revised Standard Version, quotations from the Babylonian Talmud and Midrash Rabbah are taken from the Soncino editions, the translation of the Qumran documents is that of G. Vermes (1975), and the Pseudepigrapha are quoted from R.H. Charles' edition (1913).

Abbreviations generally follow the system set out in the Journal of Biblical Literature 90 (1976) 331-46. This is supplemented from the system used in LSJ, LPGL, and the Oxford Latin Dictionary, 1968-. Abbreviations for the works of Philo are those to be found in Studia Philonica 1 (1972) 92.

I am pleased to be able to record my thanks to the Sydney Diocesan Educational and Book Society, Moore Theological College and the Australian Fellowship of Evangelical Students for financial help.

I record my gratitude for regular access to the facilities of the Tyndale Library for Biblical Research, also my appreciation of the friendship and help of others who have worked there.

I am indebted to my supervisor, Professor G.W.H. Lampe, who has been a source of great encouragement.

The typing of the final draft has been ably carried out by Mrs. Morven Baker, to whom I express my thanks.

Finally, I dedicate the work to my wife, Gail, whose patient endurance of a great affliction has made it possible for me to complete this dissertation.
Table of Contents

Preface                                      page  ii
Introduction                                 1

PART 1: Jewish Unbelief and the Gentile Mission

Chapter 1: The Rejection of Jesus at Nazareth  4
1. Introduction                               4
2. Methodological Considerations             5
7. The Rage of Luke 4.28f                    38
10. Summary                                  84
11. The Gentile Mission                      86

Chapter 2: The Parallel Between the Gentile Mission and
the Jewish (Diaspora) Mission: an Investigation
of the Significance for Luke of
Acts 13.46; 18.6 and 28.28                    90

A. The Parallel                              90
1. Introduction                             90
2. Straightforward Examples                  91
3. Acts 2.5-11 and 1.8                       93

B. The Significance of Acts 13.46; 18.6
and 28.28                                    103
1. Introduction                             103
2. Acts 28.28                                106
3. The Priority of the Jews                 113
4. The Relationship between Jewish Unbelief
   and the Gospel to the Gentiles            119

PART 2: The Function of Luke 21

1. Mark 13 and Luke 21                       129
3. Luke 21.5f                               135
Chapter 4: The Temple Accusation as Anti-Christian Jewish Polemic

1. The Existence of the Polemic
2. Destruction only, or Destruction and Renewal?
3. Possible Senses
4. Destruction as judgement of God by Enemies
5. Destruction as judgement of God by Saints/Messiah
6. Eschatological Temple Renewal
7. Messiah as Temple Restorer
8. Messianic Programme of Mark 14.58
10. Summary

Chapter 5: An Outline of Luke 21

1. Answer to v 7
2. V 8 and its Link to v 7
3. Beyond v 8
4. Vv 8-36: Shape and Function in Relation to v 7

Conclusion

APPENDICES

1. Classical and Rabbinic Parallels to "Physician, heal yourself" (Lk 4.23)
2. A Fresh Look at Acts 15.10
3. Jewish Opposition to the Gentile Mission
4. A Case of White-Washing (Jos. Ant. 18.19)
5. Sib. Or. 3.265-94, an early Maccabean Messianic Oracle

Bibliography
Introduction

This dissertation is presented as a contribution to the case for understanding Luke/Acts as addressed not primarily to Gentiles, but rather to people whose religious orientation belongs within the orbit of first-century Judaism, i.e. to Jews, proselytes or God-fearers.

Part 1 consists of a detailed exegesis of Lk 4.22-8 and a study of the significance of Acts 13.46; 18.6 and 28.28 in the light of the Lukan use of the scheme "revelation to the Gentiles" and "glory to ... Israel". Part 1 is thus concerned with the relationship between Jewish unbelief and the Gentile mission. This is an important matter for attention since the normal understanding, that in Luke's presentation the gospel goes to the Gentiles because it is rejected by the Jews, leads one almost inevitably to expect a Gentile readership.

Part 2 sets out to show that Lk 21 is Luke's refutation of a polemical Jewish use of the logion concerning the Temple destruction and renewal. The importance of this result is that it demands readers for Luke/Acts who are open to influence from such a polemic. And, it is argued, the polemical usage involved has persuasive force only for people who find their religious norms in first-century Judaism.

While the work makes no attempt to consider all the materials relevant to a decision on the readership of Luke/Acts (the dissertation is "a study of Lk 4.22-8; Acts 13.46; 18.6; 28.28 and Lk 21"), every effort has been made to take into account all the materials which may contribute to a better appreciation of the significance of the passages studied. Also, the passages have been
chosen as the most centrally relevant to the quest for Luke's readers. And, it seems to me, the approach adopted leads to conclusions which stand in their own right and are in no sense provisional upon a wider study.

The conclusions drawn from the studies are based on the assumption that a self-conscious editor like Luke can be expected to reveal what he understands to be the situation of his readers by 1. giving special attention to matters which he thinks will concern them; 2. tailoring his presentation to emphasize and build upon such common ground as he can find between himself and his readers; 3. couching his arguments and offering his evidence in forms which such people will find persuasive.

The investigation came to birth from an interest in the possibility that Luke's readers might be able to be identified precisely as God-fearers: that group of synagogue attenders who, though not prepared to become culturally and nationally Jewish by the radical step of becoming proselytes, nevertheless identified themselves to a greater or lesser extent with the religion of Judaism.

A number of features of the Lukan presentation seem to invite this suggestion. Special attention is focussed on a God-fearer in the gospel and again in Acts: for God-fearers the

1. The prologue, Lk 1.1-4 (and cf. Acts 1.1) is also extremely important, but does not easily yield unequivocal conclusions.

2. On the whole it seems better to account for distinctive editorial features in terms of Luke's appreciation of his readers' situation, rather than to regard such features as a reflection of Luke's own background. Though at times the latter is to be recognized.

3. For the literature on God-fearers see appendix 3.
centurion in the gospel (7.1-10) and Cornelius in Acts (10.1-48) would be suitably paradigm cases designed to encourage their own response to Jesus. The presence of God-fearers in the synagogues seems to have been of particular interest to Luke (Acts 13.16,26; 14.1f; 17.4,12,17; 18.4). Nowhere else in the NT do we hear of them at all.1 If the name Theophilus is symbolic it would suit God-fearers well. The assumption of a God-fearer readership allows the traditional reasons for regarding the first readers as Gentiles to retain much of their force, while opening up a new possibility for explaining the many Jewish features of Luke/Acts: Christianity would need to defend itself as faithful to Judaism, as much to the God-fearer as to the Jew.2

Certainly, other explanations can be offered for these phenomena, and to establish the thesis that Luke wrote for God-fearers is not the intention of the present study. The concern here is rather to offer support for the more general thesis that Luke wrote for people whose religious values were more or less Jewish. Only in appendix 3 does the present work go further and offer a positive argument for a God-fearer readership.

1. J. Mánek ("Aposteldekret" (1972)) accounts for this emphasis by postulating that Luke was a God-fearer before he became a Christian.

2. The possibility that Luke wrote for God-fearers has been raised by H. Mulder, "Theophilus" (1951) cf. W.C. van Unnik, "Acts" (1960) 59; B.E. McCormick, Background (1960) 28-47; N.A. Dahl, Jesus (1976) 96f; and others, but has never been made the object of a major study.
centurion in the gospel (7.1-10) and Cornelius in Acts (10.1-48) would be suitably paradigm cases designed to encourage their own response to Jesus. The presence of God-fearers in the synagogues seems to have been of particular interest to Luke (Acts 13.16,26; 14.1f; 17.4,12,17; 18.4). Nowhere else in the NT do we hear of them at all.\(^1\) If the name Theophilus is symbolic it would suit God-fearers well. The assumption of a God-fearer readership allows the traditional reasons for regarding the first readers as Gentiles to retain much of their force, while opening up a new possibility for explaining the many Jewish features of Luke/Acts: Christianity would need to defend itself as faithful to Judaism, as much to the God-fearer as to the Jew.\(^2\)

Certainly, other explanations can be offered for these phenomena, and to establish the thesis that Luke wrote for God-fearers is not the intention of the present study. The concern here is rather to offer support for the more general thesis that Luke wrote for people whose religious values were more or less Jewish. Only in appendix 3 does the present work go further and offer a positive argument for a God-fearer readership.

\footnote{1. J. Mánek ("Aposteldekret" (1972)) accounts for this emphasis by postulating that Luke was a God-fearer before he became a Christian.}

\footnote{2. The possibility that Luke wrote for God-fearers has been raised by H. Mulder, "Theophilus" (1951) cf. W.C. van Unnik, "Acts" (1960) 59; B.E. McCormick, Background (1960) 28-47; N.A. Dahl, Jesus (1976) 96f; and others, but has never been made the object of a major study.}
PART 1: Jewish Unbelief and the Gentile Mission
CHAPTER 1

The Rejection of Jesus at Nazareth

1. Introduction

The Lukan pericope on The Rejection of Jesus at Nazareth has deservedly received a good deal of scholarly attention. To justify this attention we need to do no more than draw attention to the position of prominence accorded by Luke to the pericope, right at the beginning of Jesus public ministry, and to note the widespread agreement that Luke presents this episode as programmatic for the whole of the Lukan presentation to follow.

Our interest here is to examine the claim that this pericope prefigures the transfer of the gospel from the Jews to the Gentiles; even perhaps that it sets forward the claim that it was God's purpose from the beginning to abandon the Jews in their unbelief and to take a people for himself from among the Gentiles.


2. Since it is preceded by the generalizing summary of vv 14,15 we should think in terms of a front-piece for, rather than a first item of, the Galilean ministry. Leaney, Luke, 117; A. Plummer, Luke (1901) 118; A. Loisy, Synoptiques I (1907) 838.


5. K. Lönig, "Lukas" (1969) 218f. W. Eltester ("Israel" (1972)) sets forward this thesis in a particularly striking way when he argues that this pericope in its present form belongs to a second edition of Luke's work, and negates (146) what he sees to have been the concern in the body of the gospel to picture an historically developing transformation of the people of God from exclusively Jewish into a unity of Jews and Gentiles. Eltester argues that the very hard and negative reaction to the Jews which he finds in Lk 4 arises as a reaction to the expulsion of Christians from the Synagogue or at least to the hardening of Jewish attitudes to Christianity which soon led to this (143-147).
Because this passage is understood to be programmatic, it is a crux in any attempt to identify the ethos to which the readers, for whom Luke writes, belong. One is hardly likely to attempt to win people to Christianity from a Jewish ethos by telling them the story of how God abandoned the Jews and turned his interest to the Gentiles.

Vv 24-7 are the verses of central importance: a prophet not acceptable in his own country; and the ministries of Elijah and Elisha. However what is offered below attempts to follow the thought sequence in detail from v 22 to v 28. The reason for extension of the scope will become clear from the methodological considerations which follow below. Briefly put, it is the conviction that the immediate context has first claim to determine the meaning of the verses in question and that too often a plausible understanding of individual verses or steps in the thought sequence has not been tested out by tracing through its implications for the understanding of the thought sequence of the pericope. We are therefore concerned to elucidate the development of thought in the pericope from the initial response of the synagogue audience to Jesus' message in v 22, through to the enraged response of these same people in v 28.

2. Methodological Considerations

On surveying the literature one soon discovers that there is enormous diversity between the various attempts to understand Luke here.¹ It is obvious that Luke has not presented clearly a logical development of thought and it is tempting to solve all the problems by carving up the pericope into poorly dovetailed sources.² However

1. In this chapter for example we note six different and quite distinct ways in which Lk 4.25-7 has been understood.

2. See for example the attempt by E. Hirsch (Frühgeschichte II (1941) 38ff and 409f) to analyse the passage into two distinct and almost complete sources.
the fruitfulness of modern redaction-critical studies\(^1\) suggests that we should not be content to view Luke as a rather mindless editor, more concerned to gather the pieces of the tradition together than about seeing that the resulting product made sense. It is always possible that with the best intentions in the world Luke has not entirely succeeded in integrating his material, and even more likely that he has not succeeded in making clear to his readers his own concept of how the material fits together, but we must at least credit him with the intention of producing a coherent and intelligible whole and not too easily assume that he has failed in this intention.

A critical survey of some of the previous studies will identify some characteristic inadequacies in the approaches of those seeking to understand Lk 4.

B. Violet speaks of what amounts to remembered fragments of Jesus discourse on this occasion.\(^2\) By this means he seems to discourage from too much attempt to find the development of thought involved. Nevertheless he is himself deeply concerned about the development at one point, viz. his concern to show that Jesus apparently provocative words of v 23 must be understood to be addressed to a crowd that has already given open indication of their rejection of Jesus in v 22 and we must suspect Violet of avoiding the demand that his understanding of v 22 be integrated into a .........................................


\(^2\) B. Violet, "Nazareth-Perikope" (1938) 270.
coherent understanding of the whole passage. Whatever the fragmentary nature of Luke's sources, his presentation within a narrative framework is at least a prima facie claim to be presenting something which is coherently intelligible.

It is not only Violet who in considering this pericope gives almost exclusive attention to one move in the argument. J. Bajard gives his attention to the link between the positive assessment of Jesus which he sees in v 22 and Jesus' use in v 24 of the proverb about a prophet in his home-town. He produces cogent reasons for \( \varepsilon\kappa\tau\omicrion\), in v 24, having the same meaning as the occurrence in v 18, the sense for which he elicits from the LXX usage. With \( \varepsilon\kappa\tau\omicrion\) thus understood as "propitious", he draws attention to the phrase \( \theta\omicrion\varepsilon\tau\omicrion\varepsilon\sigma\tau\omicrion\omega\omicron\nu\omicrion\varepsilon\tau\omicrion\) from v 22, and makes good sense of the transition from v 22 to v 24 by understanding v 24 as Jesus response to a sentiment in v 22 which runs something like: "All thought he was marvellous and, noting that he was one of their own, looked forward to some advantage from the connection". In v 24 Jesus is thus seen to be denying them any advantage from the connection. But Bajard is not prepared to carry through the implications of his view. His precise understanding of v 24 stands strongly in contrast with what he says on vv 23-7. "Jesus explicite alors le v.21 en indiquant clairement qu'il n'entend limiter sa mission ni à sa ville ni même à sa nation". A strong denial has been weakened into

2. Ibid., 167.
3. Ibid., 170.
an intention not to limit.

We may level the same methodological criticism at Jeremias. He focusses his attention on what seems to be "the sudden and completely motiveless change of attitude on the part of Jesus' hearers". By adopting and extending Violets understanding of v 22 Jeremias is able to present Jesus' hearers as exhibiting, not a rapidly changing, but rather a consistent strongly negative attitude to Jesus. The case is plausible if we restrict our focus in the way Jeremias has, but it is immediately undermined when we scrutinize v 23 for the attitude which Jesus himself attributes to the audience at that point. Such requests as he suggests they wish to make are just not plausible from an audience of whom it can be said "that from the outset unanimous rage was their response to the message of Jesus".

Other studies are equally at fault in failing to give proper attention to all the steps in the argument. I mention these only to underline the methodological importance of following through consistently at every point in the development of thought, the implications of any suggested understanding of one particular move in the argument.

We noted earlier the agreement that Luke presents this episode as programmatic for the whole of what follows. I.e. Luke uses the pericope to introduce and anticipate several of his basic themes. I have no quarrel with this suggestion, but wish here to draw attention to some of the methodological use that has been

1. J. Jeremias, Promise (1958) 44.

2. Though note with N.B. Stonehouse (Luke (1951) 76) that this claim may be misleading if made too absolute.
made of this insight. The insight follows from a recognition in the pericope of themes and emphases that are important to Luke in the whole structure of the gospel, or even in the structure of the double volume Luke/Acts. This being so, it should in turn be possible to use the known Luke themes to elucidate the contents of the rejection at Nazareth pericope.

L.C. Crockett sets out to do this for the case of vv 25-7. His attention is drawn to v 25b by the way its presence distorts the parallelism of the section. From v 25b the words \( \varepsilon \pi \iota \mu \alpha \sigma \varsigma \nu \gamma \eta \nu \gamma \nu \) stand out as going beyond the OT account. That they came from Luke's hand is confirmed by the way they parallel the \( \varepsilon \phi \omicron \sigma \lambda \eta \nu \gamma \eta \nu \omicron \kappa \omicron \upsilon \omicron \mu \omicron \nu \nu \nu \) of Agabus' description in Acts 11.28 of the great famine to come. In that context we come across "a gentile Christian community at Antioch sustaining a Jewish Christian community in Judea". But doesn't this exactly parallel the way that the Gentile woman sustains the Jew Elijah? Crockett has only to add that Jewish - Gentile relations are an important Lukan theme and his case is made that we have in Luke 4.25-7 a prophetic anticipation of the Jewish - Gentile reconciliation achieved by the gospel. He confirms this view by pointing out the connection between Naaman and Cornelius and drawing our attention to the prominence of the question of Jewish - Gentile fraternization in the Cornelius Story.

We must protest that Crocket has failed to inform us of the major assumption on which his exegesis depends, because if we come now, armed with Crocket's understanding of vv 25-7, and

2. Ibid., 178.
look for the way this unfolds in its context in chapter 4, we are brought abruptly to a halt. Such an understanding of vv 25-7 has absolutely no relationship to the context in the pericope. If we could forget vv 22-4 we could conceivably understand that Jesus is giving more information about the time of messianic salvation whose arrival he has announced in v 18. But even to do this we have to be content with picking up phrases from vv 25-7 and not look too closely at the actual form of even these verses. Crockett's assumption must be that we have in Lk 4 a patternless mosaic of allusions to Lukan themes: that the narrative is merely an excuse for stringing together anticipatory notices of the themes which the reader will encounter as the work unfolds.

The article by Sister E.M. Prevalllet on the Rejection at Nazareth pericope,\(^1\) strictly falls outside the scope of this chapter focussing as it does on 4.29f. Nevertheless I draw attention to it here because it exhibits the same manner of approach as that of Crockett. Scholars generally consider the Nazareth rejection pericope programmatic because they recognize there a concentration of prominent Lukan themes. However, we can reach this conclusion in a more radical form along a slightly longer path. We first of all notice that on any count the passage is bristling with difficulties. It just does not run smoothly as a connected narrative. Then we recognise the Lukan themes present, and conclude that the reason Luke did not give adequate attention to psychological motivation and development of thought is that he was intent on writing up the material to highlight its 'prophetic' anticipation of what was to follow.\(^2\) Prevalllet takes up this approach and says

\(\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\)


2. Ibid., 8. Loisy (Synoptiques I, 844, 8) goes a step further in claiming that the whole thing is purely symbolic. The preaching at Nazareth is the type of the offer of the gospel to the Jews and the lack of miracles at Nazareth is a type of the reprobabation of Israel. Loisy likens the gospel writer to a glossator on the Markan text "qui oublierait de citer le texte qu'il commente".
"It has been suggested that Luke intends the scene to telescope the career of Jesus, and to bear a symbolic meaning."¹ All this sounds plausible until we discover what it means in Prevallet’s use of it. Prevallet attempts to throw new light on 4.30: τὸν Ἀβραάμ ἔλαβεν ὁ Προφήτης ᾿Ισραήλ ὁ μεσούς ὁ πρόφητης. She marshals evidence to suggest that "ἐξέρχομαι is most frequently used by Luke with reference to mission" while πορεύομαι is seen to be linked with the journey theme which is prominent in 9.51 - 19.36. In 17.11 both verbs occur in a journey context. On this basis she suggests that 4.30 refers "to Jesus’ ministry among the Jewish people – preaching the gospel of salvation, making his way to Jerusalem to accomplish the new passover of death, resurrection and ascension". We might paraphrase the verse to express her understanding: "He exercised his mission preaching in their midst and continued his journey towards Jerusalem". Now immediately we give her suggestion the concrete form of a paraphrase it is at once clear that the pericope cannot end this way. Jesus is presented in the previous verse as about to be hurled down from the top of a cliff, and at this point we are asked to believe that Luke decided to conclude with a generalized reference to the pattern of Jesus ministry! Yet Prevallet is not content to see just a secondary allusion. Her point is that the reference is "not to a miraculous escape". We are dealing here with an even more extreme form of Crockett’s implied assumption: a patternless mosaic of allusions to Lukan

¹ "Rejection", 5.
"It has been suggested that Luke intends the scene to telescope the career of Jesus, and to bear a symbolic meaning." 1 All this sounds plausible until we discover what it means in Prevallet's use of it. Prevallet attempts to throw new light on 4.30: ἀνέβης Ἔλθετε καὶ μέσαν ἀνήλθεν ἐπηρεάσαν. She marshals evidence to suggest that ἐλθετε is most frequently used by Luke with reference to mission while περευσμαι is seen to be linked with the journey theme which is prominent in 9.51 - 19.36. In 17.11 both verbs occur in a journey context. On this basis she suggests that 4.30 refers "to Jesus' ministry among the Jewish people - preaching the gospel of salvation, making his way to Jerusalem to accomplish the new passover of death, resurrection and ascension". We might paraphrase the verse to express her understanding: "He exercised his mission preaching in their midst and continued his journey towards Jerusalem". Now immediately we give her suggestion the concrete form of a paraphrase it is at once clear that the pericope cannot end this way. Jesus is presented in the previous verse as about to be hurled down from the top of a cliff, and at this point we are asked to believe that Luke decided to conclude with a generalized reference to the pattern of Jesus ministry! Yet Prevallet is not content to see just a secondary allusion. Her point is that the reference is "not to a miraculous escape". We are dealing here with an even more extreme form of Crockett's implied assumption: a patternless mosaic of allusions to Lukan

From our contact with the work of Crocke and Prevallet it should be evident that methodologically it is not satisfactory to allow the discovery of Lukan themes anticipated in this pericope to be the sole criterion of exegesis. We may be tempted after such results to rule it out as a criterion altogether. However, with the rest of Luke/Acts in our minds, it is hard to see how Luke could avoid having the reception of salvation by the Gentiles in mind when he wrote of Elijah and Elisha's dealings with the women of Zarephath of Sidonia, and Naaman the Syrian. Equally the repeated stress on the Jewish rejection of Jesus in the Acts addresses, encourages us strongly to see in Lk 4.28f something of a "dress rehearsal" for the crucifixion. And the proverb about the prophet rejected at home sounds just so appropriate for reference to Jewish rejection of the gospel. It would then be foolish to deny that our pericope bears a relation to at least some of these Lukan themes, but in reaction to Crocke's and Prevallet's work I wish to register a strong plea for priority to be given, in the search for the meaning of our pericope, to enquiring into the internal development of the story. Later in the chapter it will be necessary to look more closely at the question of the relationship of the pericope to major Lukan themes. However, to follow this suggestion about method we turn our attention now to the details of the pericope to seek to elucidate there the development of thought.

1. In less extreme forms lack of inner coherence is also claimed by Loisy, Luc, 159f; R. Asting, Verkündigung (1939) 595f; Leaney, Luke, 52; Löning, "Lukas", 219; P. Stuhlmacher, Vorgeschichte (1968) 226 and n 4; Lohfink, Sammlung (1975) 44-5. A. Hilgenfeld, "Verwerfung" (1902) 131-44 argues that the text has been disturbed by a later editor.
3. Luke 4.23a

We begin with the proverb from v 23, Ἰκτεί, τῇ παρευσάμενῳ ἰδιωτῷ. This starting point offers us the advantage of comparison with the use of similar proverbs in Classical and Rabbinic literature.

First a preliminary note on the framework in which the proverb occurs. With most commentators, I reject Wellhausen's suggestion that ἐρείτε is a prophetic future, despite the support that this suggestion has received from Conzelmann. If it is prophetic, it is without adequate fulfilment, notwithstanding Conzelmann's attempt to use Lk 8.19-21 for this end. Further εἴρειν at the beginning of v 24 is most intelligible if with Brun we see that it functions to show that here is the answer to what would have been the remark of Lk 4.23, but this


3. H. Conzelmann, Luke (1960) 35. R.C. Tannehill ("Mission" (1972) 56 n 15) criticizes Conzelmann's use of Lk 8.19-21 while himself (54) adopting a prophetic understanding of ἐρείτε. He argues curiously that the lack of an adequate fulfilment in Luke points to pre-Lukan non-Markan tradition (after claiming to have shown that the future reference is a result of Lukan editorial activity (54ff)).


5. εἰρέω is commonly taken to be a resumption of the Markan source, e.g. Leaney, Luke, 120. C. Masson ("Nazareth" (1961) 55) considers that it betrays Luke's consciousness of introducing material out of place.
can only be so if the remark of v 23 is one that the Nazareth folk were at present prepared to make. With the prophetic future understanding of v 23 we would need to understand vv 24ff as some explanation of the situation that will give rise to the future request of v 23, or some justification of the prophecy. In either case the \( \varepsilon \iota \pi \varepsilon \nu \delta \epsilon \) is out of place.

We aid better our understanding of \( \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon \iota \tau \epsilon \) by calling to mind Luke's fondness for pointing out Jesus' ability to read peoples' thoughts. In this pericope Luke first introduces to his readers Jesus' uncanny awareness of what goes on in peoples' minds. \( \varepsilon \iota \pi \varepsilon \nu \delta \epsilon \) can introduce Jesus' answer to the request of v 23, because Jesus has in effect snatched the words out of the mouths of the people of Nazareth. He has voiced their request for them and in v 24 can to all intents and purposes be introduced as a new speaker. This is Luke's dramatic way of introducing the incredible perceptiveness he wished to have Jesus display. Thus \( \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon \iota \tau \epsilon \) has the sense "you are on the point of saying", and the verses following proceed as though the people had in fact spoken the words of v 23.

In the proverb the natural reference of \( \sigma \varepsilon \varsigma \upsilon \tau \omicron \omicron \upsilon \) is back to Jesus himself, the "physician", but many exegetes, convinced that what follows the proverb in v 23 is epexegetic, and struggling to find the thought development through the passage have been forced to the conclusion that \( \sigma \varepsilon \varsigma \upsilon \tau \omicron \omicron \upsilon \) is a corporate reference to the citizens of Nazareth. Our first step then, to an understanding

1. Lk 5.22; 6.8; 7.40; 9.47; 11.17; cf. 20.23. Brun ("Besuch", 11) also makes this connection.

2. Cf. Ellis, Luke, 97: "Jesus states what the crowd is murmuring"; D. Hill, "Rejection" (1971) 168: "The audience's reaction is actually voiced by Jesus himself". Leaney (Luke, 119) seems to be moving in this direction when he suggests that "Luke has thus not very successfully disguised what in fact people did say".

3. So e.g. Th. Zahn, Lucas (1913) 240; Creed, Luke, 68; M.-J. Lagrange, Luc (1948) 142, with reservations; Schürmann, Lukas, 236f.
of the proverb will be to decide whether \( \sigma \varepsilon \alpha \upsilon \tau \omicron \omicron \upsilon \) ought here to be allowed this corporate sense.

Dio Chrysostom comes closest to offering some support for this corporate understanding.\(^1\) Dio likens a philosopher who refuses a request to rule his own city to a doctor who refuses to treat his own body. If the Lukan proverb had read \( \sigma \omicron \upsilon \mu \alpha \ \sigma \varepsilon \alpha \upsilon \tau \omicron \omicron \upsilon \) for \( \sigma \varepsilon \alpha \upsilon \tau \omicron \omicron \upsilon \) then we would not hesitate to claim Dio's support for the corporate understanding, because then the Lukan form would also contain the more fundamental comparison of Dio's, viz. that of the body politic with one's own physical body. In the absence of the word \( \sigma \omicron \upsilon \mu \alpha \) however, the understanding of the Lukan proverb could only find support here on the rather doubtful assumption that Dio's comparison was conceived of as being vividly present to the minds of those involved in the Lukan scene.

With the Dio Chrysostom reference thus eliminated, there is no encouragement at all in Rabbinic or Classical parallels for anything other than the personal individual reference of \( \sigma \varepsilon \alpha \upsilon \tau \omicron \omicron \upsilon \). So what has always been felt to be an uncomfortable conclusion\(^2\) becomes even more so. We nevertheless proceed to consider how the corporate sense might fit into the context.

If \( \sigma \varepsilon \alpha \upsilon \tau \omicron \omicron \upsilon \) consists of the citizens of Nazareth then the link is with the \( \upsilon \omicron \omicron \omicron \) of Lk 4.22. It is the recognition that he is a "local lad" which becomes the basis

\[ \text{(1)} \text{ Dio. Chrys. Discourses 49.13f. For a detailed treatment of the Classical and Rabbinic background to this proverb see appendix 1.} \]

\[ \text{(2)} \text{ Creed, Luke, 68, "It does not seem very appropriate here";} \]
\[ \text{Lagrange, Luc, 142, "L'application n'est pas très stricte ...";} \]
\[ \text{Schürmann (Lukas, 236) speaks of the sense as "übertragen".} \]
for their demand that he show the signs of his messiahship in their midst.¹

Now we could have here a demand for privileged treatment for his own home-town, motivated by some measure of irritation that Jesus has previously performed miracles in Capernaum and not in Nazareth.² But this would be an exercise in parochialism, not the rejection of Jesus which, we will argue below, it is branded as by Jesus' words of v 24. There is a further problem created by the presence in v 23b of ἵκοοτσαμεν. ὡσεν ὑμῶν ἐν οὐκοτσαμεν without the intermediate ἵκοοτσαμεν would have been the unambiguous way of asking for a repeat performance in Nazareth of the miracles of Capernaum. The added ἵκοοτσαμεν complicates inordinately the grammatical structure,³ and to no purpose if it does not express doubts about the authenticity

1. Bajard, "Structure", 167. Other commentators do not make this connection explicit. Schürmann (Lukas, 236f) seems to imply this view.

I speak here of Jesus' messianic claim with reference to Lk 4.18-21. This is disputed by J. de La Potterie ("Onction" (1958) 231f) and F. Hahn (Titles (1969) 381f), supported by F. Schnider (Prophet (1973) 165). Jesus is certainly presented here as claiming to be more than just another prophet and whether this should be properly designated by "eschatological prophet" (as Hahn) or by "messiah" does not materially affect what we are saying. Messianic categories are simply used for convenience.

2. Plummer, Luke, 126; L. Morris, Luke (1974) 107. Zahn, Lukas, 240 expresses a similar view when he speaks of Jesus "... der bisher manchen Hilfsbedürftigen in fremden Städten Hilfe gebracht hatte, in der Vaterstadt aber, deren Bewohner ihm viel näher stehen sollten, sich mit einer schönen Rede schien begnügen zu wollen; ...." But there is of course no trace in the text of Jesus wanting his fellow citizens to be content with a fine speech. It is true that the fulfilment in Lk 4.21 is initially "als Wort": it consists of the words of Isaiah coming from the lips of Jesus, the one prophetically destined to speak them. However, it is gratuitous to suggest that there is any thought that the Nazareth folk could be left with "Wort" and no "Tat". The "Wort" fulfilment announces the presence of the one who also brings "Tat". E.g. Jesus announces (continued...)
of the Capernaum miracles. But if the citizens of Nazareth don't really believe there were miracles at Capernaum then the parochial jealousy which provides motivation at this point has its basis eroded.

We could of course follow Bajard and find no criticism at all in the proverb. According to Bajard, the people of Nazareth were delighted to discover who Jesus was and are here intent on exploiting the acquaintance, on the basis of their fellow-citizenship. This view brings us into sharper collision with the understanding of \( \text{\textgamma\textalpha\textomicron\textomicro
We can now note further that the reference to sick doctors in Classical and Rabbinic literature are overwhelmingly critical and unanimously so in the case of proverbial references. This alone should give us pause in allowing any understanding of the Lukan proverb as a simple request with a total absence of critical overtone. But this is what Bajard asks of us. He sets the proverbs on the lips of those who are enthusiastically for Jesus. For these reasons therefore we must reject Bajard's positive understanding of the request made by the proverb.

A third possibility is to see here a demand for messianic activity on the basis that, if the signs of messiahship should be evident anywhere, it ought to be at his home. "You can't claim to be the wonder-working messiah and then restrict your activities to other areas where their authenticity is not able to be scrutinized (by us)". Or to change the emphasis slightly: in answer to Jesus' claim to be messiah, the Nazareth folk reply, "but this is your home and we haven't seen any sign of it here."

What he says it is his mission to do, he has not done in his home-town. Stories of what Jesus might or might not have done in Capernaum count little if Jesus behaviour in Nazareth gives no support to his claim.

1. The proverbial references may be found in Plut. How to tell a flatterer c32 p71f; How to profit from one's enemies 88D; On brotherly love 481A; Reply to Colotes 1110E, Galen 6.307, Gen. Rab. 23.4 and parallels. Other references not in proverbial form are Homer Iliad 11.833-5; Aeschylus Promethius Bound 469-75; Cicero Ep. ad. fam. 4.5.5; Ovid Metam. 6.561, De rem. amor. 314; Galen 6.152; Greg. Naz. Oration: In Defence of his flight to Pontus; Isidore of Pelusium Ep.5.196,275; Midr. Rab. Lam.1.16851; Midr. Rab. Lev 5.6; cf. also Lucian Apology for "On salaried posts in great houses" 7; Midr. Rab. Num 20.14. For discussion see appendix 1.
I am not conscious of any major problem with this understanding of the words apart from the general problem that stands over all these suggestions, of requiring \( \sigma \varepsilon \alpha \upsilon \tau \omicron \omicron \) to have a different reference than does the \( \iota \alpha \tau \omicron \rho \epsilon \) to which it naturally refers back. However, while this understanding makes quite good sense of the words, it gives an overall shape to the development of the pericope which seems unfortunate and hardly what Luke would have had in mind. We have a situation where Jesus throws down the gauntlet by his claim to be messiah. The synagogue audience take it up and then Jesus seems to back out. Of course we can explain away the problem in terms of the sovereign freedom of the Lord and the inadequacy of faith based on miracles, but there is still an uncomfortable feeling that Jesus has set himself up as the wonder-working messiah and then backed away from his claim being put to the test.

We may then summarise our evaluation of the possibility of a corporate sense for \( \sigma \varepsilon \alpha \upsilon \tau \omicron \omicron \). Rabbinic and Classical background offers us no assistance for this sense despite the initial hopefulness of the reference from Dio Chrysostom. Further, the corporate meaning fails to give an adequate sense to the section whether we take the request as issuing from irritated parochialism, positive enthusiasm or critical acumen. We must therefore reject a corporate sense for \( \sigma \varepsilon \alpha \upsilon \tau \omicron \omicron \) and take its reference as being to Jesus himself, individually. From this conclusion we continue our investigation into the function and significance of the proverb in the Lukan context.

It would be most convenient for our understanding of the proverb if the words following the proverb which complete v 23 were epexegetical of the proverb. The request made by the proverb would then be for a repeat performance in Nazareth of the miracles reported from Capernaum. These miracles would be demanded as evidence for the claims Jesus has just made. The proverb would then have to mean "show your credentials". Luce complains that "this is over-subtle", and I am inclined to agree. For this understanding, the self-healing in the proverb has to be a bettering of Jesus own position in so far as establishing a basis for his messianic claims by miracle working. But this requires that the bettering of his own position be of quite a different kind from the improvement of condition that Jesus has claimed to be able to provide for others in vv 18-21. There is therefore an uncomfortable asymmetry in the reference of the proverb to healing.

If v 23b cannot be taken as epexegetical it still must remain important for our understanding of the proverb, since the proverb must take a sense to which v 23b can be a suitable next step.

1. Schürmann, **Lukas**, 236; Masson, "Nazareth", 52; Schmid, **Lukas**, 113.
3. Even with an epexegetical sense the reference of τ η v παραβάλλων ταύτης ν to v 23b is not strict, but is allowable in a secondary sense as a bringing out of the meaning of the parable. The rejection here of an epexegetical sense for v 23b is at the cost of claiming an even greater looseness of expression by Luke at this point. The τ η v παραβάλλων ταύτης ν refers properly to the quoted proverb, and the further development συνετείνεται is not catered for by the introductory remark.
V 23b needs to be able to form a natural development on from v 23a.

The difficulty that stands before any understanding of the proverb as a demand that Jesus authenticate his claims is this matter of finding the right application of the healing metaphor so that equal justice is done both to the case of Jesus himself and to that of his fellow-citizens in Nazareth. But maybe we are wrong to place the stress on a demand for evidence. The Classical and Rabbinic material would certainly weigh in against any such emphasis on a demand for evidence. In so far as it relates to evidence at all it would have us think in terms more of an assertion of the contrary evidence. The closest parallels have a situation where people respond to interference in their lives by somebody, with a proverbial retort. The retort denies the right to interfere, on the basis that what the well-intentioned person wants to achieve for another is what he has not managed in his own case. If we seek to conform our understanding of the Lukan proverb to this pattern there is still the need to discover the application of the healing metaphor which does justice to both parties in the exchange, but the different emphasis gives quite a new slant to the matter.

It could be objected that the Classical material we are comparing has the proverb in the form of an assertion, while in Luke the form is imperative and that we are therefore not justified

1. Schmid (Lukas, 113) already recognizes that the attitude in v 23 is rejecting and sceptical.
2. Plut. How to tell a flatterer c32 p71F; Gen. Rab. 23.4.
3. The Rabbinic reference Gen. Rab. 23.4 has however imperative form.
4. Ἀλλων ἰατρὸς αὐτὸς ἐλκεσον βρῶν.
in being directed by the emphasis of the Classical material. In answer to this we turn our attention to some verses in Lk 23. A number of studies of the Nazareth pericope draw attention to the similarity between the "heal thyself" of 4.23 and the three statements in Lk 23 (vv 35,37,39) which make the request that Jesus save himself. The form in v 35 Ἀλλοις ἐσώσατε, σωσάτω ἐκυρέω shows that the verb σώζω has here the same double reference to Jesus and to others as has Ἄρα παρεύω in 4.23. With heavy handed irony the verse plays off Jesus' claim to be able to save others (eg. Lk 19.9) against his own sorry state. Now this is exactly the emphasis that we have been considering adopting from the Classical and Rabbinic materials, for Lk 4.23. The requests in Lk 23 may be formally asking for evidence of messiahship (i.e. have imperative form) but the emphasis is all on the powerlessness of Jesus before his awful fate. So we conclude that the presence of the imperative in Lk 4.23 should not discourage us from being guided by the emphasis of the Classical parallels, while the verses from Lk 23 positively encourage us in that direction.

Taking our cue then from the Classical and Rabbinic parallels we seek a sense for the proverb that in some way lays


2. N. Geldenhuys (Luke (1950) 609) thinks that the people "admit that Ἰησοῦς saved others". Luke however consistently uses σώζω with a greater theological content than mere healing, even when healing is involved. As early as Lk 2.11 when the birth of Jesus is announced to the shepherds as of a σωτήρ ἐστιν Χριστός κύριος the question is already set in terms of whether Jesus is σωτήρ and can σῴζει or not. Geldenhuys' view greatly weakens the force of the Lukian expression.
stress on short-comings in Jesus himself. If it is true that the Nazareth pericope contains in a sense a "dress-rehearsal" for the passion, then the proverb functions in its context as do the words quoted above from Lk 23.35 in the context of the passion. The point in both will be that Jesus state doesn't match up with his claims. He looks anything but the glorious Messiah. It is already this anomaly to which the words $O\nu\lambda\iota\iota\sigma\iota\tau\iota\sigma\iota\tau\sigma$ of v 22 refer. The reference is too compressed for us to be quite sure how Luke saw their objection. In the light of the birth narratives there could be some stain of illegitimacy involved or it could relate to the dictum "famous men don't live in the


2. The corresponding section in the Markan pericope, Mk 6.3, is certainly an objection and there can be little doubt that Luke means an objection to be registered. Cf. E. Klostermann, Lukasevangelium (1929) 64. See also the discussion by Stuhlmacher, Vorgeschichte, 225-9, esp.228. Luke's $\kappa\lambda\gamma\omicron\omicron\nu$ at this point, which separates this question off from the report of their reaction in v 22a, suggests that $O\nu\chi\iota\iota\sigma\iota\tau\sigma\iota\tau\sigma\iota\tau\sigma\iota\tau\sigma$ introduces and is caught up in the exchange between Jesus and the crowd (esp. vv 22b-24). If this is so it is a further encouragement not to allow what seems to be the positive reaction to Jesus of v 22a to control the sense of v 22b.

house next-door". He who heralds the glories of the messianic age should be one who stands far above the common herd. Of the Messiah is expected splendour and majesty and great stature, not the homely presence of the boy who grew up down the road. For one who offered the glories of the messianic age, he seems himself to have participated surprisingly little in its benefits. We may capture the thrust of the proverb in the words of Farrar,¹ "If you are the Messiah why are you so poor and humble?". In their reckoning, Jesus of all people was in no position to make such a claim. A person of such humble circumstances could not be the Messiah.

We noted earlier the importance of Lk 4.23b for our understanding of the Lukian proverb. We now proceed to test this understanding of ἦν ἴδος ἔλεγεν, Ἰησοῦς ἦς οὗτος ἄνθρωπον Ἰερουσαλήμ ἔσται by seeing how well v 23b follows on from the sense we have given to the proverb.

4. Luke 4.23b

Perhaps the major question to be answered for an understanding of v 23b is whether the miracles asked for in Nazareth are to be understood in relation to the wonders promised in v 18f, and thus as a demand that Jesus exercise in his home-town the ministry he claims to have in vv 18-21. Although this would be an obvious sense to give the words, it produces real problems when we try to understand Jesus' reply to the request. Jesus is then represented as refusing to exercise his ministry in his σπέρμα on the rather lame basis that Elijah and Elisha didn't exercise

1. Farrar, Luke, 104. Note that the application of ἔδωκαί Σωτῆρα is here the same for both Jesus and the people.
their ministry in their πατρίς Israel. Further a difficulty in the overall movement of thought arises similar to that encountered with the third of those senses of the proverb which we considered that take σεαυτόν corporately. Jesus is placed in a situation where it appears he must back down from his messianic claim.

The alternative available to us in v 23b is to see the demand for miracles in Nazareth as a demand for evidence of office, rather than exercise of office, and thus to separate the miracles here from the messianic ministry outlined in vv 18-19. Jesus' reply then implies his refusal of miracles demanded as evidence of office, and not a refusal to exercise his messianic ministry in Nazareth. Jesus' reply will be elucidated further when we turn our attention to the exegesis of those verses. This understanding of v 23b forms a smooth development on from the sense offered above for the Lukan proverb of v 23a. It has already been shown that the Nazarenes are sceptical about the miracle reports from Capernaum. ¹ By means of the proverb they let Jesus know that they consider him an unlikely candidate for the claimed messianic office.

¹. It may well be true historically and/or in the tradition that Luke received that the miracles at Capernaum refer to those recorded by Luke in the following pericopes (i.e. the Markan order). However Luke shows by his generalizing introductory verses (Lk 4.14f) that he is not claiming the Nazareth incident as the beginning in time for Jesus' Galilean ministry, however much he may lay stress on it as a front-piece for his reporting of that ministry. Further, the development of thought at v 23 requires that the Capernaum miracles referred to should have already occurred, for which possibility vv 14, 15 make room. (Συνάρμολογική used in v 14 normally refers in Lk to Jesus' miracles. Cf. Schürmann, Lukas, 222, 237.)
All he has to his credit are some unlikely stories from Capernaum. Rather sceptically they offer to take him more seriously if he performs some miracles before their eyes. They are asking for wonders to dazzle them — something that will dispel their impression that one so "poor and humble" could not possibly be the messiah. They want him to show some messianic impressiveness and splendour.


We now turn to a consideration of Jesus' reply in Lk 4.24. It is first to be said that we are dealing here with another proverbial statement, as in v 23. As is common among the Rabbis a proverb is here answered with a proverb. It is not specifically labelled as such but has the economical form to be expected of a proverb, and its proverbial nature can be recognised in the manner in which a true generalization here takes on an absolute form in which it is not literally defensible.

1. Ellis (Luke, 97) links this to the request for signs in the Satanic temptations of the previous episode.

2. It may be that of v 23 has a double significance. On the lips of the Nazareth folk it reinforces their scepticism about the Capernaum miracles, by suggesting that they, his fellow citizens, are best placed to assess his claims. In relation to Luke's overall development and in particular in anticipation of v 24 it underlines the fact that it is Jesus' that is putting this demand on him and thereby showing its unbelief and rejection.


Unfortunately this proverb lacks the helpful Classical and Rabbinic parallels which aided our study of Lk 4.23a. There is both Rabbinic and Classical reference to the tendency for the "home product" to be discounted, but no true proverb and no context that throws light on the present one.

We do have, however, a parallel proverb in each of the gospels and it will be helpful from the outset to compare them. The form in Mt and Mk suggests that a prophet finds acceptance, except at home, while the forms in Lk and Jn mention only the rejection at home. Luke's exclusive focus on rejection encourages us in the view mentioned earlier that we have in the pericope a dress rehearsal for the passion. It is the lot of the prophet to be rejected by those to whom he is sent. Jesus fulfils the prophetic role par excellence. Even in Lk 4.25-7 the emphasis is not on what others received, but on what Israel missed out on. After all, two people aided is not a very impressive score. It is hardly a picture.

---

1. Pindar N. 7.61 and 89; Euripides HF 186; Apollonius Ep.44; Dio Chrysostom Discourses 47.2; Pliny Nat. 35.36; Pliny Ep. 8.20.1; Cicero Fin. 1.3; Seneca Ben. 3.3.1; Y. Ta'an 4.68a.
2. Mt 13.57 (Mk 6.4) οὐκ ... ἀπεκρύμενος εἶ μη ... 
3. Lk 4.24 οὐδὲ εἰς ... ἁπλοτός ... 
4. Jn 4.44 ... τεύχεται οὐκ εὖ εἰ. 
5. The context of the Johannine reference provides a contrasting acceptance in Galilee (Jn 4.45). 
6. This makes particularly fitting the emphasis found in the proverb of Lk 4.23 on Jesus as "poor and humble". 
7. See below where Lk 4.25-7 is dealt with in some detail.
of Israel rejecting and the Gentiles streaming in.

The other point to be noted while we are considering the other gospel parallels is Luke's exclusive use of \( \kappa\varepsilon\kappa\tau\rho\oslash \). It is a strange use of a word that otherwise always relates to God's attitude to something. It must be that Luke has taken up the word from v 19. It does not appear to seriously affect the meaning of the proverb, but merely introduces a word play, perhaps for purposes of irony something like that suggested by Brun, "Der Herald des 'willkommen' Jahres des Herrn ist in seiner Vaterstadt nicht 'willkommen'!".

We have already established that v 24 is a response by Jesus to the remarks of the people of Nazareth (which he has verbalized for them). This already narrows sharply the range of possible understandings of v 24. Thus for example any understanding which sees in v 24(ff) an explanation or justification of the claim

\begin{itemize}
  \item 1. BAG, 173; Hill, "Rejection", 169.
  \item 2. Pace Bajard, "Structure"; Hill, "Rejection", 169; Tannehill, "Mission", 58. See earlier criticism of Bajard's article. Further if we press \( \kappa\varepsilon\kappa\tau\rho\oslash \) as meaning acceptable to God (as Hill and Bajard) then the sense emerges for v 24 "The prophetic ministry must always be exercised away from home". This would make good sense of vv 25-7 but is an overkill and has to be softened down by its proponents (Bajard, 170; Hill, 169). As a reason for refusing miracles it seems to make nonsense of the prophetic fulfilment in vv 18-21 which self-consciously and deliberately finds its setting in Nazareth. Further I have suggested that v 23 is primarily a rejection of Jesus and an understanding of v 24 that responds to this would be preferable to one that responds to the rather secondary and cynical demand for miracles.
  \item 3. Brun, "Besuch", 12. J.A. Sanders ("From Isaiah 61" (1975) 99) suggests that Luke thus "emphasizes that it is not what man has pleasure in, or accepts, but what is acceptable to God that matters at the Eschaton."
\end{itemize}

Masson's "repuouser l'un, c'était repousser l'autre" ("Nazareth", 58) is over subtle.

We ought not to make too much of Luke's termination of the proverb with \( \pi\alpha\tau\rho\alpha\iota\iota\varepsilon\kappa\omicron\omicron\upsilon\omicron\nu\alpha\upsilon\rho\circ\omicron\upsilon \), where Mark has as well \( \varepsilon\nu\tau\omicron\iota\omicron\sigma\upsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon\nu\sigma\nu\tau\omicron\upsilon\nu\kappa\iota\upsilon\upsilon\kappa\alpha\upsilon\nu\kappa\iota\upsilon\upsilon\kappa\alpha\upsilon\nu \). With greater economy of expression Luke has achieved a more truly proverbial form, more suitable for use in the interchange with the Nazareth congregation which he presents. In the Markan (continued...)
that Jesus makes in v 23 is automatically excluded.\textsuperscript{1}

The words of the proverb of v 24 taken alone need express no more than the "curious psychological fact"\textsuperscript{2} that there is a human tendency to discount the home-product. There are numerous parallels for this insight in the Classical and Rabbinic material,\textsuperscript{3} and the "wisdom saying" form of the proverb in Mk 6.4 may belong in this category.\textsuperscript{4} However two considerations suggest that we have more than that here. Firstly there is the presence of \( 	ext{Q} \) in the introduction. O'Neill points out that \( 	ext{Q} \) is "the only foreign word which Luke retains in either the gospel or Acts", and shows that the six occurrences "were chosen deliberately to draw attention to key points of Jesus' teaching as Luke understood it".\textsuperscript{5}

\textbf{3. (continued ...)} context the saying has the form and function of a wisdom saying. It is possible with D.E. Nineham (Mark (1968) 167) that the Markan extra may have been added by Mark to fit the context better, but it is more likely that the wisdom saying is earlier.

\textbf{........}

1. I therefore cannot accept the suggestion of Reicke ("Nazareth", 50) that the prophet proverb substantiates the use of the physician proverb.


3. See list at p 27 n 1.

4. See p 28 n 3.

5. J.C. O'Neill, "Amen Sayings" (1959) 1. I do not however accept O'Neill's suggestion as to the point of this proverb.
If this is so there must be something more here than a "curious psychological fact". The second consideration is the apparent importance for Luke of Jesus' identification as a prophet.\(^1\) While in v 23 Jesus is only identified metaphorically as doctor, in v 24 the Lukan emphasis would encourage us to see Jesus identified quite literally as a prophet.

It is clear that Jesus' words in v 24 proceed from a sense of rejection\(^2\) (οὐδείς... τοῦτο αὐτῶν), and that the proverb constitutes some kind of interpretation of this rejection. That Jesus gives no answer to the request for miracles in v 23 confirms our earlier conclusion that what we have in v 23 is not primarily a request but a rejection. It is sufficiently plain, without the need for him to say so, that Jesus in his turn rejects the cynical demand for miracles - or perhaps more accurately disregards it.

Jesus is not at all abashed by his poor reception.\(^3\) He points out that they are treating him to a prophet's fate.\(^4\) He refers to the pattern set by the rejection of the OT prophets and thus continues his prophetic claim of vv 18-21.\(^5\) The importance

\[\ldots\]


2. Cf. Masson ("Nazareth", 58) who sees Jesus using v 24 "... dénoncer l'opposition à laquelle il se heurtait dans sa 'patrice'."

3. Schlatter, Markus und Lukas, 204.

4. G. Voss, Christologie (1965) 158; H. Schürmann, "Traditionsgeschichte" (1970) 190; F. Schnider (Prophet, 166f) admits the presence but denies the prominence of the theme.

5. It can hardly be disputed that whatever else may or may not be involved here (cf. p 16 n 1 ), Jesus is at least making a claim to be a prophet. That he repeats as his own the words of the prophet at least shows that.
to Luke of identifying Jesus as a prophet has already been mentioned. Luke is equally concerned to stress that the Israelites have characteristically rejected the prophets.\footnote{1}{We have in Lk 4.24 an intersection of these two Lukian themes. Luke works out the notion that the case of Jesus becomes the climactic occurrence of this characteristic rejection.} Once more the pericope shows itself as a dress-rehearsal for the passion.\footnote{2}{We may say that this verse serves Luke's purpose by preparing the reader for Jesus' prophetic destiny in Jerusalem.} Luke's termination of the proverb with πατρίδος facilitates the transfer from rejection by Jesus' πατρίδος which is Nazareth to rejection by his πατρίδος which is Jerusalem.\footnote{5}{By isolating two alternative sets of basic hermeneutical axioms J.A. Sanders ("From Isaiah 61") makes a case for understanding v 24 as signalling Jesus' commitment to a method of hermeneutics based on "prophetic realism" (95) in which the traditions of a group are used in such a way as to challenge from within the group's self-understanding as the elect of God (95-100). (We can paraphrase v 24 on Sander's understanding: "a true prophetic mission always shatters the complacency of the in-group and can therefore expect to be rejected"). Vv 25-27 are understood to exhibit the hermeneutic in action as the Elijah and Elisha traditions are brought to bear in a midrashic exegesis of Isaiah 61. (continued...)}


2. See esp. Lk 20.9-19 (the parable of the vineyard and tenants). We should note however that Luke has a tendency, exhibited in this parable, to lay the rejection of Jesus at the feet of the Jewish leadership rather than to blame the people at large.

3. George's claim ("Predication", 18 and 23) that πατρίδος in v 24 equals Israel is understandable in the light of the connection between v 24 and vv 25-7, but must be rejected on the basis of the statement/response relationship between v 24 and v 23 where πατρίδος clearly equals Nazareth.

4. Cf. J.A. Sanders, "From Isaiah 61", 104: "Luke wrote his gospel in large measure to answer the embarrassing question of why Jesus was crucified".

5. Cf. J.A. Sanders, "From Isaiah 61", 104: "Luke wrote his gospel in large measure to answer the embarrassing question of why Jesus was crucified".

Lk 4.25-7 must now become the object of our inquiry. It seems that at least four distinct ways have been suggested for linking these verses with what precedes.\(^1\) We can paraphrase the senses that would result as follows:

(i) "You reject me like a prophet, and like a prophet I will bestow my miraculous benefits on outsiders."\(^2\)

(ii) "Prophets are not accepted at home, as for example in the cases of Elijah and Elisha."\(^3\)

(iii) "Your rejection of me means that others will get the benefits, just as happened in the cases of Elijah and Elisha."\(^4\)

5. (continued ...)

While he claims to have in this way solved the problems of discontinuity between vv 24 and vv 25-7 (103) Sanders does not seem to notice the discontinuity he has opened up between v 23 and v 24. Sanders regards v 24 as primarily forward looking (99), however the \(\epsilon\nu \tau\hbar \pi\nu\sigma\varphi\lambda\iota\varepsilon\iota\nu\omega\) of v 24 which picks up the \(\epsilon\nu \tau\hbar \pi\nu\sigma\varphi\lambda\iota\varepsilon\iota\nu\omega\) suggests that we have rather a comment on what has gone before.

Even if we allow that Sanders' study in "comparative midrash" (cf. 74-77) illuminates the use of Elijah and Elisha traditions in vv 25-7 as a rather searching exposition of the Is 61 verses and also accept his identification of the hermeneutic tradition involved, this does not lead us to his understanding of v 24. His understanding requires the assumption of an analytical self-consciousness about the nature of the conflict between the two hermeneutical systems which Sanders does not demonstrate. Further, other Lukan uses of \(\pi\rho\sigma\varphi\eta\tau\gamma\varsigma\) point to the fate of the prophets (6.23; 11.47,48,49; 13.33,34) and not to the nature of the prophetic ministry as a ministry of challenge to the self-understanding of the in-group, as required for Sanders' understanding.

1. We should perhaps also note Crockett's view ("Jewish-Gentile Relations") where any thought of linking has been dispensed with. He sees in vv 25-7 a prophetic notice of Jewish/Gentile reconciliation.


4. Ellis, Luke, 98; Rengstorff, Lukas, 68. Schlatter (Markus und Lukas, 204) combines elements of (ii) and (iii).
(iv a) "Though I am your fellow-citizen you can't demand miracles of me, any more than Israel had claim to miracles from Elijah and Elisha in the cases cited."\(^1\)

(iv b) "Like Elijah and Elisha my prophetic calling is to minister to foreigners."\(^2\)

((iv a) and (iv b) both find the connection of vv 25-7 with what precedes in the request for miracles. They differ only in the way in which the examples of Elijah and Elisha are seen to justify the refusal of miracles in Nazareth. Schürmann is able to combine the two.)

If we have understood v 24 above correctly then, since the question of miracles in Nazareth was already closed by v 24, it can hardly be reopened in vv 25-7. If Jesus has already been responding to rejection\(^3\) in v 24 it is inappropriate that he should be defending his refusal of miracles in these verses. The

\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\]

1. Zahn, Lukas, 242; Schürmann, Lukas, 238f; C. Masson, "Nazareth", 57; Schmid, Lukas, 113f.


It would be possible to support this view by regarding the use of \(\pi\ \epsilon\ \rho\ \tau\ \epsilon\ \lambda\ \omega\) in v 26 as a synonym for \(\pi\ \rho\ \tau\ \epsilon\ \lambda\ \omega\) and thus to link with v 18 and find a semi-technical reference to the divine sending of a prophet. However three considerations tell against this view.

1. It is \(\pi\ \rho\ \tau\ \epsilon\ \lambda\ \omega\) and not \(\pi\ \epsilon\ \mu\ \omega\) that has acquired this semi-technical sense.

2. That \(\pi\ \epsilon\ \rho\ \tau\ \epsilon\ \lambda\ \omega\) is not technical is supported by the parallel for the Elisha incident being \(\kappa\ \epsilon\ \theta\ \omega\ \rho\ \epsilon\ \delta\ \omega\).

3. If there were here a reference to a ministry appointed to foreigners, then nonsense is made of Jesus announcing himself to the Nazareth congregation. (Pace Tannehill, "Mission", 59.)

3. We might add that he is responding to it in a way that shows acceptance of it rather than any "last ditch" attempt to reverse that refusal.
(iv a) "Though I am your fellow-citizen you
can't demand miracles of me, any more than Israel
had claim to miracles from Elijah and Elisha in
the cases cited."¹

(iv b) "Like Elijah and Elisha my prophetic
calling is to minister to foreigners."²

((iv a) and (iv b) both find the connection of vv 25-7
with what precedes in the request for miracles. They differ only
in the way in which the examples of Elijah and Elisha are seen
to justify the refusal of miracles in Nazareth. Schürmann is
able to combine the two.)

If we have understood v 24 above correctly then, since
the question of miracles in Nazareth was already closed by v 24,
it can hardly be reopened in vv 25-7. If Jesus has already been
responding to rejection³ in v 24 it is inappropriate that he
should be defending his refusal of miracles in these verses. The

...............  

1. Zahn, Lukas, 242; Schürmann, Lukas, 238f; C. Masson,
"Nazareth", 57; Schmid, Lukas, 113f.

2. Schürmann, Lukas, 238f; Hill, "Rejection", 169; Creed,

It would be possible to support this view by regarding
the use of περὶων in v 26 as a synonym for ἀποστέλλω and
thus to link with v 18 and find a semi-technical reference to the
divine sending of a prophet. However three considerations tell
against this view.

1. It is ἀποστέλλω and not περὶων that has acquired
this semi-technical sense.

2. That περὶων is not technical is supported by
the parallel for the Elisha incident being ἄνθρωπος.

3. If there were here a reference to a ministry appointed
to foreigners, then nonsense is made of Jesus announcing himself to
the Nazareth congregation. (Pace Tannehill, "Mission", 59.)

3. We might add that he is responding to it in a way that shows
acceptance of it rather than any "last ditch" attempt to reverse
that refusal.
emphasis on miracles in vv 25-7 is such as to require some antecedent but we suggest that this lies further back in the words Jesus takes on his lips in vv 18f. Messianic blessing is offered at the beginning of the intercharge and withdrawn at the end of it. I therefore consider it a mistake to link vv 25-7 with the preceding by means of the miracles demanded in v 23. (iv a) and (iv b) are thus eliminated from our list.

The second suggestion makes Elijah and Elisha examples of the proverb. They establish or at least illustrate its validity. The cases cited would then serve as instances of rejection of a prophet by his προφήτης. The fatal objection to this view has already been noted earlier. The emphasis of vv 25-7 is on how the widows and lepers of Israel failed to gain any benefit from the presence of Elijah and Elisha. There is not one word about their rejecting the prophet, or failing to believe etc. If prophetic rejection is what links vv 25-7 to v 24 it seems strange that any reference to prophetic rejection in vv 25-7 must be

1. Some studies (e.g. Reicke, "Nazareth", 49) link the healing references in both 4.23 and 4.27, to 4.18.
2. It will be recalled that it was argued above that the miracles demanded in v 23 do not refer back to the messianic blessings which Jesus claims to introduce in vv 18-21.
3. We should note that a correlate of this conclusion is that we are forbidden the link between Capernaum of v 23 and Syria of v 27. The folk of Capernaum do not stand in any sense for foreigners.
4. v 26 ... προς σοῦ ... αὐτῶν ἐφέπεμφην ...
   v 27 ... σὺναίσθησιν αὐτῶν ἐκαθέρνατε ...
imported by implication. More so when we see that the OT contexts in 1 Kgs 17 and 18 and 2 Kgs 5 from which the reference to Elijah and Elisha arise lack any clear reference to rejection of the prophets. The remaining suggestions are thus (i) and (iii).

It seems likely that the repeated of v 25 and v 27 takes up the of v 23 and v 24, on the basis that Israel was to the two great prophets. Plummer's suggestion ( (i) above) does not take adequate account of this. He sees the link as provided solely by the prophetic identity of Jesus. Jesus is prophet-like in one way in v 24, and announces his intention to be prophet-like in another way in vv 25-7. The link is more by catch-word than by development of thought and as such appears somewhat contrived.

Suggestion (iii) survives both the objections to Plummer's proposal. Rejection by the leads to the benefits going outside the . V 24 refers to the fact of rejection, vv 25-7 introduce the consequences of that rejection. However, even here there is a problem. To do justice to this view we must find an accent in vv 25-7 on the blessing of non-Israelites. The rejection of vv 23f leads to a redirection of the messianic blessings set forward in vv 18f to those outside the . It is the desire for just this emphasis which caused Wellhausen to maintain that the at the conclusion of v 26 is the result of a

1. Loisy, Synoptiques I, 846, "Elie n'était pas autrement honoré à Sarepta, et ... Élisée ne fut nullement meprise en Israël."

The widows of Israel receive no relief because the country stands under Elijah's prophetic word of judgement that there shall be no rain. The judgement relates to Baal worship and not to any response to Elijah himself.

Elisha heals the foreigner so that it will be known that there is a prophet in Israel (2 Kgs 5.8).
misreading of יִרְאוּ הָאָרֶץ as יִרְאֵה הָאָרֶץ in Luke's source and that we should therefore read סָפָרָה. 1 His conjecture is unlikely, but it draws attention to the fact that the text as it stands does not clearly stress the transfer from מָכָּר סָפָרָה to outsiders. As we have suggested, these verses surely focus on the many needy widows and lepers in Israel who remained without help despite the fact that there was "a prophet in Israel". 2 Taking this observation as the point of departure I therefore offer another suggestion about the significance of vv 25-7.

(v) "By rejecting me you will miss out on the benefits which you would have been in line for in the normal course of events."

On this understanding v 24 and vv 25-7 are linked by the shared interest in a prophet in his מָכָּר סָפָרָה, and by vv 25-7 giving the consequences of that rejection of Jesus which is already evident in v 24 and even in v 23.

Elijah and Elisha are a particularly suitable choice of prophets as the "grossen Propheten der Tat". 3 Where they minister we can expect mighty deeds, healing and wonders. So it is also with the prophetic office Jesus claims for himself in vv 18-21. It also entails an outpouring of marvellous outworkings of God's grace. Jesus came and announced himself in his מָכָּר סָפָרָה and it would be natural to assume that there above all he would exercise his ministry.

2. 2 Kgs 5.8.
3. Elijah is not termed prophet in the pericope, but this is hardly necessary as the mention of his name immediately evokes the prophetic role.
Elijah and Elisha were prophets in Israel their $\pi \alpha \tau \rho \iota \iota \iota$, and as we might expect most of their wonders do in fact find their setting in Israel. The choice of the incidents involving the Zarephath widow and the Syrian commander are to show that the $\pi \alpha \tau \rho \iota \iota$ can miss out. People can have in their midst a prophetic presence from which they fail to benefit. That the Zarephath widow was cared for shows that the prophet could be the instrument of such assistance, yet all in Israel missed out. Naaman's skin now clean as a little child's shows up the prophetic ministry which was somehow unavailing for all the lepers of Israel, notwithstanding Elisha's being prophet in Israel. The $\pi \alpha \tau \rho \iota \iota$ failed to receive what was there in their midst.

Of course the text undoubtedly mentions the blessings going to others. But our point is that the widow of Zarephath and the Syrian commander are there functionally to point to what was missed by the Israelites, ¹ rather than to indicate what was received by others. What they received showed that such a ministry was available and the tragedy in Israel, and in Nazareth, was that those who stood in first place to benefit had missed out.

It will be evident that the case being made weighs against these verses being in any straightforward way an anticipatory notice of the gospel being preached to the Gentiles because of Israelite rejection. It is certainly not true that "Jesus proclaims openly that unless he is accepted as Messiah, he will

1. This is recognized by L. Gaston, No Stone (1970) 284, "The point is that Elijah did not come to the aid of the widows of Israel during the famine (not that he went to the widow of Zarephath) etc."

Compare the emphasis on missing out in Lk 13.24f (the lament over Jerusalem). We can again mention Jesus' two $\pi \alpha \tau \rho \iota \iota \iota \iota$. 


turn to the heathen". 1

It must be said however that with the obvious Lukan interest (especially in Acts) in the opening of the gospel to the Gentiles, it remains difficult, despite what has been said, to avoid finding some reference to the Gentiles in Naaman the Syrian and the woman of Zarephath, a Sidonian town. In the wider Lukan context can we avoid linking the blessing they received with that great blessing of "repentance unto life" (Acts 11.18) which is extended to the Gentiles in Acts?

This is a dilemma to which we must return at the end of the chapter, 2 but at this point it is sufficient to say that from within the horizons of the episode itself, the Gentile mission to come plays no part. 3

7. The Rage of Luke 4.28f

For the present the task that remains is to put the understanding of the rejection pericope offered thus far to further test by seeing whether it supports a coherent and convincing exegesis of the remainder of the pericope. In particular it remains to examine the reactions of the synagogue audience.

As a preliminary to this exercise it will be helpful to draw together the conclusions that have so far been reached and set out briefly the development of thought that has been discerned.

From the impact of Jesus' claims the people defend themselves by referring to Jesus as Joseph's son. Such humble circum-


2. See pp 86-88.

3. I.e. Luke in no way implies that Jesus hinted to the people in Nazareth that God was planning to reach out to the Gentiles.
stances are not to be expected of the messiah. Jesus has claimed to be the messianic healer (Lk 4.18-21), and the people want to press home their objection by suggesting that, for the one who offers the glories of the messianic age, he seems to have participated surprisingly little in its benefits. "Physician heal yourself" is the caustic remark. They are prepared to make a rather sceptical offer to forgive Jesus' prima facie unsuitability for office if he produces some dazzling miracles - like those that were rather unbelievably supposed to have been performed in Capernaum. (Jesus, who knows the thoughts of men, voices those last two comments on the people's behalf). He then replies in terms which indicate that he considers himself to have been rejected. He is however unabashed by the rejection and in his reply reaffirms the prophetic aspect of his claim by pointing out that he is being treated by them to a prophet's fate. Jesus makes further comment on their rejection in vv 25-7: it is possible, he indicates, to have in one's midst a prophetic ministry from which one fails to benefit. "You people are the losers."

By means of this sequence we must needs now account for the development from scepticism to rage on the part of the synagogue audience. It is usual to locate the source of their wrath in their objection to the thought that Gentiles might be beneficiaries of the messianic age. However since we have concluded that within the pericope's own horizons the Gentile reception of the gospel is not indicated, we must look elsewhere for an explanation of the people's anger.

1. Loisy, Synoptiques I, 848; Farrar, Luke, 105; Zahn, Lukas, 242; Klostermann, Lukas, 65; Plummer, Luke, 129; W. Grundmann, Lukas (1961) 123; Schürmann, Lukas, 239; Hill, "Rejection", 169; etc. The attractiveness of this view comes from Luke's frequent indication of how sensitive an issue Gentile incursion into Jewish privileges could be. (See appendix 3.)
Plummer suggests that Jesus "comparing himself to such prophets as Elijah and Elisha would add to the wrath of the Nazarenes". Rengstorf develops this point of view further when he speaks of "'heiliger' Zorn ... wenn Jesus sein Wirken neben das der Propheten stellt und so zum Wirken Gottes selbst macht". However, if this is what troubles the people it is hard to see why they have not already been more deeply disturbed by the prior claim by Jesus to be the anointed of the Lord. Rengstorf is perhaps aware of this difficulty when he suggests that what makes Jesus' claim so blasphemous by vv 25-7 is his refusal of "das ausweisende Zeichen". It is not then, for Rengstorf, that the second claim is any greater than the first and thus appropriate to produce a more extreme reaction from the people, but rather that between the two claims lies Jesus refusal of proof. The second claim is made to an audience now well aware that Jesus has no intention of supporting his claim, and they hear the claim as an ultimate blasphemy for this reason.

This view requires Jesus' refusal of miracles to be pivotal in the passage. I do not consider this to be so. Their request for miracles is made in a context of cynicism and near mockery, and is not even answered by Jesus who takes it merely as one of their ways of saying they reject him.

2. Rengstorf, Lukas, 68.
3. See Loisy, Synoptiques I, 844.
The suggestion that the people are angered at being refused the miracles they demanded falls foul of the same observation and need not be considered further. That he refused miracles did not raise their ire since the possibility of miracles never was really a live issue in the discussion.

The ἁκούοντες τὰρτα that in v 28 links the people's wrath with what Jesus has said, occurs in Luke/Acts again only at Acts 7.54 where it has the same function of linking the people's angry reactions to what (this time) Stephen has been saying. Parallels between the incidents are not hard to find, and it may be helpful to note the cause of the outbreak on Stephen. He was brought to the Council on a charge of blasphemy (Acts 6.11,13f) but executed as a result of his pointed criticism of his hearers (7.51-3).

The synagogue rejection scene with Paul and Barnabas in Acts 13 has them speaking words which also have a certain aptness for comparison with the Nazareth rejection: "It was necessary that the word of God should be spoken first to you. Since you thrust it from you and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life, behold we turn to the Gentiles" (v 46). There are two elements here which contribute to

1. As well as the shared ἁκούοντες τὰρτα both Stephen and Jesus are put out of the city (ἀκούσεις Ἕλεος, ἢ: Ἕλεος), in both cases the intention is to put them to death, synagogue members instigate the proceedings against both. I will suggest later a further parallel between Lk 4.22a and Acts 6.15. George ("Predication", 25) also sees the death of Stephen evoked here.

2. On a superficial reading of the Nazareth scene there are elements corresponding to "first to you", the rejection, and the turning to the Gentiles. However such a reading of the Nazareth scene has difficulties. In the whole incident in Acts 13 the rejection at v 45 corresponds to that at Lk 4.23 and the persecution of v 50 to the attempted execution at Lk 4.28-30. Since the same Jews from Antioch are involved still at Acts 14.19-20 is it too imaginative to claim this as the completion of the Acts 13 incident and parallel it to the miraculous deliverance of Lk 4.30?
the annoyance of the Jewish hearers. There is the offer of salvation to the Gentiles, but there is also the criticism in the words "you ... judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life". Others have suggested that the anger of the Nazareth congregation comes from the first of these elements. I want to suggest, with the help of comparison with the Stephen incident, that in Nazareth the people are reacting to the second element, the sting of personal criticism. By speaking to them of Elijah and Elisha Jesus in effect is given to say "you judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life".

We may compare the response in Mk 3.28 to the suggestion that Jesus is possessed by Beelzebul. "... whoever blasphemes against the Holy Spirit never has forgiveness ..." There is no definite accusation but the words are potentially damning. So too in Lk 4. What reproduces the Elijah/Elisha situation is a "thrusting away" of "the word of God" from them and "judging themselves unworthy of eternal life". Jesus paints the picture, the congregation are conscious of the suggestion of guilt which would link them to the picture. I am then suggesting that, just as in the case of Stephen, it is not theological blasphemy but personal criticism (albeit implied rather than stated but nevertheless forcefully present) that precipitates the ugly response of Lk 4.28-29. On sensitivity to criticism by familiars we may quote Lagrange. "Des compatriotes sont plus sensibles aux reproches et se croient plus aisément autorisés à faire justice d'un des leurs." Though it is less a matter of pre-empting the course of justice, than of mob reaction in the heat of emotion, (perhaps with the legal side as a ready to hand rationale).

1. Luc, 145.
We can now see why the wrath of v 29 is not already there in vv 22f. Jesus has already reached the height of blasphemy before v 22. He has claimed to be the messianic prophet and is thought to be making a spurious claim. The response is negative and perhaps corresponds with that of those who disputed with Stephen (Acts 6.9) or those who contradicted Paul (13.45), but the introduction of what amounts to pointed personal criticism produces murderous wrath as it did against Stephen (7.54-8) and Paul (13.50 cf. 14.19).


We turn finally to v 22a. Acquainted as we are with what is to follow, it seems strange that it can be said about Jesus at the beginning of the verse that the synagogue audience ἐμαρτύροντι αὐτῷ.

Violet (followed by Jeremias) attempts to align this verse with the rage later expressed by the Nazareth folk. μαρτυρεῖν is understood in a negative sense and the people are seen to be testifying against Jesus. This view is hardly to be accepted.

The context is not suggestive of such an atypical usage by Luke. However if this negative understanding is to be excluded what are we to make of ἐμαρτύροντι αὐτῷ?

The Jerusalem Bible translates "he won the approval of all\)". The NEB speaks of a "general stir of admiration". These

1. Violet, "Nazareth-Perikope"; Jeremias, Promise, 44. See also K. Bornhäuser, Lukas (1934) 20-33.

2. It is however adopted by Grundmann, Lukas, 121; Rengstorf, Lukas, 68.

3. For a full list of refuting arguments see H. Anderson, "Horizons" (1964) 267-9; also Hill, "Rejection", 163-5.

4. Cf. also Zahn, Lucas, 239, "anerkennenden Worten".
translations presumably correspond to the uses of μετρηταιω listed by BAG (p 494) under the meanings, "testify favourably, speak well (of), approve (of)", and in particular to the third of these. It is however questionable whether μετρηταιω ever bears the sense "approve (of)". Certainly none of the references cited by BAG support this meaning. Even the sense "speak well (of)" is only attested in a limited way. We do not find the word meaning "speak well of" in the sense "to say kind things about", but only in the sense "give a good report about". The evidential sense of the word's legal usage never seems to be entirely absent. There is always a sense of establishing something by the testimony.2

If then, we need to find something to be supported by the synagogue congregation's testimony three possibilities are:

1. i.e. "to verbalize approval".

2. In D. Chr. 40.19 it is the supporting of the worthwhileness of the task in hand. In Ael. V.H. 1.30 the truth of what is being said about the young man's character is established by the way the king would speak to him of his exemplary character. In Dit. Syll 374,37 we are dealing with a panegyric. That the king often spoke favourably of the one lauded to the Governors establishes the man's virtue. In 1 Clem. 38.2 we are concerned with establishing the reputation of a man as humble.

The other citations are straightforward references to giving favourable testimony (Jos. Ant. 3.189, 12.134; P.Oxy 930. 16; Herm. Sim. 5.2.6).

So far as the New Testament itself goes, Strathmann (μετρηταιω (1967) 496) says of the category of uses of μετρηταιω in which he places that in Lk 4.22, "the meaning is always that on the basis of direct observation the nature or conduct of those concerned is said to be satisfactory and the one who judges is ready in some sense to vouch for it". (Emphasis mine.)
1. that Jesus' claim to be the messianic prophet is correct;
2. that Jesus' known character supports his credibility;
3. that the φωνή of Lk 4.14 which has also reached Nazareth is correct.

The first of these cannot really be squared with the development of the episode, but Leaney, who claims that Luke has produced an "impossible story", seems to opt for this view. He suggests that here the people "testified to (Jesus') special gift and claim", which must mean an acceptance of Jesus' claim. This gives us an almost Johannine sense for μαρτυρέω of "witness ... to the nature and significance of Jesus' person". Luke is however not inclined towards using μαρτυρέω in this way. Apart from Acts 23.11 there is no example in Luke/Acts of the verb used to designate the religious witness of a believer to Christ or the gospel, and even in Acts 23.11 the use of μαρτυρέω does not stand in its own right as a reference to religious witness, but only in so far as it is Luke's shorthand for the fuller form which occurs in the previous and parallel clause concerning witness in Jerusalem i.e. shorthand for διαμαρτυρήσατε τα προς ἐμοῦ. This religious use of μαρτυρέω is particularly unlikely at Lk 4.22 for the

2. Ibid., 119.
4. We should note however references to God, prophets, etc. as witnessing (Acts 10.43; 15.8 etc.).
context there means that the word would lack the "orientation to evangelization" which "distinguishes the term from Ιμαλοτενένης."

Further, that εὐστροφος αὐτῷ is followed by καὶ Θαυμασοῦ suggests that we are dealing here with something less than acceptance of Jesus' Christological claims, since for Luke Θαυμασοῦ always refers to something less than or not yet as developed as a proper belief in Jesus. I find myself then, unable to follow Leaney.

The second possibility, that the people are providing a character reference for Jesus requires us to rest heavily on the Οὐ ἦν τεθραυσμένος of Lk 4.16. It is more imaginative than likely and does not seem to find support among the commentators.

What perhaps tells most decisively against this understanding is the presence at the end of the verse of Οὐκ ἦν Ἰδός ἔστων Πωλήσων; However we understand these words, they do not constitute the "testimony" and cannot follow after a testimony which is itself based on what the people know of Jesus as an ex-resident of Nazareth. Such a testimony would need to follow rather than anticipate the Οὐκ ἦν Ἰδός κτλ.

The third possibility has the largest measure of support. As Plummer has it, "They bore witness to Him, not that what he said about Himself, but that what rumour had said respecting his power as

1. Strathmann, Μαρτίος, 497.
3. Cf. A. Schlatter, Markus und Lukas, 203.
4. George ("Predication", 21) may be an exception.
a teacher was true". For support we have the ψήφημη of Lk 4.14 and the τούς λόγους τῆς Χριστοῦ τούς ἐκπροσώπωσε ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ of v 22, at which the people marvel. But really it seems quite artificial to make this sharp distinction between what Jesus is saying and his power as a teacher in saying it. While the ψήφημη of v 14 is probably not meant to include the suggestion that Jesus is Messiah, it can hardly avoid reference to what Jesus said, along with his impressive manner of expressing it, while τούς λόγους τῆς Χριστοῦ must have as part of their essential content that the day of fulfilment of God's gracious purpose has arrived precisely because the people find themselves addressed by the messianic prophet. In any case, surely it is incredible that Jesus' momentous claim can be left to one side, while they comment on Jesus' powers of oratory? I am inclined to agree with Loisy "on aurait été frappé de sa prétension plus que du charme de sa parole". ¹

Eltester offers us a further possibility on the basis of what he sees as a parallel use of μαρτυρεῖν in Praedicatio Petri. ² The text runs

εξελέγοντας ὑμᾶς ἡμᾶς... εὐκρισθήσομεν...

... ἔφεσα οἱ ἀκούσαντες καὶ πιστεύσαντες σωθέσαντο, οἱ δὲ μὴ πιστεύσαντες ἀκούσαντες μαρτυρήσωσιν, οὐκ ἔχοντες ἀπολογίαν εἰς τίνα εὑρήσαν. <³

1. Loisy, Synoptiques I, 844.

2. Preserved in Clem. Alex. Str. 6.6.48. (Misprinted as 5.48 in Eltester, "Israel", 138.)

3. Quoted from ΠΑΙΔΑΙΤΗΚΗ ΦΑΛΑΝΝΩΝ ΠΑΤΕΡΩΝ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣΤΙΚΩΝ ΣΥΓΓΡΑΦΕΩΝ, vol 8, Athens, 1956. The possibility that we are dealing here with a distinctive use of μαρτυρεῖν is evidenced by the need felt by W. Schneemüller, Hennecke: Apocrypha II, 101 to translate as though the ἀκούσαντες preceding μαρτυρήσωσιν gave the content of the testimony. This expedient is not to be admitted.
Eltester argues that the Nazareth folk are qualified as witnesses by both hearing (ἐν τοῖς ὁτις ὄμων (v 21); τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χαρίτος (v 22)) and seeing Jesus (πάντων οἵ ὀφθαλμοί ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἴδον ἀτενίζοντες αὐτῷ (v 20)). It is not clear to me whether Eltester understands the people to ματαιρίειν merely by their seeing and hearing Jesus or whether their particular act of witness is to wonder at the words which proceed from Jesus' mouth. In any case Luke's main point will be to emphasise that the Jews have been given every opportunity to see and hear Jesus, and in this way Luke wants to prepare for the emphasis on the guilt of the Jewish people to be found in the Acts speeches.

If Eltester means that the people ματαιρίειν by seeing and hearing Jesus then it is evident that he understands ματαιρίειν in Praedicatio Petri as a reference to witnessing (= hearing) the apostolic preaching. This understanding of Praedicatio Petri cannot be sustained. The activity involved in ματαιρίειν must be contemporary with the hypothetical alternative ήπειρον τὸ κοπάμεον. But the setting for this...

2. The relevant sentences are, "So wird ihre Zeugenschaft in doppelter Weise ausgedrückt: sie haben Jesus gesehen und gehört, ja sie haben sogar seine Worte der Gnade bewundert." Und damit haben sie Zeugnis für den Messias abgelegt." And later "... die Bürger von Nazareth haben gehört und sie räumen das sogar ein." The footnote (131) preferring the rendering of χαρίς as "Anmut" inclines me towards the first alternative, but not certainly.
3. Ibid., 111.
must be the day of reckoning and not the day of hearing the preacher, so the activity involved in \( \mu \alpha \rho \tau \upsilon \rho \eta \sigma \omega \tau \iota \nu \) is what hearing the preaching puts people in the position of having to do on the day of reckoning. On that day they can admit to having witnessed (= heard) the apostolic preaching, but they cannot witness (= hear) it. Thus Eltester's appeal to Praedicatio Petri would be invalidated. Without this support Eltester would be proposing a sense for \( \mu \alpha \rho \tau \upsilon \rho \epsilon \omicron \omega \) which is not attested elsewhere and is neither demanded nor encouraged by the Lukan context.

If on the other hand Eltester means that the people \( \mu \alpha \rho \tau \upsilon \rho \epsilon \omicron \omega \) by wondering at Jesus' words, then an act of giving testimony is involved, and Eltester must be understanding \( \mu \alpha \rho \tau \upsilon \rho \epsilon \omicron \omega \) in Praedicatio Petri in some other way. We may consider for Praedicatio Petri the three possibilities:

1. They bear witness to the truth of the apostolic preaching.
2. They bear witness to the content of the apostolic preaching.
3. They bear witness about themselves, that they heard the apostolic preaching.

1. I.e. to say "\( \sigma \upiota \kappa \varepsilon \nu \kappa \omega \omicron \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu \)".

2. The suggestion that \( \mu \alpha \rho \tau \upsilon \rho \epsilon \omicron \omega \) in Praedicatio Petri means "to be an eye-witness (of)" would not be possible without divorcing the quotation from its context in Clem. Alex. Str. 6.6.48. Clement is obviously paraphrasing \( \mu \alpha \rho \tau \upsilon \rho \eta \sigma \omega \tau \iota \nu \) when he says in the following paragraph \( \tau \iota \nu \kappa \omega \omicron \lambda \sigma \iota \iota \kappa \alpha \nu \epsilon \iota \nu \ldots \varepsilon \mu \omicron \lambda \omicron \gamma \xi \sigma \omicron \tau \iota \nu \). This reinforces the conclusion that the activity envisaged in \( \mu \alpha \rho \tau \upsilon \rho \eta \sigma \omega \tau \iota \nu \) occurs on the judgement day.

We should take the context in Clement seriously for the following reasons:

1. Here he cannot be accused of special pleading since for his own point he has no interest in the precise meaning of \( \mu \alpha \rho \tau \upsilon \rho \epsilon \omicron \omega \).
2. He was presumably reading the text in its original context. (It is alternatively possible that the quotation stops earlier and the use of \( \mu \alpha \rho \tau \upsilon \rho \epsilon \omicron \omega \) is actually Clement's.)
3. He spoke Greek.
The first could have a stronger or weaker sense, both of which fall outside the normal lexical range for \( \pi \alpha \rho \tau \upsilon \epsilon \omega \). It could denote religious witness by those not committed to the religious conviction involved or the weaker sense of simply admitting the truth of the matter. Besides the lexical difficulties neither of these possibilities has any particular claim to fit the Praedicatio Petri context. It is not obvious why unbelievers should be testifying to the apostolic message in the judgement day, and while they must certainly concede its truth in the judgement, the activity designed by \( \pi \alpha \rho \tau \upsilon \epsilon \omega \) is seen in Praedicatio Petri to follow from their having heard the preaching, in a manner not accounted for by this understanding.

The second alternative would seem to have no point in the Praedicatio Petri context and we may set it aside. If Eltester allows one of these suggestions it must be the third. ("Auch die Bürger von Nazareth haben gehört und sie räumen das sogar ein.") If the reference is to bearing witness to having heard the apostolic preaching, then it is so as a testimony against themselves, as at Mt 23.31, i.e. testimony "that we heard (and are thus guilty)". That the emphasis falls on such a confession of guilt is supported by Clement's paraphrase in the following paragraph, as seen in the following phrase in the following paragraph, \( \gamma \nu \, \kappa \omega \lambda \alpha \theta \iota \nu \, \delta \omega \kappa \alpha \iota \nu \, \varepsilon \iota \nu \, \zeta \mu \o\eta \o\mu\o\rho\o\nu \tau \omicron \varsigma \iota \iota \iota .


2. A more neutral "we agree that we heard" would render the following tautological.

3. It is assumed that to hear is to know. A failure to believe is not a failure to be convinced that something is true but rather a culpable refusal to respond to what is known to be true and has been placed immediately before one's attention in the proclamation.
Now it is not at all easy to import this emphasis on a self-condemning admission into the Lukan context. Even if it is true (with Eltester) that Luke emphasizes the exposure of the Jews to Jesus' teaching and presence to prepare for the emphasis on the guilt of the Jewish people to be found in the Acts speeches,\(^1\) it is hard to put an admission of guilt onto the lips of the Nazareth folk in Lk 4.22. We would need to translate "they were testifying against themselves"\(^2\) with regard to Jesus by wondering at the words which were coming from his mouth.

The thought is clear enough but incredibly compressed and rather involved. Luke certainly wouldn't want to say that the Nazareth folk saw themselves to be making such a confession. Rather in a manner similar to Mt 23.31 what they do functions as such an admission without their intending it to be so. So then we have here a comment from the Lukan perspective on an item in the episode rather than something that belongs properly to Luke's recounting of the episode. The thought would run:

Amazement indicates that they have in fact heard and that what they heard registered. It is reprehensible to hear and not believe (since the message is (self-evidently?) true). It will soon appear that the Nazareth folk do not respond with belief, therefore their amazement testifies to their guilt, since their failure to believe is not from failing to hear.

\(^1\) Eltester, "Israel", 111.

\(^2\) I.e. "making a self-condemning admission".
It may be fairly objected that this is too subtle for Luke. It is certainly too compressed to be unprepared for. The infancy narratives bear witness to great reversals to follow in the train of the coming of the messiah, but there is not yet any theme of Jewish rejection of Jesus and the gospel. At this point the Nazareth folk have not even themselves rejected Jesus to make it possible for Luke to stress their guilt in this way. We therefore conclude that the use of μετριψάω in Praedictio Petri cannot help us with the sense of that verb at Lk 4.22.

A suggestion which we may salvage from our discussion of Eltester's treatment of Lk 4.22a is the possibility that with μετριψάω we are dealing with a Lukan perspective which is not visible from within the episode's own horizon. To repeat from above, "the Lukan perspective on an item in the episode rather than something that belongs properly to Luke's recounting of the episode."

The first of our original set of possibilities for μετριψάω was testimony "that Jesus' claim to be the messianic prophet was correct". Can we suggest that Luke considers that the amazed response stands as testimony to Jesus despite the rejection which follows? The amazement of the Nazareth folk makes its contribution

1. The use of the imperfect μετριψάω tells against this understanding since their amazement can only become a testimony against them after they have rejected Jesus, an event which is still future from the perspective of Lk 4.22a.

2. Not that they are presented as prepared to see their own response as testimony to Jesus, but that it stands as such in Luke's eyes and for his readers.
to the evidence which is meant to bring Theophilus to faith in Jesus!

Luke seems to set quite a store on testimony which is not "from faith to faith", i.e. he has a concern for the secular evidence for Christianity. This note is set from the prologue where "The secular character of the language is very noticeable." Flender comments that Luke "does not water down the gospel message but points to its human exterior. The story of Jesus is not a myth but a real event and the usual means of historical research can check it". A.A. Trites in an article, "The Importance of Legal Scenes and Language in the Book of Acts", finds much the same emphasis there. To quote from his conclusion:

... The frequent use of legal language in connection with real courts of law is germane to Luke's presentation and part of his theological intention. The claims of Christ are being debated, and Luke intends by the use of lawcourt scenes and legal language to draw attention to this fact. The messiahship and Lordship of Jesus are in dispute, and this challenges Luke to demonstrate these claims by many convincing proofs. (ἐν πολλαῖς τεκμηρίωσιν i 3; cf. Jos. Ant. 5.39). An important part of his task is the presentation of the courtroom evidence in such a way that it will bear witness to Christ.

In this light I draw attention to Luke's concern to "document" the public impact of Jesus.

1. Luke is concerned to point out that Jesus' activity
is not only known of by those present on a particular occasion, but
that its impact is such that reports spread far and wide. (Lk 4.14f;
4.37; 5.15; 7.17; (8.39)).

2. Luke emphasizes both the number of people attracted
to hear and see Jesus (5.15; 6.17; 8.4; 11.29; 12.1) and also the
range of places from which they come (5.17; 6.17; 8.4).

3. Luke stresses the general recognition of the "good"
done by Jesus (Note the use of μητηρ ζητεονετον ετεριων to express this in
Lk 5.26; 7.16). The idea is present constantly in the healing

4. Luke records the public astonishment caused by
Jesus (Lk 4.22,32,36; 5.26; 7.16; 9.43; (11.38; 20.26)).

Now none of this in Luke is directly a matter of
people becoming disciples. It is not the beginnings of faith that
Luke documents. He is concerned rather to tell us something about
Jesus, and not something about him which may only be discerned by the
eye of faith. The public are in some sense Luke's "impartial"

1. Setting aside for a moment notes of specific amazement (which
may have critical overtones and in any case merely denotes the
extraordinary), Luke has a generally favourable attitude maintained
towards Jesus by the people (as opposed to the various classes of
leaders) through the gospel (7.29; 9.43; (11.27); 13.17; 18.43;
19.48; 21.38; 22.2,6; (23.27); 23.48). Lk 23.13 is exceptional in
associating the people with the chief priests and rulers (A. George
("Israel" (1968) 504 and n 54) following G. Rau ("Volk" (1965) 41-51)
and P. Winter (Trial (1974) 141 n 23 = (1961) 201 n 23) eliminates
the exception by reading το vg. χασων for και τον χασων. This
move is criticised by W. Radl (Paulus (1975) 303).

2. It is the "human exterior" of the gospel to which Flender (63)
draws attention.
witnesses, since Jesus' ministry makes its impact on them all alike whether they be those who are committed to discipleship (Lk 19.37), or those who reject him in murderous rage (Lk 4.22) or those who cold-bloodedly set out to trap him in the political machinations of the day (Lk 20.26).

Such a role for these "public witnesses" finds further support in Luke's general failure to show any interest in what might be, for the people involved, the aftermath to their having been so impressed by Jesus. This is especially acute with regard to the favourable attitude by the people to Jesus (see p 54 n 1). They simply remain as the approving public (19.48) right up to Jesus' arrest. We want to ask, isn't that an impossible position to remain in. But Luke is not conscious of any tension that needs resolving in terms of faith or rejection, since his framework at this point is not that of personal response to Jesus but rather that of "impartial" witness. Along with the approving crowd, the disciples are there as well (more widely or more narrowly viewed) but with no thought of transition from the one to the other. This same phenomenon is exhibited at Acts 5.13f. The people hold the band of Christian believers in high honour, but this in no

1. We should also note how Luke has the crowds present for teaching which is addressed to the disciples. It may be that Luke wants to stress the availability to the crowds of the possibility of discipleship but I am inclined to see Luke stressing here the public (and not esoteric) and therefore at least theoretically verifiable nature of the teaching of Jesus (Lk 6.17-20 and cf. 7.1; (9.43); 12.1). (Lohfink (Sammlung, 65, 72-7, 94 cf. 33-46, 62) wants to find here represented the gathering of the people into the community of disciples in the time after Pentecost.) There is also a large amount of teaching in Lk specifically directed to the public. (Luke does have a small amount of esoterica, e.g. Lk 10.23,4; (9.43?; 11.1ff?); 9.18-22.)

2. There seems to be some movement in Luke's use of the term μαρτυρία.

3. We may compare the significance of public reputation for Paul at 2 Cor 8.21.
witnesses, since Jesus' ministry makes its impact on them all alike whether they be those who are committed to discipleship (Lk 19.37), or those who reject him in murderous rage (Lk 4.22) or those who cold-bloodedly set out to trap him in the political machinations of the day (Lk 20.26).

Such a role for these "public witnesses" finds further support in Luke's general failure to show any interest in what might be, for the people involved, the aftermath to their having been so impressed by Jesus. This is especially acute with regard to the favourable attitude by the people to Jesus (see p 54 n 1). They simply remain as the approving public (19.48) right up to Jesus' arrest. We want to ask, isn't that an impossible position to remain in. But Luke is not conscious of any tension that needs resolving in terms of faith or rejection, since his framework at this point is not that of personal response to Jesus but rather that of "impartial" witness. Along with the approving crowd, the disciples are there as well (more widely or more narrowly viewed) but with no thought of transition from the one to the other. This same phenomenon is exhibited at Acts 5.13f. The people hold the band of Christian believers in high honour, but this in no

1. We should also note how Luke has the crowds present for teaching which is addressed to the disciples. It may be that Luke wants to stress the availability to the crowds of the possibility of discipleship but I am inclined to see Luke stressing here the public (and not esoteric) and therefore at least theoretically verifiable nature of the teaching of Jesus (Lk 6.17-20 and cf. 7.1; (9.43); 12.1). (Lohfink (Sammlung, 65, 72-7, 94 cf. 33-46, 62) wants to find here represented the gathering of the people into the community of disciples in the time after Pentecost.) There is also a large amount of teaching in Lk specifically directed to the public. (Luke does have a small amount of esoterica, e.g. Lk 10.23,4; (9.43?; 11.1ff?); 9.18-22.)

2. There seems to be some movement in Luke's use of the term \\text{\textmacrol forgot}\

3. We may compare the significance of public reputation for Paul at 2 Cor 8.21.
way marks a transition to sharing their faith. It is more a kind of objective witness to Christianity. The following verse moves to the response framework of thought and speaks of people becoming believers. That vv 13 and 14 have been conceived in quite different frameworks of thought is at once evident from the tension between the "none of the rest dared join them" of verse 13, and the "and more than ever believers were added to the Lord" of v 14.

There are a number of examples of "impartial" witness by opponents of Christianity in Acts. Commenting on Lk 4.22 Leaney suggests we "Cf. Acts vi.15 for a similar testimony from the opponents of Stephen." The comparison is most apt. Those who stand as Stephen's opponents and will soon be his murderers cannot but register that which was undeniable about Stephen. "And gazing at him ( \( \nu \tau \epsilon \nu \xi \omega \) as at Lk 4.20), all who sat in the council saw that his face was like the face of an angel." Their witness is that which they cannot but concede. There is another clear example of this at Acts 4.13-16, esp. v 16b, "For that a notable sign has been performed through them is manifest to all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and we cannot deny it." Eltester's characterization of Lk 4.22 as "eine Art negativer Zeugenschaft" fits this Acts passage admirably, since the admission is preliminary to an attempt to silence the Christian witness of Peter and John.

1. It is because F. Sahlin has no such concept that he translates Acts 2.47, "sie erwiesen dem ganzen Volk ... Güte" ("Früchte" (1947) 63 and cf. F.P. Cheetham, "Acts ii.47" (1963)).


Further examples could be added but these suffice to show Luke's concern for the visible-in-history aspect of the Christ event. I hasten to add that this is not all Luke knows of the Christ event. While Stephen's face as angelic is a matter of "secular" history, that he sees "the heavens opened, and the Son of man standing at the right hand of God" (Acts 7.56), is a testimony spoken by a man of faith to be received by faith. This was not visible to the Council members. But things which are "visible" are of some importance to Luke and make their contribution to the witness through which Luke means to bring Theophilus to faith in the Christ.

Luke is free to use μαρτυρεῖ in Lk 4.22 for this kind of "impartial" witness to what has a place in secular history because he has not claimed the word to express the religious witness of believers (see the earlier discussion). For Luke, such witness is not unimportant to faith, since the impact of Christ in secular history points beyond itself to the genuinely divine event to be perceived.

It is appropriate that Luke should indicate in this first incident which he records from the ministry of Jesus, the significance he sees in material on the impact of Jesus, to follow throughout the gospel. Luke makes this connection at the beginning to alert his readers so that they can appreciate the cumulative weight of this kind of testimony to Jesus as the course of the gospel unfolds.

To reach this understanding for ἠμαρτον we have obviously assumed a relationship between the activity involved in ἠμαρτον and that involved in ἔθεσεν. To be more exact, the activity of the first verb is achieved and defined

by means of the activity of the second verb. This could be so if we have in ἕμωρταντες αὐτῷ καὶ ἐπιστρεφόμεν an example of colloquial parataxis. There is an example of such parataxis at Lk 6.48, though the relationship between the two verbs is different there. Mt 8.14 is closer, but the verbs there are simple participles.

Another possibility is an expository use of καὶ. BDF recognise a category of "expository" uses of καὶ which are "always used to particularize". Of the list 1 Cor 8.12 is of special interest to us. We read there ἐμωρταντες εἰς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς καὶ τύπτοντες αὐτῷ τὴν συνεδρίαν ἐσθενοῦταν εἰς Χριστὸν ἐμωρτάνετε. The particular way in which the brothers are sinned against is by the wounding of their consciences in the matter of sacrifice to idols. ἐμωρταντες occurs by means of, and is defined more closely by the action involved in τύπτοντες, which means the verbs stand in precisely the relation I have suggested for the verbs of Lk 4.22a.

This particular usage of καὶ is to be observed in the LXX, which may account for its use by Luke. A third possibility is to assimilate this Lukan usage to the common tendency in NT narrative to duplicate words for speaking (e.g. ἀποκρίνομαι καὶ λέγω; μετατρέπομαι καὶ λέγω;)

1. Cf. BDF § 471; BAG, 393.
2. BDF § 442(9).
3. E.g. 3 Kgdm 13.21f Ἀνθ' ἐν παρεξήγησας τοῖς κυρίοι καὶ οὖν ἐδίδαξες τὴν ἐπιστρεφόμεν ... καὶ ἐπέστρεψας...
   It is doubtful whether these examples should be thought of in terms of expository καὶ rather than Semitic parataxis.
4. Lk 13.15; Mk 7.28; Jn 1.48 etc.
This usage tends to be rather pleonastic, but it can achieve a certain emphasis, and of interest to us is that the relationship between the two verbs is what we are suggesting for Lk 4.22a. The answer (or testimony etc.) is given in what is said. In the Lk 4 context ἐκβιβάζω functions analogously to a verb of speaking and it may be against this background that we should set the Lukan usage here. For a non-pleonastic example of this usage we can compare Jn 1.15, Ἱωάννης μαρτυρεῖ περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ κέρκυραν....

For our purposes it is not necessary to decide between these suggestions. It is sufficient if we have been able to demonstrate that it is a natural reading of Lk 4.22a to understand the witness borne as finding its expression in the amazement expressed at the words of Jesus.

We now summarize this section on the meaning of μαρτυρεῖ in Lk 4.22a. It has been seen that there are problems with regard to word usage or thought sequence or both with most suggested senses for ἐμπρόσθου. In view of these difficulties the possibility has been raised that we may be dealing here not with something that belongs properly to Luke's recounting of the episode but rather with a Lukan assessment of the significance of an item in the episode. Noting the Lukan interest in testimony to the Christ event which is not specifically religious, i.e. that has a place in secular history, it has been suggested that Luke is indicating here in Lk 4.22a that, in his judgement, the amazement of the Nazareth synagogue congregation counts as evidence for Jesus and his claims, despite their

2. It is even more frequent to have one verb in participal form.
consequent violent rejection of Jesus. Finally an attempt has been made to show that there is no syntactical barrier to this understanding.


There only remains now to comment on τὴν λόγον τῆς ἀγαθοτητάς in Lk 4.22a. Winsome words or words of God's grace, or a deliberate ambiguity?

Masson in a study published in 1961 suggests that almost all commentators understand the genitive τῆς ἀγαθοτητάς as a genitive of quality and thus emphasise the attractiveness of the form of the words. The weight of opinion has probably shifted somewhat in the time since, but this view does find some measure of support in the Rabbinic references cited by Str-B which show concern for proper form and attractiveness of presentation in the synagogue address.


6. IV i, 171-3.
consequent violent rejection of Jesus. Finally an attempt has been made to show that there is no syntactical barrier to this understanding.


There only remains now to comment on τὰς λόγους τῆς Ἰωάννου in Lk 4.22a. Winsome words or words of God's grace, or a deliberate ambiguity?

Masson in a study published in 1961 suggests that almost all commentators understand the genitive τὰς Ἰωάννου as a genitive of quality and thus emphasise the attractiveness of the form of the words. The weight of opinion has probably shifted somewhat in the time since, but this view does find some measure of support in the Rabbinic references cited by Str-B which show concern for proper form and attractiveness of presentation in the synagogue address.

.............


6. IV i, 171-3.
However the most weighty reason for its adoption has been a concern to explain the apparent juxtaposition of positive response to Jesus' speech with rejection of his claims. Whatever commends this view, it needs to be admitted that Luke nowhere else uses χρηστος to designate "winsomeness",¹ and in this phrase, so reminiscent of phrases using χρηστος in Acts,² it would be surprising to find such an innovation.

Those urging a deliberate ambiguity in χρηστος have the same motivation as those suggesting "winsomeness" as its sense, only these feel compelled by Luke's other uses of χρηστος to admit that Luke could hardly write το λογος τον Χρηστον χρηστα without thinking of the grace of God. The Nazareth rejection context brings them to the suggestion that, while Luke sees Jesus' words as words of God's grace, it is possible for the unbelieving audience to hear merely winsome words, and that Luke chooses his words to allow for this. To support this ambiguity it is possible to point out that the Acts passages used for comparison have a further genitive following 

τον Χρηστον which ties down unambiguously the sense of χρηστος, and to suggest that if Luke had not meant such an ambiguity in Lk 4.22 he would have quite naturally added a further defining genitive.

It would not be impossible to combine the sense I have given above to ευευθυνων with a mention of winsome words. Given Jesus' background, his powers of oratory and display of knowledge may count as

1. In Acts 7.10 χρηστος in Joseph is perceptible to Pharaoh (This is better than taking χρηστος as "favour", which does not couple well with σοφια, but the ευευθυνων points to something more like the anointing of the Εσχη των rather than to mere "winsomeness".

evidence for his messianic claim (cf. Lk 2.47; Acts 4.13). But if we grant the sense "winsome words" for the Nazareth folk, it is hard to resist the argument that it must at the same time, for Luke, have a reference to the grace of God. Things do then become rather involved. As winsome words Jesus' words impress the people. Given Jesus' background this impressiveness argues in favour of Jesus, but the words are really more than just winsome words, they are words of God's grace. So then, the recognition of Jesus' words as \( \tau \eta \varsigma \chi \omega \rho \iota \rho \varsigma \) in one sense becomes evidence for their being \( \tau \eta \varsigma \chi \omega \rho \iota \rho \varsigma \) in a more significant sense.  

There is however another possibility. It is not at all necessary that Luke be understood to say that the people marvel at the words because they are conscious of them as words \( \tau \eta \varsigma \chi \omega \rho \iota \rho \varsigma \). Rather to follow a line suggested by our understanding of \( \epsilon\mu\rho\nu\tau\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\upsilon\omicron\upsilon\) above, Luke may well be saying that it is precisely because Jesus' words are \( \tau \eta \varsigma \chi \omega \rho \iota \rho \varsigma \) that they have their impact. The people admit to the impact of the words on them, Luke wants his readers to see that it is the \( \tau \eta \varsigma \chi \omega \rho \iota \rho \varsigma \) which makes it possible for the words to have their impact.

If this is so, then it suggests a rather dynamic sense for \( \chi \omega \rho \iota \varsigma \), where it is the presence of \( \chi \omega \rho \iota \varsigma \) which gives the words their quite tangible impact. \( \chi \omega \rho \iota \varsigma \) is some kind of divine influence present in the words. The question is whether it is reasonable to think of Luke using \( \chi \omega \rho \iota \varsigma \) in this way.

1. Cf. L. Bieler, \( \Theta E I O \Sigma \ AN H P \) (1935) 52. In relation to the \( \Theta E I O \Sigma \ AN H P \) he suggests, "Für christliche Autoren fließen in dem Worte \( \chi \omega \rho \iota \varsigma \) die Begriffe 'Anmut' und 'Gnade' in eins zusammen: das eine ist der offenbare Erweis des anderen."

2. Cf. A. Loisy, Luc (1924) 158, "le discours serait caractérisé d'après son object, non d'après l'idée que s'en fait la foule." We should note that this represents a change of mind since Synoptiques I, 843.
First to be said is that such a usage would have good antecedents. Right from Homer there seems to be a continuous thread in the use of Χρόνια considering Χρόνια as a kind of power or influence which can be present in something, sometimes in a quasi-physical sense.

So in Hom. Od. 6. 235f we read,

διὶς Χρόνια τῷ καρέχευε Χρόνια κεφαλῇ τε καὶ ζύµωσις,
εὐρέτ' ἐπὶ τῇ ἄνωθεν κἀκεῖν η ἐπὶ Θείᾳ Ἐλκυστήρι.

καλλίτε καὶ Χρόνια στείρευν.

Here the Χρόνια is conceived of as a kind of "stuff" which the goddess can pour out over a person, the effect of which is to make one very attractive. The Χρόνια is viewed from a double aspect. It is both what is received from the goddess which has power to beautify, and at the same time it is the visible attractiveness resulting. Χρόνια is attractiveness become substantial and quantifiable - "bottled attractiveness".

Pindar seems to use Χρόνια as a metaphor for song, or perhaps as a way of designating song under a particular aspect.

Πί. 0.1.30 Χρόνια δ', ἐπερ ἀπελέυσε Τεύχος
τῇ μεῖικος ἁγνοῖς, ἐπιθυμεῖς τοῖς καὶ
Χρόνιον ζυγόν πιστῶν ἐμφανίζοντες.

His intention is to indicate that people are inclined to believe something which is well presented in song. Song can in this way

1. "... even so the goddess shed grace upon his head and shoulders. Then he went apart and sat down on the shore of the sea, gleaming with beauty and grace". (LCL)

Conzelmann (Χρόνια, 376) criticizes Moffat for not finding a qualitative change in thinking from classical to later hellenistic thinking with respect to Χρόνια becoming power in a substantial sense, but is then able to cite this reference from Homer in relation to the later concept.

2. "But the grace of song, that maketh for man all things that soothe him, by adding her spell, full often causes even what is past belief to be indeed believed." (LCL)
promote a lie and has great power to deceive. Entranced by the song
men believe the words. 

\[ \chi \alpha \rho \iota \varsigma \] is thus for Pindar the
entrancing power, or spell-like quality resident in song. (\[ \chi \alpha \rho \iota \varsigma \]
with its associations with delight, may with added appropriateness be
used to designate this power of influence, since the influence is
here by pleasant seduction (cf. \[ \tau \lambda \mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \chi \kappa \]).) 1

\[ \chi \alpha \rho \iota \varsigma \] is more clearly quasi-substantial in
Euripides Hipp. 527.

E. Hipp. 525ff, ἔρως ἔρως, ὅ καίρ' ὀμυμίτων
στάσεις πάθων, ἐκείνων γλυκεῖν \[ ψυχή \]
\[ \chi \alpha \rho \iota \varsigma \] οὐ ἐπιστρέφειν \[ ψυχή \] ....

Here the sweet \[ \chi \alpha \rho \iota \varsigma \] is introduced into the soul by the goddess
to work its influence there of promoting deep yearnings. 3

1. It is just possible that \[ \chi \alpha \rho \iota \varsigma \] is here personified as a
goddess, present in song and giving it its power to charm. The
idea of resident power would still be present.

2. "O Eros, O Eros, how melts love's yearning from thine eyes,
when thy sweet spell witcheth the heart of them against whom
thou hast marched in thy might." (LCL)
The image here is probably from the sweet drippings of
the honey-comb (\[ \sigma \tau \alpha \zeta \iota \varsigma \] , γλυκεῖαν ). Cf. Prov 10.32 LXX,
\[ χείλῃ ἡμῖν δείκνυν ἀποστρέφειν \[ χρίτας \].

3. It is not enough to read \[ \chi \alpha \rho \iota \varsigma \] here as "delight" (as LSJ,
1969) since \[ ἀποστρέφειν \] suggests Eros exerting herself to
gain the mastery over a person. Rather Eros bends to her will
by making it a delight for a person to follow her prompting. It
is a moot point whether the notion of delight is included at all
in \[ \chi \alpha \rho \iota \varsigma \] or is supplied by \[ γλυκεῖαν \], leaving \[ \chi \alpha \rho \iota \varsigma \]
to carry the sense "influence" as in Med. 439 below.
In Med. 439 Euripides uses $\chi'\phi\lambda$ in a sense like "effective influence" where he writes $\beta\varepsilon\delta\omega\nu\,\chi\phi\lambda$, ouj $\varepsilon\,\alpha\nu\lambda\omega\nu$. We could perhaps translate "spell" since the influence is probably seen as a magical quality inherent in the oath.

A reference in Sophocles has $\chi\phi\lambda$ as quasi-substantial and coming from the realm of the gods.

The $\chi\phi\lambda$ points to a quasi-substantial conception. 

Beyond that it may not be possible to define $\chi\phi\lambda$ more closely than to say that it is beneficent ($\mu\sigma\sigma\epsilon\pi\tau\epsilon\tau\nu\nu$).

If we might leave the Classical period now and introduce a reference from a Jewish writing, it will be of significance to note T. Jud. 2.1,

$\kappa\alpha\iota\varepsilon\delta\omega\iota\kappa\varepsilon\,\mu\varepsilon\kappa\\nu\,\chi\phi\lambda\imath\nu$ en $\pi\alpha\tau\iota\tau\iota\iota\,\iota\gamma\gamma\gamma\mu\upsilon\upsilon$. 

This is then followed by examples given in the first person of Judah's super-human fleetness of foot and strength. Then in 3.10 the same point is made in a slightly different setting by saying

1. "Disanulled is the spell of the oath; no shame for the broken troth." (LCL)

2. Absent here is any overtone from $\chi\phi\lambda$ as "that which delights".

3. Dry your tears; when grace is shed on the quick and the dead by dark Powers beneficent over-grief they would resent. (LCL) 

The translation is paraphrastic and may be misleading.
"an angel of might followed me everywhere". \( \chi \alpha \rho \iota \) comes to Judah as super-human ability bestowed on him by God.¹

Plu. Sull. 38 to which we now turn has the virtue of contemporaneity with the New Testament writings.

Τούς μὲν \( \chi \alpha \rho \iota \) καὶ δεῖτε, τοὺς δὲ \( \alpha ρελγ \ ζελκουσθείμενος \)

This use of \( \chi \alpha \rho \iota \) stands a little to one side of the line of usage to which I have drawn attention. It need have nothing of the quasi-substantial conception which has interested us. It is included because it shares the notion of \( \chi \alpha \rho \iota \) as influence - here kindly influence as opposed to threats. We may sharpen the concept a little by noting that there is a gradation from \( \chi \alpha \rho \iota \) to \( \delta \epsilon \gamma \sigma \iota \) to \( \zeta \pi \epsilon \alpha \lambda \gamma \). The first relates to those folk who gladly agree when they learn what Pompey desires. The second to those who comply when put on the spot by being specifically requested. The third to those who must be threatened to be brought to heel.

\( \chi \alpha \rho \iota \) is thus the power to influence which Pompey has directly from the good-will the people bear him. It is the power of being affectionately regarded.

Note finally in this survey, the use of \( \chi \alpha \rho \iota \) for love charms (e.g. Luc. Alex. 5, \( \chi \alpha \rho \iota \) \( \epsilon \iota \) \( \tau \alpha \upsilon \epsilon \gamma \rho \omega \mu \omicron \nu \)). Power to influence has here been fully concretized. \( \chi \alpha \rho \iota \) is that which works its gentle influence to the erotic advantage of its owner. It is not now the power to influence as such but a concrete object that has this power. This use of \( \chi \alpha \rho \iota \) for love charms with its over-

1. The sense "gracious help" for \( \chi \alpha \rho \iota \) which is established at e.g. Plu. Luc. 18 would fit the context in so far as accounting for Judah's successes. However, the list of achievements is very much a catalogue of his own personal exploits, and "gracious help" would not suit the mood of the passage. Gracious help has its correlate in a sense of need. Here we have a story of personal triumph, made possible by the possession of some divine "charisma".

2. "Pompey diverted some from their purpose by his kindly influence and entreaties, and others by his threats ...." (LCL)
tones of magic links with the uses cited from Pindar and Hippolytus above.

The line of use of χαρίς which I have traced can be shown to continue and develop through the New Testament period and into the early Christian centuries. References could be made to the magic papyri, the Corpus Hermeticum and references in the philosophers Porphyry and Philostratus. It will suffice to quote Conzelmann on this development. "... χαρίς becomes a power in a substantial sense ... the concept of power ... is now [of] a potency that streams down from the world above, a religious quality .... It appears in the Ὄεις ἀνήρ and expresses itself in magic." The evidence for these developments is too late to influence our understanding of New Testament word usage, but it does show that the usages to which I have drawn attention above were very much alive in the language of the New Testament period.


2. E.g. Corp. Herm. I, 32, καὶ καὶ οὗτος καὶ τὸν ἐπίπεδον καὶ καὶ ἐν ὑπεράσπισιν καὶ καὶ <πληροῦσαν καὶ ἐν Χαρίτου τοὺς τούς εἰς κύνικες τοῦ γένους ... καθώς παρέκτησες αὐτῷ τῆς πάσης ἐπιστολῆς. The text is quoted as given by Wetter, Charis, 126. W. Scott, Hermetica, Oxford, 1924 supplies a different conjectural restoration of the text which seems less likely than the above and which can in any case allow the same sense for χαρίς. Conzelmann, χαρίς, 376 lists other references.

3. These belong to the Ὄεις ἀνήρ circle of ideas and we may refer the reader to L. Bieler, Ὄεις ANHP, 50-6.

Testament Christian literature. Here it should be possible to find ourselves in living contact with the New Testament word usages.

First to the New Testament material. Paul is always difficult to use for comparisons of linguistic usage, because with \( \chi\nu\rho\iota\sigma \) as with so many terms his use is creatively original. \(^1\) Nevertheless there does seem to be a strand in his use of \( \chi\nu\rho\iota\sigma \) which can be helpfully compared with the usages we have been considering above.

Paul can use \( \chi\nu\rho\iota\sigma \) to designate an ability or capacity received as a gift. He does this in particular in relation to his own functioning as an apostle (Rom 1.5; 12.3; 1 Cor 3.10; Gal 2.9; etc.) but also more generally of what all Christians receive which empowers the manifestations of the divine presence in their lives (1 Cor 1.4-7). \(^2\)

In 1 Cor 15.10 (ὁμιληταὶ ἡθικὸς Θεοῦ ἐν δύναμιν ἐν ὑποκάρῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ) Paul is attributing his ability to work hard to the presence of God's grace with him. There is a dynamic working of God in him which he experiences as a divine enabling. Cf. 2 Cor 1.12 where the contrast between human achievements and what is wrought by the power of God is expressed by ὁμιληταὶ ἡθικὸς Θεοῦ.

In 2 Cor 12.9 the Lord assures Paul ἀνακεῖ σοι ἡθικὸς μου ἡθικὸς ἐν καθενείς τελεῖται. ἡθικὸς is the experience of God which gives power in the life of the Christian within the very experience of weakness.

\footnote{1}{For a useful short statement of Paul's use of \( \chi\nu\rho\iota\sigma \), see J.G.D. Dunn, Jesus (1975) 202-5.}

\footnote{2}{It may be that \( \chi\nu\rho\iota\sigma \) in v 4 is non-specific and refers to inward capacity or power, while \( \chi\nu\rho\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\alpha\tau\alpha \) in v 7 refers to the outward manifestation as taking specific and different forms. There is one \( \chi\nu\rho\iota\sigma \) empowering many \( \chi\nu\rho\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\alpha\tau\alpha \). Rom 12.6 would also be well suited by such a distinction.}
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is, in 2 Cor 9.14 (Τῇ ὑπερβάλλωσιν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπιλυόντος) that from God which motivates and enables the generosity of the contribution for Jerusalem. (The contribution is in turn their χάρις, 1 Cor 16.3).

In all these references χάρις is associated with a power that comes from God to be in the believer. Sometimes the χάρις seems to be directly equated with the power, sometimes the stress is more on the experience of God which produces in the believer this power.

In Hebrews also we meet a dynamic concept of χάρις. In 13.9 grace is suggested as an alternative to food as a source of strength. In 4.16 the concept is not so indisputable. We are to come with boldness to the throne of grace ἐν λαβώνειν εἰλικρίνειας καὶ χάριν ἐφορμήσασθαι ἐν προθυμίᾳ. The idea could be, to get into favour with God so that he will help you when you need it, however it seems more likely to me, especially in the light of the established sense at 13.9, that χάρις is what helps and is thus a power given by God for timely help. This understanding gives good separation between ἐλεος and χάριν which is suggested by the separate verbs governing these words and by the word order which ensures that the ἐλεος phrase qualifies only one of the two words. It further provides a suitable development from ἐλεος to χάριν, the one being the presupposition of the other.

Finally from New Testament uses of χάρις, 1 Pet 4.10f. Here gifted church members are exhorted to use their χάρις as good

1. Cf. 2 Cor 8.1 where ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ δεδομένην εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τῆς Ἡττικῆς μετέφερες is evidenced by enthusiastic and sacrificial giving under difficult circumstances.
stewards of God’s varied \( \chi \rho \iota \varsigma \). Grace is thus a possession, many-faceted in its manifestations but in each case making possible a \( \chi \rho \iota \varsigma \).

Thus the New Testament epistolary corpus knows of \( \chi \rho \iota \varsigma \) as an ability or power from God which becomes resident.¹

In the early post-New Testament Christian writings there are many references where \( \chi \rho \iota \varsigma \) could have the sense “that which helps”, i.e. the notion of power in which we are interested, but where the context is equally satisfied by the sense “gracious help”² (1 Clem. 5 5.3; Ign. Pol. 7.3; Just. dial. 116.1 etc.).

Sib. Or. 4.189 is more certain. Here “grace” is bracketed with “breath” and “life” as what God provides for those who live again after the judgement. This suggests that \( \chi \rho \iota \varsigma \) is the possession, in the renewed life of the godly, of a divine power analogous to the life-force.

Just. dial. 9.1. is particularly useful for comparison since here the \( \chi \rho \iota \varsigma \) is associated with \( \lambda \varsigma \gamma \varsigma \), as in Lk 4.22. Here we read:

\[ \text{où κενοῖς ἐπιστεύωμεν μοῦθοι σὺν ἀναπεδείκτων λόγοις, ἀλλὰ μετατίθεντες πνεύματος Θείου καὶ δυνάμεις πρότεσι καὶ τεθηκεῖς \( \chi \rho \iota \varsigma \).} \]

Justin is certainly waxing lyrical and we cannot ask too much of precision in his meaning. Nonetheless there can be no doubt that he thinks of \( \chi \rho \iota \varsigma \), like \( \delta \nu \gamma \varsigma \) and \( \pi \nu \varepsilon \delta \mu \kappa \) \( \Theta \varepsilon \iota \varsigma \), being present in the words of the gospel message and giving it its power and authenticity.

1. \( \chi \rho \iota \varsigma \) is absent from the synoptics outside Lk. There are three occurrences in the prologue to John. That “grace” is spoken of quasi-substantially may be seen by comparing Jn 1.14 with 1.16. In 1.14 “the Word” is \( \beta \lambda \rho \iota \varsigma \gamma \varsigma \), \( \chi \rho \iota \varsigma \) and in 1.16 \( \varepsilon \kappa \gamma \theta \iota \varsigma \) \( \varepsilon \kappa \gamma \theta \iota \varsigma \). The concept of grace is here made more complex by its relationship to \( \gamma \lambda \gamma \theta \varepsilon \iota \varsigma \) (1.14,17) and \( \delta \nu \delta \mu \kappa \varsigma \) (1.17).

2. A sense which is established at e.g. Plu. Luc. 18.
With Mart. Pol. 12.1 we have come the full circle back to Hom. Od. 6. 235f. Polycarp "became filled with courage and joy and his face was suffused with grace ... the proconsul was amazed".

We also note here Prot. Jas. 7.3, where we read concerning the childhood of Mary that Joachim
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usage, ἐπιτεθεὶς τῷ Δανιήλι τῷ Χρυσίνῳ ἐνεπίθετον τῷ Ἀρειπαναίκου.

Here the setting of ἐπιτεθεὶς alongside τῷ Χρυσίνῳ reinforces the judgement for Gen 39.21 that the ἐπιτεθεὶς is something in the person, not merely the attitude of the viewer.

The ἐπιτεθεὶς shows itself in what the king says, and the quality of his speech is the correlate to the beauty of his form. It is not indicated whether wisdom, oratory, kindness in speech, etc. is in mind. ἐπιτεθεὶς is that about his speech which impresses, which sets him head and shoulders above other men.

Somewhat different is the use of ἐπιτεθεὶς at Bar 2.14.

The request to God is, δος Ἰλιν ἐπιτεθεὶς πρόσωπον τῶν ἀποκαταστάτων and the reason suggested is "so that the whole world may know that you are the Lord our God". Now it is possible that the concern is to be in favour with the captors. But this would give a very distinctive sense for καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα unparalleled in the rest of the LXX. Almost certainly we have at Bar 2.14 καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα = "in

1. The phrase καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα would then mean "in the eyes of, i.e. from the perspective of". Of the many LXX occurrences of this phrase, only Sir 45.3 offers us a possible parallel for such a sense. There we read of Moses that God ἐξεσείωτον καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα ἔτοιμον. We could have here the kings as witnesses of Moses' glory (καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα = "in their presence, so that they saw it") or the idea that it seemed even to kings that Moses was glorious (καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα = from the perspective (even) of). Kings are presumably singled out for mention because they possess ἐξεσειώτος themselves and will only be impressed by something greater. This being so, it has to be admitted that καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα here has gained something of the second sense (i.e. is concerned with their viewpoint). Before, however, we hastily transfer this sense to Baruch context we must recognize that in Sir 45.3 this second sense occurs only in the closest continuity with the first and more usual sense. The kings' perspective only comes into view because they happen to be particularly suitable witnesses. On the other hand in the Baruch context καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα used with reference to the viewpoint of the captors would stand in sharp contrast to καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα = "in their presence so that they can see it". It thus seems that even Sir 45.3 does not provide a true parallel for the sense that has been suggested for καὶ τὰ πρόσωπα in Bar 2.14.
their presence, so that they can witness it. This fits well with the ἄνδρες ἃπτομεν ἡ γῆ, which follows. The captors are the inner circle of eyewitnesses by means of whom the whole world comes to know. On this view Χαρᾶσ is here not a means to favour, but an endowment from God, the presence of which will be evident to all. It will be seen in this poor disheartened remnant beginning to flourish and prosper and in their being enabled to return to their homeland (cf. 2.34f). We could perhaps say that Χαρᾶσ is the power of God's favour at work in and around the remnant.

From the LXX we should note as well Sir 21.16, 

Ἐκ τῆς ἰδέας μετούσας ἐν ἑαυτῷ φαρέτρου, ἐν τῷ δὲ Χαίλου σωστῷ εὐφροσύνης Χαρᾶσ. 2

On the basis of the parallel between ἰσοτίκος and Χαρᾶσ we may say that "it may be found there" = "one can go there and get it", not just "one may discover it to be present there". In other words Χαρᾶσ is transferable to the listener. Something like "inspiration" would make a suitable opposite to "burden", but in any case Χαρᾶσ is something worthwhile, something helpful.

1. The Jerusalem Bible translates, "grant us your favour for all our captors to see it".

2. Χαρᾶσ is missing here in A, and in X has been altered by a corrector to παραμαθήματι. παραμαθήματι may have been suggested by the δικβοήθησεν Θεοῦ ἐν ἐκείνῳ of the following verse. However Χαρᾶσ is to be accepted as the original reading.

3. The form of expression used in Ps 44 (45).2 (quoted above) is here taken a step further.

4. Something more than "delight" is suggested by v 17 which follows, "They inquire at the mouth of the wise man in the congregation, and they shall ponder his words in their heart." The various words in Sir for wise man are not to be distinguished.

It is possible that Eccl 10.12 should be added to this list. Λόγοι στομαχίας σωστοί Χαρᾶσ, καὶ Χαίλης ἐπανθρώπων καὶ εὐφροσύνης Λότεν. The bringing together of Λόγοι, Χαρᾶσ and στομαχία makes comparison with Lk 4.22 attractive. We can at least say that Χαρᾶσ as something which gives help would give good balance to the sentence.
Thus it may be seen that the LXX is not antithetical to viewing \( \chi\nu\rhoi\varsigma \) as quasi-substantial and dynamic in its operation.

As we turn now to Luke's own use of \( \chi\nu\rhoi\varsigma \) we have had provided for us already a broad background of the kind of understanding of \( \chi\nu\rhoi\varsigma \) which is being suggested for Lk 4.22 - \( \chi\nu\rhoi\varsigma \) as a quasi-substantial divine power, present in the words. However it must finally be Luke's own use of \( \chi\nu\rhoi\varsigma \) that determines the probabilities for such a sense. Luke uses the word no less than 25 times which gives us good opportunity to determine the range of meanings for which he might be prepared to use the word.

Quite a number of Luke's uses of \( \chi\nu\rhoi\varsigma \) may be passed over quickly as irrelevant to our inquiry. At Lk 1.30; 2.52; Acts 2.47; 7.46, \( \chi\nu\rhoi\varsigma \) simply means "favour", at Acts 24.27; 25.3,9, "a favour". In Lk 6.32,33,34, the expression is elliptical and the precise sense disputed.\(^1\) However none of the possible senses is going to influence our understanding of \( \chi\nu\rhoi\varsigma \) at Lk 4.22. In Lk 17.9 the sense is "thanks" or "gratitude". In Acts 11.23 \( \tau\nu\chi\nu\rhoi\varsigma \) is what God has done and which can be seen, and thus \( \chi\nu\rhoi\varsigma \) = "gracious deed or working". Acts 13.43 uses a spatial metaphor with \( \chi\nu\rhoi\varsigma \) and it becomes the region in which God is gracious, where his grace is experienced and thus "the state of grace".

The remaining references may be divided into two categories. \( \chi\nu\rhoi\varsigma \) is used absolutely at Acts 4.33; 6.8; 7.10; 18.27 and of course at Lk 4.22. The other references speak of the "grace" "of God" or "of the Lord" etc. (Lk 2.40; Acts 14.3,26; 15.11; 20.24,32). We will deal with the absolute uses first since this is what we have at

\[ \ldots \]

\(^1\) Cf. BAG, 885; Wetter, Charis, 209ff; Conzelmann, \( \chi\nu\rhoi\varsigma \), 392.
Thus it may be seen that the LXX is not antithetical to viewing $\chi\nu\rho\iota\upsilon$ as quasi-substantial and dynamic in its operation.

As we turn now to Luke's own use of $\chi\nu\rho\iota\upsilon$ we have had provided for us already a broad background of the kind of understanding of $\chi\nu\rho\iota\upsilon$ which is being suggested for Lk 4.22 - $\chi\nu\rho\iota\upsilon$ as a quasi-substantial divine power, present in the words. However it must finally be Luke's own use of $\chi\nu\rho\iota\upsilon$ that determines the probabilities for such a sense. Luke uses the word no less than 25 times which gives us good opportunity to determine the range of meanings for which he might be prepared to use the word.

Quite a number of Luke's uses of $\chi\nu\rho\iota\upsilon$ may be passed over quickly as irrelevant to our inquiry. At Lk 1.30; 2.52; Acts 2.47; 7.46, $\chi\nu\rho\iota\upsilon$ simply means "favour", at Acts 24.27; 25.3,9, "a favour". In Lk 6.32,33,34, the expression is elliptical and the precise sense disputed. However none of the possible senses is going to influence our understanding of $\chi\nu\rho\iota\upsilon$ at Lk 4.22. In Lk 17.9 the sense is "thanks" or "gratitude". In Acts 11.23 $\gamma\nu\chi\nu\rho\iota\upsilon\nu$ is what God has done and which can be seen, and thus $\chi\nu\rho\iota\upsilon$ = "gracious deed or working". Acts 13.43 uses a spatial metaphor with $\chi\nu\rho\iota\upsilon$ and it becomes the region in which God is gracious, where his grace is experienced and thus "the state of grace".

The remaining references may be divided into two categories. $\chi\nu\rho\iota\upsilon$ is used absolutely at Acts 4.33; 6.8; 7.10; 18.27 and of course at Lk 4.22. The other references speak of the "grace" "of God" or "of the Lord" etc. (Lk 2.40; Acts 14.3,26; 15.11; 20.24,32). We will deal with the absolute uses first since this is what we have at

1. Cf. BAG, 885; Wetter, Charis, 209ff; Conzelmann, $\chi\nu\rho\iota\upsilon$, 392.
Lk 4.22.

Acts 6.8, στέφανος δε κλήμας χάριν και δυνάμεως ἐποίησεν τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα μεγάλα, certainly speaks of χαρίς quasi-substantially and the balance of the sentence suggests there is about as much distinction between χαρίς and δύναμις as between τέρατα and σημεῖα.

We have already argued (p 61) that χαρίς at Acts 7.10 comes close to its use of the attractiveness of the θεὸς ἀνάβασις and we may compare Homer Od. 6. 235f and Mart. Pol. 12.1, above, for the rather substantial understanding of χαρίς involved in this usage.

Acts 4.33 is sometimes thought to be a reference to the high regard that the Jerusalem populace had for the early Christians. Those who promote this viewpoint to Acts 2.47. The attractiveness of the suggestion is the close parallel in content between the summarizing sections in which the respective statements are embedded. Further, in both places the mention of χαρίς occurs in close proximity to a reference to successful evangelism. However as we give closer attention to the movement of thought at the points of occurrence of χαρίς, the force of the parallel is greatly diminished.

In Acts 2.47 the mention of being in favour precedes the notice of evangelistic success. Being in favour could thus provide the favourable climate for successful evangelism. However it seems more likely that there is no real connection between the points beyond both being evidence of the presence and power of God in the situation.

1. πλήρης governs χαρίς καὶ δυνάμεως and is placed before, μὲ καὶ μὴ χαρίς governs τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα and is placed after, and the τέρατα and σημεῖα flow from the χαρίς and δυνάμεως (πλήρης .... έποίησεν).

2. E.g. H.J. Holtzmann, Apog. (1901) 45; Conzelmann, χαρίς, 392.
This is certainly so at 5.13f where we have the same thoughts juxtaposed. The peoples' favourable attitude is noted without any intention of indicating this as providing a sympathetic hearing for the gospel.

The order of items in Acts 4.33 is reversed. The \( \chi \rho \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \tau \) follows the mention of powerful evangelism. The use between the clauses of \( \tau \epsilon \) shows the close connection here between the \( \chi \rho \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \tau \) and the successful evangelism. However, not only the order of items precludes the connection being provided by \( \chi \rho \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \tau \) as a good climate for evangelism, but it is doubtful whether such a connection would be close enough to justify a use of \( \tau \epsilon \). With \( \chi \rho \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \tau \) as "popular favour" we are hard pressed to find a connection that does justice to the use of \( \tau \epsilon \).

Any difficulty with \( \tau \epsilon \) at once dissolves if we once allow that the use of \( \chi \rho \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \tau \) here may be like that at Acts 6.8. There we noted the close connection between \( \chi \rho \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \tau \) and \( \delta \upsilon \nu \nu \mu \mu \) . Here the \( \tau \epsilon \) points up the close connection between the \( \delta \upsilon \nu \nu \mu \mu \mu \epsilon \gamma \alpha \lambda \gamma \) with which the apostles gave their testimony and the \( \chi \rho \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \tau \mu \epsilon \gamma \alpha \lambda \gamma \) which was on the whole church. Haenchen catches the relationship expressed by \( \tau \epsilon \) with his, "The divine grace is not however restricted to the Apostles; it spreads over them all." The others don't do quite the

1. The favourable attitude is here expressed by \( \psi \mu \epsilon \chi \lambda \nu \nu \nu \varepsilon \nu \eta \mu \eta \) , but the same verb \( \pi \rho \omicron \tau \iota \iota \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \) is used with respect to the successful evangelism.


2. See BDF § 443(3).

3. At Acts 2.47 we are only explaining a juxtaposition, not a close grammatical connection.

4. The repeated \( \mu \epsilon \chi \lambda \gamma \) fits well the \( \chi \rho \omicron \omicron \omicron \omicron \tau \) being essentially the same as the \( \delta \upsilon \nu \nu \mu \mu \).

same thing as the Apostles but are all filled with the same divine power.

This quasi-substantial sense for \( \lambda \nu \rho \iota \sigma \) might already be suspected at Acts 4.33 from the use of \( \lambda \nu \rho \iota \sigma \) \( \varepsilon \eta \nu \) . The \( \varepsilon \eta \nu \) may point to a certain reification.

Haenchen\(^1\) points to Lk 2.40 in rejecting the sense "popular favour" for \( \lambda \nu \rho \iota \sigma \) at Acts 4.33. We will see below that in Lk 2.40 \( \lambda \nu \rho \iota \sigma \) is used as of a quasi-substantial endowment. Here it is enough to note that a comparison of Acts 4.33 with Lk 2.40 makes this sense for \( \lambda \nu \rho \iota \sigma \) more likely in both verses. In the New Testament \( \lambda \nu \rho \iota \sigma \) \( \varepsilon \eta \nu \) occurs only in these two verses\(^2\) and we can expect the use of \( \lambda \nu \rho \iota \sigma \) to be the same in both cases. Human favour is automatically excluded as a possible sense for \( \lambda \nu \rho \iota \sigma \) at Lk 2.40 by \( \Theta \epsilon \omega \) . This further reduces the probability of such a sense at Acts 4.33, which, as has been indicated above, is already seen to be a difficult sense there. But if we eliminate this sense at Acts 4.33, the obvious alternative is not divine favour in a general sense, but more concretely, an endowment of divine power. And if this is the force given by \( \lambda \nu \rho \iota \sigma \) at Acts 4.33 it is likely to be the same at Lk 2.40.

Thus the inadequacy of the parallel with Acts 2.47, the need to account for the use of \( \tau \varepsilon \) , the suggestiveness of the preposition \( \varepsilon \eta \nu \) , and the comparison with Lk 2.40 all point to \( \lambda \nu \rho \iota \sigma \) at Acts 4.27 being a quasi-substantial endowment along the lines of the Acts 6.8 usage.

The last of the absolute uses of \( \lambda \nu \rho \iota \sigma \) is in Acts 18.27 where Apollos \( \sigma \nu \nu \gamma \beta \lambda \epsilon \tau \varepsilon \tau \nu \tau \omega \tau \nu \tau \sigma \eta \ , \tau \iota \nu \varepsilon \gamma \iota \sigma \rho \iota \sigma \, \). There is

\[ \ldots \ldots \]

1. Ibid., n 4.

2. The LXX adds only Sir 26.15, \( \lambda \nu \rho \iota \sigma \ \varepsilon \pi \iota \ \lambda \nu \rho \iota \sigma \, \gamma \nu \iota \, \kappa \iota \sigma \chi \nu \tau \gamma \gamma \ldots \), which is not really comparable.
a strong body of opinion that \( \text{Σκέπασμα} \) refers to Apollos and links with \( \text{συνεδρία} \). If this is so then the sense of \( \text{Χριστός} \) will be, as Holtzmann notes, the same as at Acts 6.8.

\[ \text{περιστερόκοσμος} \] is however the immediate antecedent to \( \text{Χριστός} \) and has the first claim to be considered as the point of attachment for \( \text{Σκέπασμα} \). J. Moffat argues that, "The omission of \( \text{Σκέπασμα} \) from the ordinary text \( \text{περιστερόκοσμος} \) by some authorities under the influence of the Western text, really confirms the view that the words were taken with \( \text{περιστερόκοσμος} \), for they were left out as apparently redundant." The whole episode is notoriously difficult and no firm decision on the correct connection is possible. The connection with \( \text{περιστερόκοσμος} \) is however likely enough for us to investigate its implications.

In the references we have been considering, \( \text{Χριστός} \) as a divine power is characteristically on or in a person and exercising its influence out from there. This may cause reservations about finding the same kind of divine power in the \( \text{Χριστός} \) of Lk 4.22. Now if at Acts 18.27 the \( \text{Σκέπασμα} \) connects with \( \text{περιστερόκοσμος} \), it is significant that \( \text{Χριστός} \) here stands outside the person and exercises its influence on the person. As elsewhere \( \text{Χριστός} \) is not just the attitude of divine favour, rather it is somewhat separated from God as a relatively independent power. Further cases of \( \text{Χριστός} \) as such a

1. Thus Holtzmann \( \text{Apg.} \), 119; A. Loisy, \text{Apges} (1920) 716; H.W. Beyer, \( \text{Apg.} \) (1955) 114ff; H. Conzelmann, \( \text{Apg.} \) (1963) 109; G. Stählin, \( \text{Apg.} \) (1966) 249; \text{et al.}
2. \text{Grace} (1931) 362.
3. Of particular importance in determining the probabilities for the connection of \( \text{Χριστός} \) is one's answer to the question: does \( \text{Σκέπασμα} \) refer to the Holy Spirit? As well as his own comments see the literature cited at Haenchen, \text{Apges}, 550 nn 7 and 8.
4. So Conzelmann, \( \text{Χριστός} \), 392 n 156, "\( \text{Χριστός} \) and \( \text{Σκέπασμα} \) (continued...)

\( \text{Σκέπασμα} \) and \( \text{περιστερόκοσμος} \)
power not resident in or possessed by a person will emerge below.

We now turn our attention to the remaining uses of \( X \hat{\chi} \hat{r} \hat{\rho} \hat{i} \hat{s} \) where the word does not stand absolutely but is qualified by \( \tau \circ \circ K u r i o u \) etc.

We consider first of all Acts 14.26 and 15.40 since the use of \( X \hat{\chi} \hat{r} \hat{\rho} \hat{i} \hat{s} \) here has a certain continuity with the sense we have suggested for \( X \hat{\chi} \hat{r} \hat{\rho} \hat{i} \hat{s} \) at 18.27. In 14.26 we have \( \pi \rho x e d o i \hat{b} e i \hat{u} a \) \( \tau \hat{\chi} \hat{r} \hat{\rho} \hat{i} \hat{s} \) \( \tau \circ \circ \Theta e u \) and it is to be understood that this had been done by the Christians at Antioch with regard to Paul and Barnabas. In 15.40 it is \( \pi \rho x e d o i \hat{b} e i \hat{u} a \) \( \tau \hat{\chi} \hat{r} \hat{\rho} \hat{i} \hat{s} \) \( \tau \circ \circ K u r i o u \) \( \up\circ \circ \) \( \tau \hat{\omega} \hat{u} \) \( \chi \hat{\phi} \hat{\mu} \hat{\nu} \).

The phrase is stereotyped. Haenchen suggests it is "part of the Christian vocabulary of devotion and probably originated in prayer". Luke's interest is in the approval and involvement of the "sending" church in the missionary endeavours, not in the function of grace in the mission. For this reason we cannot rest too much weight on the usage of \( X \hat{\chi} \hat{r} \hat{\rho} \hat{i} \hat{s} \) here. Nevertheless the phrase is in Luke's own personal vocabulary of devotion and thus could well reflect his theology and we should not fail to note the usage. The two uses we have here are in the context of leave taking, and since the use of \( \pi \rho x e d o i \hat{b} e i \hat{u} a \) fits this context so well, this is probably the context that gives rise to the expression. Those leaving have been in the circle of care, protection, help, etc. of the church. They are leaving this and are handed over to the safe-keeping of \( X \hat{\chi} \hat{r} \hat{\rho} \hat{i} \hat{s} \).

4. (continued...) are distinct in relation to the message, close in relation to the pneumatic."

God's grace is a power that is able to take care of those who must leave the church fellowship behind.

With different vocabulary the idea is very similar at Acts 20.32, παρατηθείσαι ἕξω τῷ Κυρίῳ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ. Since those to whom Paul speaks would see his face no more, they must now stand without his help, and he entrusts them to the (unmediated) care and protection of the Lord and the word of his grace.¹

Acts 20.32 has special interest for us because of the association of χαρία with λόγος. More so when the word of his grace is spoken of as τῷ δυνατῷ ἀνασκευασμένῳ καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ τῆς κληρονομίας ἐν τοῖς γεγραμμένοις ταξιν. There is certainly a power involved here and I suggest that here and at Lk 4.22 the ἁρπαγμός (κύριου) designates the power resident in (or perhaps better, capable of being conveyed by) the word(s).² For Moffat λόγος already suggests power since he considers that in Acts, "the word (of the Lord or of God) suggests almost a personified power in the life of the community."³

Certainly ἐν λόγῳ can be spoken of as of a living thing.⁴ However the notion of a power can only be claimed at 19.20, and this is one of the three references (6.7; 12.24; 19.20) where the sense


2. Cf. Cambe's comment (ΧΑΡΙΣΜΑ, 201), "La vertu salvifique est inséparablement reconnue à Dieu et à la parole de la grâce; τῷ λόγῳ τῆς χάριτος est même, semble-t-il, l'antécédent de τῷ δυνατῷ (Act.XX,32)." The context makes clear that Cambe finds in χαρία the reference to power.


is given if we replace "the word of God (or the Lord)" with "the church". The usage at 19.20 is thus distinct from that at 20.32.

We are thus justified in considering that the reference to power is contained in \( \chi'\rho\zeta\upsilon\sigma\varsigma \) and not in \( \lambda\delta\gamma\varsigma\sigma\varsigma \). Moffat says of the phrase "God and the word of his grace", "the collocation implies a sort of 'mystical independence' of the word, which is so charged with a divine or numinous power that the writer can speak of it side by side with God Himself." He expresses the situation well with the correction that it is really the \( \chi'\rho\zeta\upsilon\sigma\varsigma \) that stands alongside God and \( \delta\lambda\delta\gamma\varsigma\sigma\varsigma \) only in so far as the \( \chi'\rho\zeta\upsilon\sigma\varsigma \) is conveyed or carried by \( \delta\lambda\delta\gamma\varsigma\sigma\varsigma \). \( \eta\chi'\rho\zeta\upsilon\sigma\varsigma \) is "the divine or numinous power".

At Acts 14.3 the sense of \( \chi'\rho\zeta\upsilon\sigma\varsigma \) is not closely determined by the context, but there would be a certain appropriateness if the word imbued with power is given supporting testimony by deeds of power \( (\sigma\gamma\mu\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma\alpha\iota\varphi\psi\tau\varsigma \gamma\nu\nu\nu\chi'\epsilon\gamma\nu\alpha\omega \chi'\upsilon\tau\varphi\upomega \). \)

Of course it is possible that "the word of his grace" is here merely the message that offers salvation as now available through the name of Jesus. The expression is elliptical but whichever way we understand it, it seems clear to me that \( \chi'\rho\zeta\upsilon\sigma\varsigma \) is receivable and not just stated to be God's attitude, nor yet a past salvific act of God. If \( \tau\omega\lambda\delta\gamma\psi\tau\eta\chi'\rho\zeta\upsilon\sigma\varsigma \omega\tau\omega \) is a message about God's grace it must at the same time offer God's grace.

1. Ibid.

2. Cf. Cambe's comment re Acts 14.3; 20.24, 32 (\( \chi\Lambda\Pi\Sigma\), 195) "Le message chrétien est l'annonce de la grâce faite par Dieu aux hommes; il la communique même aux croyants, car cette grâce est réellement présente dans la prédication et opère par elle."

3. The same comment would apply to Lk 4.22. Jeremias' view of \( \chi'\rho\zeta\upsilon\sigma\varsigma \) at Lk 4.22 (Promise, 44\( \delta \)) fails to meet this demand. His understanding of \( \chi'\rho\zeta\upsilon\sigma\varsigma \) coming to the hearers in the encounter. Just as the hearers can receive the words, so they can receive the \( \chi'\rho\zeta\upsilon\sigma\varsigma \). We would expect Jeremias' sense - God's mercy as the topic of Jesus' discourse - to be expressed by \( \tau\omega\lambda\delta\gamma\psi\tau\eta\chi'\rho\zeta\upsilon\sigma\varsigma \). Cf. Lk 1.1, \( \delta\nu\nu\nu\delta\nu\nu\nu\rho\nu\nu\nu\chi'\gamma\nu\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma\alpha\nu\omega \chi'\rho\zeta\upsilon\sigma\varsigma \); 24.19, \( \tau\alpha\nu\chi'\gamma\nu\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma\alpha\nu\omega \chi'\rho\zeta\upsilon\sigma\varsigma \).
Where Paul speaks at Acts 20.24 of his συνκοινωνία ... διαμαρτύροντας τῷ ζωγράφου τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ, the expression is again elliptical and it is not possible to define its boundaries. The fullest content could be "the grace of God revealed in Christ and offered to men." But here the offer or application to men can be part of the content of χάρις and it would not be unreasonable to confine the extent of χαρίς to the salvific act of God in Christ, though the absence of other Lukan uses of χαρίς in this way counts against this.

We now come to Acts 15.11, ἀλλὰ δὲ ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν κυρίῳ Ἰησοῦ Μεστερίου εὐθυμῶν ἔνθα ὁ ἀπόστολος ἔπανωθεν κακείναι. These words constitute the climax and conclusion to Peter's speech to the council at Jerusalem over the question of the need to circumcise Gentiles. It is usual to translate v 11 "We believe that we shall be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus, just as they will." However I have argued that the thought sequence of Peter's speech demands that we read εὐθυμῶν as an infinitive of result and translate 15.11, "But through the grace of the Lord Jesus, we believe (in order) to be saved, and so do they." If this is correct the possibility of understanding χαρίς as the instrument to belief is excluded as alien to the point at issue. χαρίς is what makes possible the situation whereby belief is salvific. The reference could be to disposition or to deed. In any case there can be nothing quasi-

1. RSV translation, supported by e.g. Haenchen, Acts, 446 and Conzelmann, χαρίς, 392 n 160, who both refer to BDF § 397(2).
2. See appendix 2.
4. With καθόν ταῦτα κακείνα the stress must fall in such a way as to make clear that the case of the Gentile Christians is being proved from the case of the Jewish Christians.
substantial about Χριστός here.

In our survey of Luke's uses of Χριστός we come finally to Lk 2.40 where it is said of the child Jesus that Χριστός ἐστιν ἐν ἀνθρώπο. The weight of Lukan usage as surveyed above would already incline us to see more here than Χριστός as God's favourable attitude. Indeed I have already argued briefly for Χριστός here as a quasi-substantial endowment, while considering Acts 4.33. This case is strengthened when we compare Prot. Jas. 7.3 where we read, concerning the childhood of Mary, that Joachim

ἐκ Καθεστ. ἀλλ' εἰς τοὺς παρευμένος θεός θυσιαστήριον καὶ ἐβαλλε κύριος ἐκ θεοῦ ζηταν ἐν ἀνθρώποις καὶ Χριστός ποιεῖ τοῖς προσώπω ἀνθρώποις καὶ ἔκτεθησθεν ἀνθρώποις πασί ἐν οἴνοις ἱππαρκῆ.

Used here is the Χριστός ἐν ζωή which in the New Testament is exclusive to Luke (Lk 2.40; Acts 4.33). Here and elsewhere in Prot. Jas. there is such an obvious use in relation to Mary of elements from the pattern provided in the infancy narratives of Luke in relation to Jesus, that we can fairly say that this verse reflects an early understanding of Χριστός at Lk 2.40. The Χριστός on Mary is clearly quasi-substantial and this is how we should understand Lk 2.40.

This review of Luke's uses of Χριστός shows a well established tendency to speak of Χριστός as a quasi-substantial power. This is seen most clearly where the Χριστός is viewed as resident in or on people, and exercising its influence from that point, but this attachment to the person is absent in a number of cases where the Χριστός is evidently a quasi-substantial power.

1. Cf. Loisy, Luc, 126f, "Et la grâce - non seulement la bienviellance, mais la vertu 'de Dieu était sur lui'. - La grâce divine agissait spécialement dans la sagesse qui vient d'être dite et qu'on va voir."

2. See p 71 n 1.

3. O. Cullman in Hennecke: Apocrypha I, 327, suggests a date of about 150 AD.
Luke's other uses of \( \chi \rho \sigma \tau \) give us, then, every encouragement to pursue the suggestion above, that in Lk 4.22, \( \Gamma \tilde{\Pi}^{5} \chi \rho \tau \omega \sigma \) is Luke's explanation to the reader. Luke has already introduced his readers to \( \chi \rho \tau \sigma \) as a palpable presence of power with Jesus (Lk 2.40). He now cites the astonishment of the Nazareth folk as evidence that the same \( \chi \rho \sigma \) adhered to his words. ¹ The people admit to the impact of the words on them, Luke wants his readers to see that it is the presence of \( \chi \rho \sigma \) which makes the impact understandable.

10. Summary

This exegetical exercise is now brought to its conclusion by outlining what has been understood to be the development of thought through the passage.

Jesus gives his address, claiming that the quoted words from Isaiah find their fulfilment in being taken on his lips. Luke considers that the astonishment elicited by Jesus' words counts as evidence for him and his claims, and explains the impact of his words on unbelieving people in terms of the presence of divine power (\( \chi \rho \sigma \)) in the words. From this unwelcome impact of Jesus' words on them the people defend themselves by referring to Jesus as Joseph's son. Such humble circumstances are not to be expected of the messiah. Jesus has claimed to be the messianic healer (Lk 4.18-21) and the people want to press home their objection by suggesting that for the one who offers the glories of the messianic age, he seems to

1. Cambé (\( \chi \rho \sigma \), 200) draws attention here to the close connection between \( \chi \rho \sigma \) and \( \pi \gamma \epsilon \mu \chi \) in Acts. That Jesus begins in Lk 4.18 with the assertion \( \pi \gamma \epsilon \mu \chi \chi \rho \tau \omega \sigma \) \( \sigma \) \( \epsilon \rho \sigma \), may not be insignificant in preparing the reader for \( \chi \rho \sigma \) in v 22 as a presence of divine power.
have participated surprisingly little in its benefits. "Physician
heal yourself" is their caustic remark. They are prepared to make a
rather sceptical offer to forgive Jesus' prima facie unsuitability
for office if he produces some dazzling miracles - like those that
were rather unbelievably supposed to have been performed in Capernaum.
(Jesus who knows the thoughts of men voices these last two comments
on the peoples' behalf.) Jesus then replies in terms which indicate
that he considers himself to have been rejected. He is however
unabashed by the rejection and in his reply reaffirms the prophetic
aspect of his claim by pointing out that he is being treated by them
to a prophet's fate. Jesus makes further comments on their rejection.
By illustrations from their history he points up the possibility of
having in one's midst a prophetic ministry from which one fails to
benefit. "You people are the losers." In the given context these
last remarks come home with the impact of pointed personal criticism
and bring to a head the murderous rage that would have done away with
Jesus there and then.

The passage is not without its difficulties. Luke has not
always made it as easy as he might, to follow his train of thought
through the passage, but it would seem that the initial presumption
in favour of internal coherence is justified by the results, and also
that the particular understanding of the function of vv 24-7 offered
within the exegesis gains additional credence from the contribution
it makes to a coherent understanding of the whole sequence of thought
from vv 22-8.

We are consequently able to reaffirm the judgement that
the pericope knows nothing of Jewish rejection of the gospel becoming
the basis for the Gentile mission.
11. **The Gentile Mission**

Now this conclusion, earlier in the chapter posed for us something of a dilemma. Well based as it may seem in terms of the inner thought development of the pericope, in the total Lukan context it is difficult to believe that Luke would not have thought of the salvation of Gentiles when he wrote about the blessing of Naaman and the woman of Zarephath.

Faced with this dilemma I propose that we consider the possibility of applying to Lk 4 the kind of distinction used by K.H. Rengstorf with reference to Acts 1.8. He suggests that Luke is capable of making a verse in its local context and in relation to its recipients have one significance, but in relation to Luke's whole work to have a different or at least an additional significance. So the Apostles understand Acts 1.8 with reference to a diaspora mission to the Jews, but by means of the development through Acts, Luke shows the reader that there is a wider reference to the Gentile mission in the words of Acts 1.8: through the book Luke depicts the Holy Spirit at work breaking through the more limited understanding to make possible the Gentile mission.

Whether Rengstorf is right about Acts 1.8 is not here our concern, but whether Luke is capable of using a system of two levels of meaning like that suggested by Rengstorf is relevant for our understanding of Lk 4.25-7. John certainly uses the technique to make Caiaphas speak prophetic words about Jesus' vicarious suffering (Jn 11.49-51). We have already been moving towards such an

---

1. K.H. Rengstorf, "Election" (1962) 186f. Cf. also p 102 n 4
2. Is Luke moving in the same direction with Gamaliel's speech in Acts 5.36-9 esp. v 39?
assumption for Luke where it was suggested that the Nazareth rejection is for Luke a kind of "dress-rehearsal" for the passion, and prepares Luke's readers for Jesus prophetic fate in Jerusalem. There, however, the question did not strike us quite so sharply since the episode is in its own right a kind of working out in miniature of what we see worked out on a full scale later in Jerusalem. There is not required any second and different meaning in the wider Lukan context. To find reference to the Gentile mission in Lk 4.25-7 requires a decidedly larger step.

Rengstorf's two levels of meaning seem to offer us the most helpful way out of our dilemma. This allows us to register the episode's own emphasis as being fully on what Jesus' would miss out on, but at the same time to see in the verses against the wider Lukan context a significant pointer to the universalism which underlies Luke's presentation.

The ministry of Elijah and Elisha was not narrowly nationalistic. Their prophetic ministry brought benefit to those outside Israel, and in this way their example offers a precedent for the offer of the Christian gospel outside the bounds of Judaism.

That universalism which is the basis of the Gentile mission and finds its conscious recognition in Acts 11.18 is already adumbrated in the work of Elijah and Elisha.

In this way the perceptive reader, glancing back to Lk 4 will be able to see a significance in the two blessed Gentiles which was not evident from within the episode's own horizons.

1. Stuhlmacher (Vorgeschichte, 226f) develops in a different direction the possibility that the pericope might function at two levels.

2. Cf. in ch.2 the implicit argument for the Gentile mission which I have suggested is to be found in the Pentecost account.
Of course once we allow in a level of meaning that is not represented within the pericope's own internal thought development we lose for the most part the controls from context which, it has been argued, are such an important bastion against arbitrariness.

This suggests that it will be a very unwise procedure to determine what Luke is saying about the unbelief of the Jews and the Gentile mission from Lk 4 and then, on the basis that it is programmatic, to use this understanding as the key to understanding the remainder of the Lukan presentation as it relates to these matters.

It seems to me, however, that the understanding of these verses to which I stand opposed, it can be claimed that the particular content given here to the second level of meaning builds out from what does properly have a place in the sense of the pericope as controlled by its own internal thought development, i.e. it does not use the material in a sense which is alien to its function in the primary context, and in this way we do not entirely lose the contextual controls which I consider to be so important.

Thus while we are unable to find in Jesus' words in their primary context, any threat that the benefits of the messianic ministry will be transferred to others because the Messiah is being rejected by those for whom his ministry is intended, the mention of the blessing of Naaman and the woman of Zarephath does seem to presuppose God's interest in a wider group who also stand in line for the messianic blessing. Within the pericope it only forms the backdrop against which Jesus can say, "you will be the losers; it is you who will miss out." If they miss out there must needs be others who don't. The "others who don't" are available from properly within the pericope in its natural sense, to be given in the total
context of Luke's work a more focussed sense and a greater
significance.1 By contrast a transferral of the blessing is not
available from the pericope in its natural sense.

Now it needs to be stressed that the sense provided here
for elements of the rejection pericope in the total Lukan context
is as much controlled by an understanding of other Lukan material
as it is by the Lk 4 material itself,2 so that the final justification
for the results offered here depends on exegesis which is yet to be
provided. Chapter 2, which looks at the relationship between the
Jewish and the Gentile missions with special attention to Acts 13.46;
18.6; and 28.28; sets out to defend the overall understanding on which
the particular judgements here depend.

1. In our study of the relationship between the Jewish and Gentile
missions in Acts (ch.2) it will be suggested that Luke uses the fact
of the Gentile mission to soften the blow of the extent of Jewish
unbelief: if one must face the fact and extent of Jewish unbelief,
one can also point to the new ground broken by God in calling Gentiles
to himself. Perhaps this kind of compensation is already hinted at
here in Lk 4.

2. N 1 and p. 87 n 2 already give some indication of this.
CHAPTER 2


A. The Parallel

1. Introduction

"... a light for revelation to the Gentiles, and for glory to thy people Israel." (Lk 2.32).

With these words Luke gives his first clear indication that the coming of the Christ will mean the offer of salvation to the Gentiles. The words of the devout Simeon, "who was looking for the consolation of Israel" (v 25), set in poetic parallel what the Christ would be for the Gentiles and for the people of Israel. While it is true that the immediately continuing words of Simeon indicate a dark side to the hope for Israel: "this child is set for the fall and rising of many in Israel", nevertheless it would be surprising indeed if by the end of the two volume work all hope for Israel had been dissipated and God's future seen to be with the Gentiles alone; in other words if by the end of the work it becomes necessary to strike out from Simeon's prophecy the words "glory to thy people Israel."

But isn't this just what Acts 13.46; 18.6 and 28.28 imply? What are we to make of these very sharply worded, rather programmatic looking, thrice repeated words of Paul about turning from the Jews to the Gentiles? Must Simeon's complementary parallelism be transmuted into antithetical parallelism: "since Israel will not have Christ for its glory, he will instead become a light for revelation to the Gentiles"?

\[\text{1. Cf. v 25: "the Holy Spirit was upon him".}\]
It cannot be disputed that the repetitions involved in the passages which report the turning to the Gentiles establish a general principle. However, it will be argued here that the principle involved has been understood too much from outside the Lukan documents and not enough in the light of Luke's own structures of thought.

2. Straightforward Examples

Lk 2.32 is not an isolated reference to Gentiles standing alongside Jews as the recipients of salvation. As late as Acts 26.23, at the conclusion of the third recounting of Paul's conversion, Luke can still allow Paul to say that "the Christ ... being the first to rise from the dead, ... would proclaim light to the people and to the Gentiles". Earlier in the same speech, 26.18 ("... that they [i.e. the Gentiles] may receive ... a place among those who are sanctified by faith in me") reflects a pattern of a gathering of Gentiles into the sphere of salvation rather than a replacing of the Jews by the Gentiles. The great discovery of the Cornelius experience was: "then to the Gentiles also God has granted repentance unto life" (11.18, and cf. v 1), i.e. that the Pentecost experience of the Jewish Christians had been granted also to a Gentile (11.15: "just as on us at the beginning"). The bold missionaries who came to Antioch "spoke to the Greeks also" (11.20). What Peter seeks to impress upon the Jerusalem Council is that God "made no distinction between us [Jews] and them [Gentiles]" (15.9). It may be debated whether we can make the whole content of James' quotation from Amos 9.11f in Acts 15.16-18

1. The passage cannot be explained away as recounting unfortunate turns of events in a few particular locations.
relevant to Luke's own theology, but it is worth noting that it does set up, side by side, the "rebuilding of the dwelling of David", and "the rest of men (i.e. the Gentiles) ... seeking the Lord".2

In Paul's "Testament" in Acts 20 his ministry is characterized as a "testifying both to Jews and to Greeks" (v 21). If we may leave the "kings" to one side for a moment,3 we may note that Ananias is told by the Lord: "Paul is a chosen instrument of mine to carry my name before the Gentiles ... and the sons of Israel" (9.15). Already in his first recorded sermon Paul addresses himself to "Men of Israel and you that fear God" (13.16).

Luke catalogues a parallel response among Jews and Gentiles in Iconium: "they ... so spoke that a great company believed, both of Jews and of Greeks" (14.1); in Thessalonica: "some of them /Jews/ were persuaded, and joined Paul and Silas; as did a great many of the devout Greeks and not a few of the leading women" (17.4); in Beroea: "many of them /Jews/ therefore believed, with not a few Greek women of high standing as well as men" (17.12); and in Corinth: "Paul persuaded Jews and Greeks" (18.4). In 21.20 James reminds Paul that the believers are a both/and of Jews and Gentiles with quite a large percentage of Jews: "You see, brother, how many thousands there are among the Jews of those who have believed."

Jews and Gentiles are set in parallel in a more general way in 19.10: "all the residents of Asia heard the word of the Lord, both Jews and Greeks"; and in 19.17: "And this /the sons of Sceva

1. S.G. Wilson, Gentiles (1973) 225: "Luke may have used Am 9.11f solely because it contains a reference to the inclusion of the Gentiles."
3. Radl (Paulus, 74) argues that the Greek requires the kings and Gentiles to be understood together as a single group.
debacle} became known to all the residents of Ephesus, both Jews and Greeks, and fear fell upon them all; and the name of the Lord Jesus was extolled."

It seems fair therefore to say that "revelation to the Gentiles" and "glory to ... Israel" is an understanding of the significance of the Christ which Luke works with and expresses frequently.¹

3. Acts 2.5-11 and 1.8

This finds additional confirmation of quite a different kind when we turn our attention to Acts 2.5-11. The interest of this passage for us is in the way that it relates both to the Jewish (diaspora) mission, and to the Gentile mission.

K. Lake considered that under Luke's hand the passage actually began the description of the Gentile mission: "the foreigners understood what was said, each man hearing the Apostles speak in his own language, but it was unintelligible to the Jews who thought that the speakers were full of new wine."² Lake achieves this understanding by following Χ in omitting Ιουνσαίοιοι from v 5 and then by understanding Ιουνσαίοιο ΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΠΡΟΣΓΛΟΤΑΙ in v 11 as a separate and distinct entry in the list of nations and peoples. He has not been followed in either of these moves³ and his understanding

¹ F. Hahn (Mission (1965) 130) finds in the "juxtaposition of the two sendings in chapters 9 and 10 /of the gospel/ a preliminary notice of the two-fold mission among Jews and non-Jews".

² K. Lake, Beginnings V, 112-116, quotation from 115.

³ C.S.C. Williams, Acts (1957) 64 thinks that Ιουνσαίοιο in v 5 may have been interpolated from v 14. However, it seems altogether more likely that the word has been omitted by a scribe who has been impressed by some of those features of the passage mentioned below which turn the reader's thoughts to the Gentile mission.
of the passage is almost certainly wrong.\textsuperscript{1}

However, it is not without reason that Luke's mind had been directed to the Gentile mission by this passage. The reader knows that the gospel is destined for Gentiles also (Lk 2.32), and the words from the final chapter of the gospel, \textit{κύριος Θεός... εἰς πάντα ἐν Θεόν} (24.47) seem to find an appropriate echo in the \textit{κύριος Θεός (τῶν ὦν τῶν άφενών)} of Acts 2.5. The emphasis throughout the passage on speaking in different languages\textsuperscript{2} seems to

\begin{itemize}
  \item[1.] Luke is careful not to have those scattered by the persecution following Stephen's death evangelize Gentiles before the Cornelius incident (11.20 cf. 8.4), which in Luke's framework marks the point of recognition by the early church that "to the Gentiles also God has granted repentance unto life" (11.18).
  \item[2.] The alternative understandings of Acts 2.11 presented by C.S. Mann in J. Munck, \textit{Acts} (1967) 275, which do not recognize this emphasis, have little to commend them.
\end{itemize}
confirm this impression (v 4 ετέροις γλώσσαις; v 6 τὴν ὠπῇ διαλέγεις; v 8 τῇ ὠπῇ διαλέγεις ἡμῶν ὑπό τῇ ἑσσόμεθα; v 11 ταῖς ἡμερίναις γλώσσαις). Indeed, against the background of the reader's expectation of a Gentile mission, the list of nations and peoples is itself quite an impressive pointer.1

Lake finds further a relationship between the ἀν ὕπνοι ῥήματων ἐν 1.8 and the ζητήματα ἐθνῶν ὑπὸ ὠπὸ τῶν ὁμιλίαν of 2.5. It seems altogether likely that there is such a connection for Luke.2 Acts 1.8 will receive further attention below, but for the moment it suffices that, since the Gentile mission is involved in the ἐν ὕπνοι ῥήματων ἐν 1.8, this connection between 1.8 and 2.5 is a further encouragement to think that Luke also thinks of the Gentile mission in the Pentecost account.

It is not nearly so certain that Luke has in mind in the Pentecost account a reversal of the confusion of languages at Babel.3 Trocmé finds it in Luke's sources: "La source devait prendre le contre-pied de l'épisode de la tour de Babel (Gen 11/1-9) et relater comment, par la grâce divine la confusion des langues avait pris fin. Les hommes de toute nation avaient reçu le jour de la Pentecôte un nouveau langage dans lequel ils pouvaient désormais louer Dieu d'une

1. "The story of Pentecost (2.1-14), which is really the account of the first ecstatic 'speaking with tongues' in the community, becomes, by means of the enumeration of the races to which the hearers belong, a prototype of the mission to the world", M. Dibelius, Studies, 106. Cf. E. Lohse, πετβεκογράφησις (1968) 51f; G. Heuperorst, "Acts 2:1-13" (1957) 41; also Harnack, Acts, 69f.

2. D. Mínguez (Pentecostés (1976) 132) produces quite an impressive list of correspondences between Acts 1.8 and the Pentecost account.

3. J.G. Davies ("Pentecost" (1952) 229-31) finds linguistic links to the LXX of Gen 11.1-9; but, while these are suggestive, it is a real disadvantage to his case that the points of reference for the shared vocabulary should be so divergent between Gen 11 and Acts. M.D. Goulder (Type, 152-9) gains support for the link with the Babel story from the connection he finds between the list of nations Acts 2.9-11 and the names of the grandsons of Noah in Gen 10. Scholars who favour the connection include H.H. Wendt, Apoc. (1913) 84-88; W. Grundmann, "Problem" (1939) 49 n 10 (source); K. Lake, Beginnings V, 114f; Harnack, Acts, 70; (continued...)
mème voix."1 However it is unfortunate for Trocmé's theory that the central notion of one (new) language understood by all is unrecognizable in what, according to Trocmé, is preserved from Luke's source in the Acts text.2 And in the end it is the absence of this same notion from the extant Acts text which makes it extremely difficult to claim a Babel background for the account.3 So, while it would be convenient for the case being presented here to find a

3. (continued...) C.F. Sleeper, "Pentecost" (1965) 390; E. Trocmé, Actes (1957) 203 esp. n 6 (source). Emphatically against it are Haenchen, Acts, 168 n 5, 172-5; Kremer, Pfingstbericht, 253f and presumably the many others who simply fail to raise the possibility of a connection.

1. Actes, 203f.

2. In Acts 2.1-13, Trocmé (Actes, 202-206) regards vv 1-6 and 12f as essentially from the source except that ἐπεράσει γλῶσσας in v 4 and possibly Τούδας in v 5 come from Luke, and in 6b ἡ θέου ὅτι ἵνα ἔδωκαν γλῶσσας ἀπομάκρυνε is a Lukan retouch of what might originally have been ἡ θέου ὅτι ἵνα ἔδωκαν γλῶσσας where the reference is to the supernatural language spoken by the Twelve.

It is notable that in Trocmé's reconstruction everything that registers understanding on the part of the hearers has disappeared from the source.


It is interesting to note a tendency among those who see a connection with Gen 11 to read this central notion into Acts 2. E.g. E. Schweizer, πιστ. (1968) 411, "Luke is perhaps thinking of the speech of the Spirit as a new miraculous speech which all understand." (Cf. Harnack, Acts, 70.) Contrast this with 2.11, "we hear them telling in our own tongues the mighty works of God": v 4 "began to speak in other tongues"; v 6 "bewildered, because each one heard them speak in his own language"; v 8 "how is it that we hear, each one of us in his own native language".

The importance of the one language in the Babel tradition is confirmed by the accounts in Philo Conf. 1-13, Jos. Ant. 1.41 and 113-121. In T. Jud. 25.3, where the reversal of Babel finds expression as an eschatological hope, the reference is to γλώσσαι μίκα.

One could argue that Acts 2 is connected to the Babel account via the notion of establishing communication across language barriers, i.e. that the effect of the Babel confusion of tongues is overcome, even if the phenomenon of multiplicity of mutually unintelligible languages is not reversed. However, it will appear below that the Acts phenomenon of reaching people in their own languages has a more plausible background in the Jewish tradition connected with the giving of the law at Sinai.
reversal of the Babel confusion of languages, such a conclusion seems unwarranted.

Many scholars have lined up with the Acts 2 account:

1. The Rabbinic tradition that Pentecost was the occasion of the giving of the law at Sinai;
2. Philo's account of the giving of the law at Sinai; and
3. The Rabbinic tradition that all nations heard the law in their own language when it was promulgated from Sinai.


2. E.g. S.'Olam Rabbah 5 where the tradition is given under the name of R. Jose b. Chalaphta (c.150). Cf. Lohse, Πενεκοστή, 49 and n 30. Contra Lohse, the link with Pentecost is surely already implied in the views of R. Mattiah b. Héresh, R. Jose the Galilean and R. Akiba recorded in *B.T. Yoma* 4b, where Pentecost (the sixth day of Siwan) is either the final day of preparation for or the day of the giving of the law.

3. Philo Dec 32-5; 44; 46f and cf. *Spec Leg* 2.189. Hull, *Holy Spirit*, 54 n 1 tabulates some of the more striking similarities. Particularly notable is Dec 46 where "the flame became articulate speech in the language familiar to the audience."

4. *Midr. Tanhuma* 26c: "Although the ten commandments were promulgated with a single sound, it says, 'All people heard the voices'; it follows then that when the voice went forth it was divided into seven voices and then went into seventy tongues, and every people received the law in their own language." Quoted accordingly to the translation in *Beginnings* V, 116.

Perhaps the earliest surviving form of the tradition is that attributed to the school of R. Ishmael (c. 130 AD) in *B.Sabb. 88b: "And like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces: just as a hammer is divided into many sparks so every single word (continued...)"
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The links are impressive. However, there has been some reluctance to allow that such Jewish traditions lie behind Acts 2. A Rabbinic identification of Pentecost as the time of the giving of the law cannot be attested before the early second century. Philo does not actually connect the Sinai events with Pentecost and if this connection were only a later development we might be inclined to feel that Philo's similarities with Acts 2 can be balanced by equally striking dissimilarities. The identification of Pentecost as the feast of law-giving has sometimes been thought to be the kind of spiritualization that only the destruction of the Temple in 70 AD made possible.

Fresh attention to the book of Jubilees under the stimulus of the Qumran discoveries has highlighted the fact that at least in some sectarian circles the dating of the Sinai lawgiving at Pentecost was well established before the Christian era, and further that the feast of Pentecost was being celebrated as a feast of covenant renewal.

4. (continued...) that went forth from the Holy One, blessed be He, split up into seventy languages." (Soncino)

1. See p 97 n 2 The argument of L. Finkelstein (Pharisees (1938) 116, 667) that the concern of the Pharisees to celebrate Pentecost on a fixed date (over against the Sadducees) already implies a connection of the feast with the law-giving is not cogent in the light of the zeal at Qumran for correct dates.


3. Cf. G. Dalman, Arbeit (1928) 468; E. Lohse, πεντεκοστή, 49.

4. To be more exact, the covenant is renewed on Sinai on 15th Siwan (= Pentecost in the sectarian calendar) and the law given (as a detailed spelling out of the terms of the covenant) the following day. Cf. B. Noack, "Pentecost" (1962) 82-86; E. Wiesenberg, "Jubilee" (1961) 6 n 18.

5. Jub. 6.17. There is still some dispute about whether there was a covenant renewal celebrated at Qumran at Pentecost. 1QS 1.1 - 3.12 is thought to reflect a ceremony for the renewal of the covenant (e.g. J.T. Milik, Discovery (1959) 37, but cf. H. Conzelmann's caustic dismissal of the possibility in Apq., 27).
Given, then, that the Pentecost/Sinai connection was already available,¹ the case becomes that much stronger for judging that the similarities to Philo indicate that Acts 2 draws on a Sinai theophany tradition, which in turn makes it altogether more likely that the Rabbinic tradition about the giving of the law to the nations in their own languages, with such a striking resemblance to Acts 2, should have a pre-history running back into the New Testament period.²

To admit the existence of this Jewish background is not at all to concede W.L. Knox's view³ that the gift of the Spirit is

-------------

1. It is notable that E. Lohse, who argued so firmly against a pre-70 AD association of Pentecost with the giving of the law (Pentecost 48f), now accepts an early connection (Umwelt (1971) 114). The ET (London (1976) 157) obscures what is in the German a clear indication that Lohse now considers that the feast was connected with the giving of the law prior to 70 AD. E. Haenchen has also come to accept the influence of these Jewish traditions on the Lukan formulation (Acts, 174 and cf. Dupont, "Salut", 144 n 2).

2. This is clearly the majority opinion amongst scholars. Dunn's remark (Jesus, 141: "As for the Jewish legends about Sinai, the earlier they are the greater the difference from Acts 2") would be damaging if a process of development could be mapped in the tradition, but this is hardly the case, despite the attempt of Adler (Pfingstfest, 54-8) to trace such a development.

The Rabbinic tradition about the giving of the law in 70 languages serves to stress the universal significance of the Sinai event (cf. J. Potin, Pentecôte (1971) 259 who notes that the universalism inherent in the 70 languages tradition is completely lost in the use of this tradition in the later midrashim). This concern is already evidenced by Philo Spec Leg 2.189 who records that at Sinai "the sound of the trumpet pealed from heaven and reached, we may suppose, the ends of the universe ... those who were far from the spot and dwelling well nigh at the extremities of the earth."

It is just possible that Paul's quotation of Ps 19.5(4) in Rom 10.8 ("Their voice has gone out to all the earth, and their words to the ends of the world") points to the existence of an early Rabbinic interest in this verse. (Potin, Pentecôte, 259 draws attention to the similarity of Paul's treatment of Ps 19.5 to the Rabbinic use of Ps 68.12.)

presented as equivalent in the New Covenant to the gift of the law in the Old, or that in Christianity the Spirit replaces the law. Jewish Christian obedience to the old Torah seems rather too important in Acts for such an antithesis to be possible; and, as Trocmé points out, the Lukan text lacks the positive confirmations we might expect if this were indeed the intention.

There is the possibility that the connection is already made in Luke's source and has no active significance for Luke himself. However, the "day of Pentecost had come" (v 1); "tongues of fire" (v 3); "other tongues" (v 4); "each of us in his own native language" (v 8); etc.: the very things on which the identification of the underlying Jewish tradition is based occupy a certain prominence in the Lukan recounting and it seems preferable to suggest that this use of the Sinai tradition was significant for Luke himself.

Since the tradition spoke of a time when the word of God was taken in their own languages to the Gentile nations, could it be that by making these links Luke is offering a subtle advance justification, in Jewish terms, for a Gentile mission? "As the word of the Gospel is taken out to the Jews of the world, it is right that it should go to the Gentile peoples as well." 4

1. Actes, 203.
2. As e.g. Dupont, "Salut", 144 n 2; Kremer, Pfingstbericht, 248-253.
3. συναγωγή ρητορικήν ἡ ἡγεμονία τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως as at Lk 9.51.
4. It is hard to be quite sure what is happening in 3.25f (cf. the discussion by J. Jervell, "Divided People", 58-60, which is effectively criticized by Wilson, Gentiles, 219-222), but it is possible that we have here another example of the same sort of thing. (continued...)
Jervell has disputed the consensus that refers to Christ in v 25 (he refers it to Israel as does Dupont, "Salut", 146; also apparently T. Holtz, Untersuchungen (1968) 80) on the basis that Luke nowhere else uses to refer to Christ (Lk 1:55; Acts 7:5-6; 13:23), and also because he feels that the mentions of Gentile mission which he finds in the context fit best into a sequence of thought which requires that to refer to Israel.

While Jervell is technically right in saying that Luke nowhere else uses to refer to Christ, I would think that Christ as in Acts 13:23 comes close enough to using of Christ (Christ is surely here in effect ) that it should not surprise us if he does so in Acts 3:25. As well, Jervell's other problems about sequence of thought can I think, be accounted for in a different manner to that which he adopts.

If we may take it that is Christ (as most commentators agree (cf. Jervell, "Divided People", 73 n 42)), then it is likely that the text is being brought forward as a text expressing messianic hope and pointing to the time of messianic blessedness which Peter declares to have arrived (cf. the lame man's "perfect health" in v 16).

Now, with Luke's scheme for the unfolding of the Jewish Christians' discovery of God's interest in Gentiles (Haench, Acts, 209), it would be surprising if Luke has Peter here announce the Gentile mission to his Jewish audience with this text. The LXX text of Gen 22:18; 18:18; 26:4 (in 12.3 and 28.14 where the Hebrew has , LXX has ) would admirably suit such an intention with its (intended for ) but Luke has a rather more obscure which need be no more than a rather fulsome expression of the universal range of the messianic blessing - a matter about which Peter and his hearers can heartily concur without a thought of Gentile mission. (This change counts strongly against Jervell (cf. Wilson, Gentiles, 221) despite his confident: "For the reader 'the families of the earth' must have referred exclusively to Gentiles" ("Divided People", 59).)

Even the in v 26 doesn't have to imply a Gentile mission as is normally supposed. It can relate to the offer of the gospel first in Jerusalem (i.e. if in v 26 means "raised from the dead") - cf. Lk 24:47 "beginning from Jerusalem"; Acts 1:8; 2:39 - or first in Palestine (if is to be referred to the coming of the messiah). Its counterpart can be provided by a diaspora Jewish mission rather than a Gentile mission. (U. Wilkens, Missionsreden (1963) 43 n 1 offers other alternatives for understanding apart from the Gentile mission.)

There is a level, then, at which we can understand Peter's speech entirely within a Jewish framework.

Now the reader knows full well that a Gentile mission is in the offing, and it becomes clear to him at Acts 13.46, if not before, that concerns Jews first and then Gentiles (cf. p 102 and n 4 for the relationship between Acts 2.39 and 2.21 and between 1.8 and 13.47). The possibility that the includes the Gentiles is not lost on him (even less so if he happened to know the LXX text). Alert to the coming Gentile mission he may well feel that he is being offered here a biblical text to justify it ahead of time. Though, if we may put it this way, he is being offered it by Luke and not by Peter. (For the relationship between the two levels of meaning compare the discussion (continued...))
If this is correct it would confirm the impression already emerging that Luke is, at one and the same time, recounting the Pentecost event as experienced only by Jews (and proselytes), and setting up the categories for the Gentile mission.

We seem to have a passage then, which is on the one hand plainly talking about the impact of Pentecost on Diaspora Jews gathered in Jerusalem and yet could hardly be better designed to make the reader think of a proclamation of the gospel to men of all nations. It seems to me that this is best explained from the parallel in Luke's presentation between the gospel going to the Jews (especially the Diaspora Jews) and the gospel going to the Gentiles. The gospel is proclaimed to the ends of the earth by being taken in each place to the Diaspora Jews and also to the Gentiles. In recounting the event which marks the beginning of all Christian mission, an event which was and is recorded by Luke as a strictly Jewish affair, Luke symbolically encapsulates the gospel going to every creature by exploiting the parallel between the Diaspora Jew and his fellow

..........

4. (continued...) of Lk 4.25-7 in chapter 1.)
If this suggestion is at all along the right lines, then once more we find Luke exploiting a parallel between the diaspora Jewish mission and the Gentile mission.

Such an understanding makes unnecessary the kind of antithesis drawn by J.D.G. Dunn, Jesus, 395 n 21: "Luke's picture of 'every nation under heaven' being represented at Pentecost is determined more by his concept of the universality of the gospel (Acts 1.8) than by the later portrayal of the Ten Commandments being given in the seventy languages of the peoples of the world."

..........

1. Luke makes no sharp distinction between Diaspora and Palestinian Jews (especially if 'Ἰουδαίων in 2.9 should be retained). However, it is the Diaspora Jews who make it possible to draw attention to the Gentiles.
countrymen. The Pentecost account proclaims simultaneously God's interest in both Jews and Gentiles.

Acts 1.8 may provide us with yet another example of the way Luke develops a parallel between the Jewish (Diaspora) mission and the Gentile mission. K.H. Rengstorf has argued that this verse is purposefully vague so that it is possible for the disciples to initially understand it in terms of a Diaspora Jewish mission - thus the astonishment at Cornelius' conversion - and only later, from the clear intervention of God, does it become clear that the verse in fact contains the imperative to universal mission. (Cf. Acts 13.47 where the setting out of the context of the phrase ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ σῶμα ποιήσω ἵνα ἔρθῃ γῆ to Isaiah 49.6 makes clear that a Gentile mission is in view.) If this is so, then once again Luke has made use in a structural way of a parallel between the evangelization of Diaspora Jews and Gentiles.


What has not attracted attention is the relationship between the Jewish and Gentile missions which comes to expression in Luke's literary formulation.


3. There is in some sense a fulfilment already in Acts 2. Cf. p 95 note 2.

4. Rengstorf's view is accepted by E. Haenchen, "Judentum" (1963) 160; also Zehnle, Pentecost, 99 and n 13. Zehnle (124) further points to the ambiguity in Acts 2.39 of τῷ ἀποκάλυψιν (the natural sense here is Diaspora Jews) and the clear statement in Acts 22.21 αὐτῷ ἀποκάλυψιν. Cf. also E. Jaquier Actes (1926) 18.
There is for Luke, then, an important symmetry between the significance of Christ for the Jews and the significance of Christ for the Gentiles. It seems to me that we cannot set this aspect of Luke's thought to one side when we try to understand Acts 13.46; 18.6; and 28.28.

B. The Significance of Acts 13.46; 18.6 and 28.28

1. Introduction

Those who see the passing of the gospel from the Jews to the Gentiles as a central Lukan theme may account for such indications as Luke gives of a successful Jewish mission,¹ and of the existence of a body of Jewish Christians faithfully adhering to Judaism,² in terms of Luke's concern to establish a salvation-historical continuity between the old people of God (Jews) and the new people of God (essentially Gentiles). Those Jews who believe have the transitory significance of providing historical continuity in God's people through the process ³ whereby God's interest is transferred from the Jews to the Gentiles. In this way the successful Jewish mission and faithful Jewish Christian observance of the law fulfil a subordinate role in the larger theme of the transfer of the gospel to the Gentiles.⁴

1. E.g. 2.41,47; 4.4; 5.14; 6.1; 9.42; 12.24; 13.43; 14.1; 17.10ff; (19.20); 21.20.

2. J. Jervell ("Law") convincingly argues the importance for Luke of the fidelity of (Jewish) Christianity to the law.

3. A process set in motion by Jewish unbelief.

4. Conzelmann (Luke, 212) and Eltester ("Lukas" (1961) 13f; "Israel", 115,131) espouse such a view. Eltester ("Israel", 114f) cautions that "Übergang der Mission von den Juden zu den Heiden" doesn't do justice to the success of the Jewish mission, esp. Acts 21.20. However, such an "Übergang" seems to be essentially the view he adopts. (continued...)
However, it does not seem possible to subsume "revelation to the Gentiles" and "glory to ... Israel" under some such larger theme. This seems rather to compete as an alternative primary principle which offers its own way of explaining Luke's attention to the successful Jewish mission and the faithfulness to Judaism of the body of Jewish Christians thus brought into being.  

4. (continued...)

Haenchen (Acts, 189) is content to point out that the large number of (Jewish) converts shows God's blessing on the church. However, further explanation is required (cf. J. Jervell's criticism in "Divided People", 44) if this emphasis is not to sabotage the theme of the transfer of the gospel from the Jews to the Gentiles - a theme given prominence by Haenchen (see 413f, 417f, 535, 729f).

Jervell ("Divided People", passim and esp. 43) offers the interesting suggestion that a successful Jewish mission constitutes the restoration of Israel, which is a necessary prerequisite for the Gentiles coming to share in the promises to Israel. Jervell's case suffers (60-62) from a rather unnatural understanding of Acts 13.46 and of the Cornelius episode (64-67). In the Cornelius incident it is not the view that God intends us to encourage proselytism among the Gentiles (to make it possible for them to enjoy the benefits of the gospel) which is being overcome. In 10.34; 11.18 (cf. 14.27) it is God's interest in Gentiles which comes as fresh insight (11.12). The implication is that circumcision is unnecessary, but this only comes to sharp focus with the council in ch 15. From the viewpoint of this study, the essentially sequential nature of the relationship between the Jewish and Gentile missions required by Jervell weakens his case. If the order were reversed in Lk 2.32 it would suit Jervell's view better.

Wilson (Gentiles, 232f) tries to understand what he sees to be "the tension between 13:46, 18:6, 28:28 and the rest of Acts", by regarding these verses as expressions of Luke's theology and the other disparate material as Luke's attempt to be faithful to history. The importance, precisely for Luke, of the parallel between the Jewish and the Gentile mission shows the falseness of such a distinction.

1. Eltester, "Israel", 114f and cf. 129 links the successful Jewish mission to "glory to ... Israel" (Lk 2.32) and at this point (though not in his overall presentation) is moving in the direction of the interpretation being offered here.
It will be the burden of the remainder of this chapter to attempt to show that Acts 13.46; 18.6; and 28.28 are not concerned to set forth the transfer of God's interest from the Jews to the Gentiles, but are rather to be understood in relation to the scheme: "revelation to the Gentiles" and "glory to ... Israel".

As I see it, the two pillars for this view, that Luke is concerned to demonstrate the transfer of God's interest from the Jews to the Gentiles, are the rejection at Nazareth pericope at the beginning of the gospel (ch. 4.16-30) and Acts 28.28 at the end of the book of Acts. Chapter 1 has been concerned to demonstrate

1. Wilson, *Gentiles*, 227, speaks of this as "the usual, almost universal view".

2. The view is often supported from Lk 21.24: "the times of the Gentiles", but even some for whom the transfer of the gospel remains an important theme (e.g. J. Gnïlka, *Verstockung* (1961) 140) admit that there are insurmountable difficulties for such a use of the verse. The second section of this work is concerned with the significance of Lk 21 in Luke's redaction; the whole understanding of the chapter presented there excludes such an understanding of v 24.

Some find the transfer exemplified in the preaching to Gentiles in Antioch (Acts 11.20) which follows the violent persecution of the church in Jerusalem (8.1). However, this possibility is excluded by 11.19: "speaking the word to none except Jews." The function of these words is to preserve for Peter the reaching of the first Gentile, but it also takes away the possibility of seeing in the scattering after the persecution the pattern of benefit redirected to Gentiles because rejected by the Jews.

Haenchen (Acts, 413) and others find in the unexpected work of 13.41 a threat of the rejection of the Jews and the acceptance of the Gentiles. Even Jervell ("Divided People", 60) accepts that the Gentile mission is in view here but attempts to see the prospect of the mission in a different light.

I propose the following grounds for not finding in 13.41 any reference to the Gentile mission.

1. Haenchen can point to nothing in the text which specifically calls for an understanding in terms of the Gentile mission. The plausibility of this understanding depends on a prior acceptance of the view that Luke has a major preoccupation with the passing of God's purposes from the Jews to the Gentiles and this is just what is in dispute in our study. (continued...)
2. The understanding as a threat of judgement which the Hab context encourages would be quite appropriate and would fit in with the use elsewhere (Acts 3.23) of Deut 18.19 to place a threat of judgement over the heads of the Jerusalem Jews. If εφ' ὑμᾶς should be read in v 40 after ἔκπτωσις this better suits an understanding in terms of judgement, rather than in terms of the Gentile mission. The Gentile mission is not exactly something which comes upon the Jews. Even if εφ' ὑμᾶς is secondary it probably points to an early understanding of the quotation in terms of judgement.

3. However, there may be indications which point in another direction. The textual evidence is against the inclusion of εφ' ὑμᾶς (omitted by B D 74 etc.) and its absence opens up a possibility of finding the clue to the sense of v 41 from the context. Paul's final statement before introducing the quotation is εὐγενείας τῶν ἔρημων ὅριτον ἔφη (v 39) and the quotation speaks of "an ἔγκρισις ὃς ὑπὸ μὴν παράγηθην if one declares it to you". Isn't the failure to believe, the possibility being warned against? The Jews are being warned against being scoffers who will not believe the marvellous deed which God has done in their days. The deed is the resurrection/exaltation of Jesus which attests his messianic status, or perhaps more broadly, the deed is the sending of Christ. Hab 1.5 can thus be seen to be another Scripture which prepares for the extent of Jewish unbelief (like Isa 6.9f quoted at Acts 28.26f).

The RSV translation of Acts 13.47: "For so the Lord has commanded us, saying ..." (sim. Jerus. Bible and cf. RV) encourages the possibility that it is a turning away from the Jews to the Gentiles which is being commanded by Isa 49.6; however, μηδὲν ἀποκρύπτειν ἐναλλακτικά τοὺς Ἰουδαίους can hardly be translated this way. It is possible for μήδὲν to relate forward to what follows or back to what precedes, but hardly both simultaneously as required by the RSV translation. The difficulty of the translation is already indicated by the need to supply a verb not represented in the Greek. With citation formulae ὁμηροῦσα regularly relates to the content of the citation (Mt 2.5; Lk 24.46; Acts 7.6; 13.34; Rom 10.6; Heb 4.4), and this is the most natural way to take ὁμηροῦσα in Acts 13.47.

This being so, the text does not make the turning from the Jews to the Gentiles the content of the command, but rather the command to go to the Gentiles becomes the basis on which the particular reaction to unbelief in the synagogue becomes possible.

In the light of the discussion to follow, I suggest that we have here a situation where the missionaries who have a command to minister to the Gentiles, having proclaimed the gospel and won converts in the synagogue, are provided with the occasion for setting about fulfilling that second obligation by the rise of unbelief and opposition in the synagogue.
that the transfer of the gospel to the Gentiles plays no part
in Lk 4, and it is to Acts 28.28 that we now turn our attention.

2. Acts 28.28

"Let it be known to you then that this salvation
of God has been sent to the Gentiles; they will
listen."

A contrast is found between the Gentile response here indicated
and the Jewish unbelief of the preceding verses; between the
sending of the gospel to the Gentiles here and the prior sending to
the Jews at 13.26 and cf. 3.26. These words are taken to represent
the final and decisive giving up of the Jews and the turning of
God's interest to the Gentiles; at that moment we are said to stand
on the brink of the Gentile mission.

However, is all this really what the text is about? The
final three words seem to be the really decisive ones for understanding
Luke here: \( \text{kai de koousoyin} \).

The \( \text{kai} \) is usually simply ignored and not represented
in translation, but I want to suggest that its presence places a
question mark over the whole of the generally accepted understanding
of the verse.

1. E.g. F.F. Bruce, Acts (1954) 534: "... unlike the majority of the
Jews, they \( \text{the Gentiles} \) will accept it."

2. G. Stählin, Apq., 328: "Damit wird die grosse Zusage, mit der die
Judenmission des Paulus einsetzte (13,26), fast im ihr wörtliches
Gegenteil verkehrt", and cf. Bruce, Acts (1954) 534: "henceforth the
Gentiles will have priority in receiving the message of salvation."

den Eindruck zu erwecken, dass es mit den Juden hoffnungslos steht."
J. Munck, Acts, 259: "Israel's unbelief becomes the cause of \( \text{Paul's} \)'
preaching the gospel to the Gentiles". E. Haenchen, "Judentum", 185:
"... Lukas eine endgültige Verwerfung Israels und seine Ersetzung
durch die Heiden darstellen will." E. Schweizer, Order (1961) 66:
"It is only \( \text{the Jews} \)' refusal that opens the way to the Gentiles."
(und für Lukas wohl ausschliesslich) zu den Heiden gesandt."

4. Jervell, "Divided People", 64: "\( \text{Luke} \) leads his readers to the
threshold of the Gentile mission". Cfn. Gnilka, Verstöckung, 148:
"... Paulus ... endgültig die Freiheit der Heidenmission verkündet."
Haenchen seeks to justify his failure to translate the word by assimilating the usage here to the use of ςον after a relative pronoun which he documents in detail and in which it is quite correct to have the ςον untranslated. But ςον is not a relative pronoun, and when, to justify such a move, we look through the NT for other examples of ςον following a personal pronoun they are singularly lacking. Nothing encourages us to follow Haenchen's suggestion.

How then are we to understand ςον? It makes perfectly good sense to understand ςον here as having its common adverbial force of "also". While ςον = "also" normally modifies a following word, in Classical Greek it modifies a preceding word when that word stands first in its clause, and it seems reasonable to suggest that that is what is happening here.

If this is right, then there is another change which must be introduced into the translation as well. We cannot translate: "they also will listen" (implying a response), since the previous verses have been concerned with the extent of Jewish failure to respond. We must translate: "they also will hear".

2. Ibid., 140 n 8.
3. This contrasts with at least 57 certain NT examples of ςον following a relative pronoun of which no less than 21 are to be found in Luke/Acts. Apart from the trivial cases where ςον means "and", the nearest thing is Εγω δε ςον γεννησε ιουσίαν in Acts 22.28. Here, while the ςον is difficult to represent in English translation, it does have a clear force: Paul not only is a Roman citizen, but also has been one from birth.
5. This is already the translation of RV, ASV.
However, this is not a choice which is made merely for the convenience of the grammatical analysis being suggested here. There are contextual reasons for expecting *ἀκούσταυ* here to have this sense. In the Isaiah quotation which immediately precedes the verse, the fathers are presented as those who heard but without the message really getting through to make any positive impact on the hearers: 'Ακούσταυ καὶ ὁ οἶκος σου (v 26); τοὺς ὁσίους ἄρεως ἀκούσταυ
... μήπορε... τοῖς ὁσίοις ἀκούσταυ... καὶ ἐνυπάρχεισιν (v 27).
They heard in such a way as to preclude response, but they certainly heard. Even more importantly, in v 22 the Jewish leaders whom Paul has summoned are represented as saying ἀκούσταυ δὲ ποιλὶ ὁ ἄνωτα ἕφαντοι.
So, once these Jewish leaders have come on the appointed day (v 23) and heard, Paul can say "they /i.e. the Gentiles also will hear". 1

1. It might be argued that a καὶ before τοὺς ἔθετεν would have more clearly expressed the thought which I attribute to Luke. It would certainly express sharply the "to the Gentiles also". However, this hardly counts against the exegesis offered when we realize that Luke could not have simply transferred the καὶ to before τοὺς ἔθετεν. He needs it where it is for the balance of his material and the development of thought. Without the καὶ the final clause of v 28 is redundant and even anticlimactic unless it is to mean "they will listen" - which, as we have argued above, is unlikely in the light of the earlier uses of ἀκούσταυ in the incident. However, the clause cannot be deleted without making the transition from v 28 to v 30 abrupt. (The reader would have to make the link between the gospel having been sent to the Gentiles and Paul preaching to those who visit his place of imprisonment.) Also, the deletion would remove the parallel between the Jews hearing (v 22) and the Gentiles hearing. Luke could have included καὶ in both places, but this arrangement would still leave the final clause somewhat repetitive. By keeping the καὶ for the second position, the final clause of v 28 offers a significant development on the previous clause and at the same time leads into Luke's description of the Gentiles hearing: "they also will hear ... and despite Paul's imprisonment they did."
Now this survey of the uses of ἀκούσω in ch. 28 not only supports the translation being adopted for v 28, but also helps us to recognize that here in ch. 28 we have once again the pattern that sets Jewish mission and Gentile mission in parallel.¹ In Rome too, Paul offers the gospel to the Jews and also to the Gentiles, as he has done previously in so many other cities.²

There are just a couple of further hints to suggest that we are right to see in ch. 28 the offer of the gospel to the Jews set beside the offer to the Gentiles. Luke makes a point of telling us that in both cases the people came to Paul in his lodging (v 23, v 30). In both cases Luke identifies the theme of Paul's message as "the kingdom of God" and "Jesus" (v 23, v 31).³

It is important to note that once it is realized that ᾧ ἀκούσω is to be translated "they will hear" and not "they will

1. Of course the usual understanding of Acts 28.28 makes use of a kind of parallel between the Gentile mission and the Jewish but it is a parallelism dominated by contrast not by similarity: as a matter of principle the one must end before the other can start; the one is near total failure, the other is enormously successful, etc.

2. The sending of the gospel to the Gentiles is not the reversal of 13.26 as claimed by Stählin (Apg., 328). In 13.26 the address is already to Ἰησοῦς Χριστός καὶ οἱ ἐν οἴκοις ἠγοραζόμενοι τὸν Θεόν. In 28.28 the Jews are to know that the message is meant for Gentiles also. (The significance of this is discussed further below.) Jervell ("Divided People", 63) is right to point to the aorist tense of and say that "long ago ... the place of the Gentiles in God's plan of salvation was clear."

3. Perhaps "all who came to him" (v 30) is balanced by the "great numbers" (v 23), and the "openly and unhindered" (v 31) by the "from morning till evening" (v 23). In quite another connection E. Harnsack ("Nochmals" (1977) 120f) draws out the parallels between v 23 and v 30.
listen (= respond)", the supposed contrast between Jewish unbelief and Gentile responsiveness entirely disappears from the passage. The Jewish response has been mixed: "Some were convinced by what he said, while others disbelieved" (v 24). The extent of Gentile response

1. It may be added that we look in vain for any such contrast elsewhere in Acts. There is a large response among both Jews and Gentiles in the synagogue in Iconium (14.1); in Thessalonica the larger response is Gentile (17.4); in Beroea the larger response is Jewish (17.12 and cf. v 11).

2. Eltester ("Israel", 113) considers that it cannot be decided whether the Jews who were persuaded went back or not. He cites this uncertainty as evidence of Luke's greater and greater emphasis on the fate of the Gentile mission from ch.11 on. This verse aside, the development claimed by Eltester is not discernible.

Haenchen's view (Acts, 724 and cf. A. Loisy, Actes, 937) that "neither of the two groups decides for Christianity" has rightly been criticised by Jervell("Divided People", 71 n 21 and cf. Wilson, Gentiles, 226). Since Paul was "trying to convince them" (v 23) and "some were convinced" (v 24), surely we must understand that he has achieved his goal of winning them for faith in Christ. δοξήσει δὲ πρὸς ἀλλήλους (v 25) does not refer to continuing debate between the Jews of opposite opinion, but reiterates the ἀδικεῖν ἐπειδὴ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ... (v 24) and thus draws attention to the division that has been created in Jewry by the gospel. (Cf. Jervell, "Divided People", passim.)

A. Schlatter (Apg., 320) has seen in the "they departed" of v 25 an indication that Paul's attempts to win the Jews ended in total failure (cf. F. Stagg, Acts (1955) 265: "turned away because of Paul's one statement"). It would be easier to agree if it were found in John. In any case it is quite likely that ἀπελύσασθε should be translated "they were dismissed". The middle voice of the verb is not used elsewhere in the NT and the passive never occurs in the NT meaning "to depart" while it is regularly used to mean "to be dismissed, sent off etc." Just as in 28.17 Paul summoned the Jewish leaders (συγκολλῆσαι ἐξαρχικῶς), so it would accord with the regal bearing which Luke has Paul exhibit (cf. Acts 27.10f and v 21; also Haenchen, Acts, 730) that they should be dismissed by him.

Perhaps the particular function of this sort of language in ch.28 is to underline the "freedom" of Paul. Paul the prisoner, on trial for his life, orders people around with magisterial presence. Paul is irrepressible = the gospel is irrepressible. See further below.
is not registered. If we may judge from the extent of Gentile response to the gospel recorded in other parts of Acts, then in Rome too it would be fair to expect a mixed response among the Gentiles as among the Jews.

1. We are not told that large numbers went to hear Paul, nor that those who did were converted. "Preaching quite openly and unhindered" (v 31) is undoubtedly a triumphant note, but it does not mean producing great floods of converts. (Where Luke is able to say this he does.) Rather Luke tells us that, sent from God, the gospel continues to make its way in the world despite every human threat and obstacle. See p 110 n 2 (end) and further below.

2. S.G.F. Brandon (Fall (1951) 28 and n 3) suggests that there is in Acts no indication that the number of Gentile converts was large. The mixed response of Gentiles to the gospel is noted by e.g. Jervell, "Divided People", 45-47. While Luke wants us to see that the Christian mission had a large impact, there can be no doubt that in his presentation most Gentiles remain unbelieving. (Eltester ("Israel", 113) draws attention to some of the negative Gentile response to the gospel.) In Acts 13.44 the Gentiles stream into the synagogue to hear Paul, but when it comes to response it is "as many as were ordained to eternal life believed" (v 48). In 17.4 at Thessalonica there is a special response among God-fearers. In 19.27 we are meant to allow for hyperbole when Demetrius the silver-smith speaks of a danger to his trade and of the possible dethronement of Artemis. We should compare the more sober ἐκκλησία δικαιωμάτων which Demetrius speaks of in v 26. In 18.8 the identity of the many Corinthians who believed is confused by Crispus the ruler of the synagogue heading the list. The pre-Pauline evangelization of Gentiles at Antioch had notable success (11.21, 24).

3. The extended quotation of Isa 6.9f gives a certain prominence here to the unbelieving part of the Jewish response. This could give a false impression. We should note that the quotation functions to explain Jewish unbelief, not to describe it: the passage is ἐκκλησία παραπτώματος ἡ Ἰουδαία (cf. 28.25) and not a prophecy about the present generation. Present unbelief should not be surprising since it is the culmination of a national history of disregard for God's ways (cf. Stephen's speech). We ought not to think that Luke highlights Jewish unbelief as an important theme. (I regard Conzelmann's claim (Luke, 140) that Luke focuses exclusive guilt on the Jews for the death of Jesus as effectively refuted by F. Schütz, Christus (1969) 126-38.) Such prominence as it enjoys is because as a fact obvious to Luke and his readers it is an embarrassment which Luke felt it necessary to account for. In chapter 1 we have already noted in the gospel Luke's interest in accounting for Jesus' rejection in terms of his receiving a prophet's fate. Luke's focus of Jewish unbelief on the Jewish leaders (Lk 7.29f; 20.19; Acts 4.1-4.17; 5.17 (cf. v 13) etc.) seems to be part of his explanation of the problem of Jewish unbelief. It in no way evidences an interest in emphasizing Jewish unbelief. (J. Chilka's view (Verstockung, 151) that "Lukas gewinnt mit den beiden Gruppen von Führern und Volk die Möglichkeit, die Abhebung der Kirche von Israel in einer den Juden nicht verletzenden Art vorzubereiten", is closer to the mark than Eltester's explanation ("Israel", 114) in terms of "die Verwandlung des Gottesvolkes aus Juden in ehemalige Heiden, historisch einsichtig machen.") (continued...)
Everything leads us to find in Acts 28.28 another instance of the pattern "revelation to the Gentiles" and "glory to ... Israel". In Rome as elsewhere Paul carries out a Jewish mission and also a Gentile mission. In each place he is concerned to harvest for the gospel among the Jews and also among the Gentiles. Paul's presence in each new city is marked by an advance of both the Jewish mission and the Gentile mission.

Having come this far, can it reasonably be said that Luke leaves us on the threshold of the Gentile mission? The Jewish mission is usually thought to be completed at the end of Acts, but since the missions are conducted in parallel from city to city, I suggest that in whatever sense we wish to claim that the one is completed we may equally claim the other to be completed. The preaching in Rome stands as fulfilment of the promise/command of Jesus that witness be borne to the ends of the earth (Acts 1.8). We should note that

3. (continued...) However, it must be said that Luke does have a positive interest in drawing attention to the interference of unbelieving Jews in the Christian mission. The significance of this theme for Luke is considered separately in appendix 3. Far from wishing to draw undue attention to Jewish unbelief in Acts 28, Luke marks a positive Jewish response to Paul in several ways: they know of no evil reported of him (v 21); they are eager to hear what he has to say (v 23); they came in great numbers (v 23); they hear him out for a whole day (v 23); and then some are convinced (while others disbelieve - v 24).

1. With some regularity Luke marks a positive response to Paul's preaching in the synagogue (13.42f; 14.1; 17.4; 17.11f; 18.4?; 18.20; 19.9).

2. It is interesting that J.C. O'Neill (Theology (1970) 97) should talk of Luke making sequential two missionary impulses which were originally parallel, since what is being claimed here is that Luke presents them as in fact parallel.

3. Jervell ("Divided People", 63) speaks of it being "an open question whether Luke is of the opinion that with the work of the Apostles and of Paul the world mission was already completed". However, he soon decides most emphatically in favour of seeing Luke as leading "his readers to the threshold of the Gentile mission" (64).

4. W.C. van Unnik (ΕΞΑΤΟΥ (1966)) has argued (continued...)
Acts 28.30 marks a terminus to Paul's witness to Gentiles in Rome. At least in Asia the mission to both Jews and Gentiles is represented as complete (Acts 19.10).¹

In fact it is probably not fair to say that Luke wants his reader to understand either mission as literally complete. Rather, the universal scope of both has been epitomized or illustrated. We are shown in a schematized manner successive stages of both without any real claim to having been told the whole story, or that the story is complete. In Luke's opinion, enough has happened for him to narrate an unfolding fulfilment of Acts 1.8, but this is no claim that its content has been exhausted.²

What is important for us is that the Jewish and Gentile missions are equally complete (or incomplete) at the end of the Acts account. This counts strongly against reading Acts as the story of the transfer of the Gospel to the Gentiles.

3. The Priority of the Jews

One of the things which comes to focus in the "transfer"

4. (continued...) that Luke does not mean Rome by εῶς ἐγχέρω τῆς Ῥώμης. However, W.G. Kümmel (Introduction (1975) 164 n 41) is right to point out that "that does not exclude the idea that Luke has obviously seen the promise of Jesus fulfilled with the unhindered preaching in Rome".

1. For D.P. Fuller (Easter (1965) 199-201,208,219-29) the theme of fulfilment of Acts 1.8 climaxes in Ephesus!

scenes for which we are trying to account is the priority of the Jews: "It was necessary that the word of God should be spoken to you first" (13.46). 1 It should not be lost on us that the clearest expression in Acts of this principle is reserved for just these scenes. 2

While it was possible to understand 28.28 as the final end of the Jewish mission, it was also possible to understand the recounting in Acts of mission conducted according to the principle of "the Jews first" as an account of how this principle came to be no longer applicable; 3 as an historical explanation of how it came to be that this principle was no longer applied in Luke's own time; 4 as the story of how Paul had seen in the end that going to the Jews was futile. 5 However, this line of explanation loses its coherence once we admit that the narrative of Acts ends with the two missions equally complete (or incomplete).

...........

1. Paul's absolving himself of responsibility for the unbelieving Jews in Corinth (18.6) implies this principle.

2. On p.100 n.4 we have seen that 3.26 is not an unambiguous statement of the principle.

3. Bruce, Acts (1954) 534: "henceforth the Gentiles will have priority in receiving the message of salvation." George, "Israel", 521; "maintenant cette priorité prend fin".


I would want to claim in any case that passage into obsolescence is not the most natural understanding of what happens in Acts to the principle of "the Jew first". Luke's interest in Paul the faithful Jew has been frequently noted\(^1\) and Paul's commitment to "the Jew first" principle seems better understood as a further example of his fidelity to Judaism. Luke seems to be concerned to show that Paul, despite his call to evangelize Gentiles\(^2\) (esp. 22.21) remained unswervingly faithful to the principle that the Jew has first place in God's purposes.\(^3\) Paul always offered the gospel first in the Jewish synagogue and he only gave up his ministry there when conditions made it impossible for him to continue.\(^4\) Far from justifying an abandonment of "the Jew first" principle, Luke shows that the evangelization of the Gentiles always took place within the context of a firm commitment to that principle.\(^5\)

\(^{1}\) C. Burchard, *Zeuge* (1970) 33 n 39 lists the texts.

\(^{2}\) Burchard's contention (*Zeuge*, 166) that "\(v\delta\varphi\eta\) als Stichwort der Arbeit des Paulus ... ist ... geographisch-politisch gemeint" is not in the end convincing. However it does draw attention to the extent of Paul's preoccupation with Jews in the Lukanan presentation.

\(^{3}\) Acts 21.21 (cf. v 19) and 21.27-29 well illustrate the suspicion of infidelity to Judaism which attached to Paul's Gentile mission.

\(^{4}\) Cf. G. Bornkamm, "Stance" (1966) 200. Acts 13.45: "they were filled with jealousy and contradicted what was spoken by Paul"; 18.6: "they opposed and reviled him"; 19.9: "some were stubborn and disbelieved, speaking evil of the Way before the congregation". The impossibility of working in the synagogue is further underlined by accounts of Jewish attempts to disrupt the mission (13.50; 14.4f; 14.19; 17.5-9; 17.13; 18.12-17 etc.).

\(^{5}\) K. Rengstorff ("Election", 189) recognizes that Luke "does not want to see anything changed in that scheme of redemption according to which the gospel is first meant for Jews". E. Franklin (Christ (1975) 14f, 140,175,180) also opposes any thought of the final rejection of the Jews. Also cf. Dahl, "Abraham", 151.
When a synagogue is abandoned, there is no withdrawal of "the Jew first" principle. Luke is at pains to make clear that it is the unbelieving Jews who exclude themselves by their unbelief and interference with the gospel proclamation, not Paul who has second thoughts about going to the Jews first. The synagogue which is abandoned is always one which has first produced a harvest of Jewish converts, and, as Acts 19.9 makes clear, when Paul left a synagogue he took the believing segment of the synagogue with him. He turned his back on unbelief, not on Jews.

One could think that the mere fact of "going to the Gentiles" means the withdrawal of "the Jew first" principle. If "the Jew first" principle meant every Jew everywhere being given every possible opportunity to embrace the gospel before a word can be spoken to the Gentiles, then this of course would be the case.

1. In this context it is probably fair to draw attention to the phenomenon of Paul's return to the synagogue in the next city after the most dramatic breach in the city before (cf. van Unnik, ΕΣΧΑΓΟΥ, 341).

2. 13.46: "you thrust the word of God from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life"; 18.6: "your blood be upon your heads! I am innocent." Peter has already established the principle "that every soul that does not listen to that prophet shall be destroyed from the people" (3.23).

3. It seems striking to me that Paul, the missionary to the Gentiles, should in the most poignant and personal way express his commitment to Jerusalem in terms of his preparedness to go to death there for the sake of being able to bear his witness to the city (21.13 cf. 20.22-24). (F. Stagg, "Purpose" (1947) 17: "The Jew had as large a place in Paul's heart as ever." Cf. P. Schubert, "Final Cycle" (1968) 7). Cf. also his protest about not being allowed to remain and witness in Jerusalem (22.19f).

4. Corinth could be an exception. It depends on what force we should give in 18.4.

5. Or do we go further and say every Jew must be brought to confess Christ first?
However, this is not the understanding of the principle which emerges in Acts. The same Paul who expresses his commitment to "the Jew first" principle can also, before there is any hint of synagogue rejection, bring the Gentile proconsul in Paphos to faith (13.12). Already in his synagogue address in Pisidian Antioch this Paul addresses himself to the "men of Israel and you that fear God" (13.16).\(^1\) Gentile evangelization regularly occurs in the Jewish synagogue (14.1; 17.4; 18.4) before there is any split. In Athens Paul carries on a ministry in the synagogue in parallel with a ministry (to Gentiles) in the market-place (17.17).\(^2\) "The Jew first" principle means starting with the Jews in each place and seems to have involved initial concentration of efforts on the synagogue, but it does not preclude a simultaneous interest in winning Gentiles.

The going to the Gentiles certainly means a change of missionary focus, but it is done by a Paul who has in that city fulfilled the demands of "the Jew first" principle.\(^3\)

What is more, it is clear enough that this Paul who goes to the Gentiles doesn't lose his interest in the Jews. In Corinth,

\[\ldots\]

\(^1\) In Pisidian Antioch Luke seems to indicate that it is the large Gentile influx into the synagogue to hear Paul which precipitates the split (13.44f).

\(^2\) This stands in flat contradiction to Haenchen's remark (Acts, 539) on Acts 18.6: "Here that dramatic breach with the Jews took place, without which he [i.e. Luke] could not conceive of a Pauline mission to the Gentiles".

Burchard (Zeuge, 165 n 16) comments on 17.17: "offenbar in Anlehnung an den örtlichen Brauch, wie er [i.e. Luke] ihn sich vorstellt", but this is going too far.

\(^3\) The Paul who goes to the Gentiles is the Paul who has already gone to the Jews. He who has already focussed his missionary efforts on the synagogue fulfils the second aspect of his missionary responsibility in a city by focussing his missionary efforts now on Gentiles.
despite Paul's protestations of no longer holding himself responsible for the Jews, he sets up operations right next door to the synagogue (18.7) in clear competition for the allegiance of the synagogue congregation. In Paul's consequent successful evangelism, it is the conversion of Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue (v 8) which is singled out for special mention.¹ In 19.9 Paul withdraws from the synagogue and sets up in the hall of Tyrannus, but the consequent ministry is not restricted to Gentiles: "all the residents of Asia heard the word of the Lord, both Jews and Greeks" (v 10).

The priority of the Jews remains unimpaired in the Lukian portrayal. The missionary to the Gentiles retains to the end his deep concern to win the Jews and his deference to their first claim on the salvation being offered in the gospel.

Thus far everything fits into Luke's thorough-going commitment to the scheme "revelation to the Gentiles" and "glory to ... Israel". We have seen that Luke labours to present the Jewish and Gentile missions as belonging side by side in the purposes of God. Luke, who tells us of the successful penetration of the gospel into the Gentile world, also takes pains to portray the success of the Jewish mission. Luke, for whom it is most important that Gentile Christians are saved without the law, i.e. as Gentiles, is careful to stress the continuing Jewishness of the Jewish Christians, i.e.

¹ It is evident that the conversion of Crispus is not thought of as preceding the split since it is presented in some relationship to the conversion of the "many of the Corinthians" which clearly belongs to the post-synagogue ministry.
that they are saved very much as Jews without loss to their Jewishness. "The Jew first" principle could have been thought to compromise this parallel, but while on the one hand it is upheld, as a testimony to Christian fidelity to historical Judaism, on the other hand it is so portrayed in action as to make clear that the priority of the Jews in no way contradicts God's interest in the Gentiles.¹ To the end we have a Paul who in each place reaches out to Jews and to Gentiles.

4. The Relationship between Jewish Unbelief and the Gospel to the Gentiles

The question which we have not yet clearly addressed is that about the relationship between Jewish unbelief and the gospel going to the Gentiles. That there is some relationship seems undeniable. In Acts 28.28 the Jews are informed that the gospel is sent to the Gentiles also, as part of the ἐρχομένου ἐστιν which comments on Jewish unbelief. In 13.46 we have: "since you ... judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life behold, we turn to the Gentiles". In 18.6, in response to Jewish opposition and reviling, Paul absolves himself from responsibility for their fate and announces: "from now on I will go to the Gentiles".

The usual understanding of this connection is one which cuts across all that up to this point we have sought to establish. It is generally said that Luke portrays God's interest in Gentiles as stemming from the failure of the Jews to embrace the Gospel:

1. For Luke the priority of the Jews relates to how you go about reaching both Jews and Gentiles with the gospel.
that as a principle the gospel is offered to the Gentiles precisely because it has been rejected by the Jews.  

Now while it is not at all unlikely that we should find in Luke/Acts disparate elements which will not fit into a coherent theological whole - partly because of the reproduction of tradition, partly from aspects of Luke's theological thinking which he has never noticed the need to reconcile to each other - I cannot believe that we have such a case here. On the one side the scheme "revelation to the Gentiles" and "glory to ... Israel" is deeply significant to Luke, and on the other side the repetition of the "transfer" scenes suggests that Luke has thought carefully about these as well.

What is to be attempted here then is to formulate an understanding of the link between Jewish unbelief and the gospel going to the Gentiles which does justice to the scheme: "revelation to the Gentiles" and "glory to ... Israel".

At one level an easy answer is possible. Paul's rejection in the synagogue is the means by which Luke achieves a concerted Gentile mission without compromising the principle of "the Jew first".

1. Haench (Acts, 729) speaks of "that obduracy which compelled the mission to the Gentiles." J. Munck (Acts, 259) says "Israel's unbelief became the cause of Paul's/ preaching the gospel to the Gentiles." Cf. Dupont, "Salut", 137,155. Wilson, Gentiles, 229, recognizes that "the temporarily prior claim to the gospel of the Jews is a presupposition of the Gentile mission, but its success or failure is incidental."

2. This is not to be taken to mean that a concerted mission to the Gentiles would, in Luke's thought have been impossible without prior rejection of the missionaries in the synagogue. The possibility of using the synagogue itself as a base for evangelization of Gentiles is intimated especially in Acts 13.44 but also by the frequent conversion of the God-fearers there. If the whole synagogue had come over to Christianity that would equally have served to free Paul to concentrate on mission to the Gentiles.
Luke can thus have a concerted mission to the Jews and a concerted mission to the Gentiles in each city - "glory to ... Israel" and "revelation to the Gentiles". This significance of rejection in the synagogue has already been intimated above.

However, there does seem to be something more. This explanation hardly justifies the dramatic intensity of Acts 13.46 or 18.6, and we must explore further the dynamics of Paul's departure from the synagogue.

I think it likely that the dramatic "turning" scenes should be viewed in relation to a complex of Lukán interests which have not yet been explored here, so to these we now turn our attention.

We begin from Acts 19.21. On this verse Haenchen comments: "Luke feels it necessary to mention here [Paul's planning of a trip to Macedonia] in order that the reader may not think that Paul was driven out of Ephesus through the riot of Demetrius". But perhaps this is not quite right. I would suggest that Luke wants to show that it is what God has already planned to happen (ἐὰν εἶπον ... ἐν τῷ ναῷ) which is forwarded by the turn of events. Paul is forced out by the riot, but even this apparent reversal only advances the missionary strategy.

Even if one were to be unsure that this is the right understanding of the mention of the Macedonia plans, in the case of the intention to visit Rome there can surely be no doubt: a journey

1. This pattern depends upon a successful harvest in the synagogue before the rejection by the unbelieving remainder.

2. Certainly some of the drama can be attributed to Luke's concern to underline the fact that the unbelieving Jews are self-excluded from the "glory to ... Israel" (Christianity did not cut itself off from its Jewish roots). However, the central dramatic fact is the turning to the Gentiles (ἐὰν εἶπον ... (13.46); ἐὰν τὸ τοῦ νόμου τῷ ναῷ ... (18.6)).

which Paul makes, under circumstances quite unforeseen and unforeseeable, in custody as a prisoner, is a journey that he has, well before the event, and under the impulse of the Spirit, resolved to make.  

Acts 23.11 reinforces this understanding of Paul's plan in 19.21 for a trip to Rome: "As you have testified about me in Jerusalem, so you must bear witness also in Rome." This is not God's hint that Paul should appeal to Caesar. It is rather an indication that what happens as a result of the accusations of the Jews and the whole ensuing intrigue and legal action and delay all turns out to forward God's plan for the mission.  

Luke wants us to see that whatever happens forwards the mission. Nothing diverts the course of the gospel. The fulfilling of God's plan is the outcome of all the machinations.

This motif is closely related to another Lukan interest which finds its rationale in Acts 5.38. Gamaliel is represented as saying to the council, "If this plan or undertaking is of men, it will fail; but if it is of God, you will not be able to overthrow them. You might even be found opposing God." Against this background Luke sets out to show that everything that would have put down a merely human enterprise only spurs on the Christian mission. That

1. As an aside we may note that "after I have been there I must also see Rome" (19,21) provides no encouragement for viewing the journey to Rome as a symbolic transfer of the gospel to the Gentiles. In so far as the places might possibly symbolize respectively the Jews and the Gentiles, the verse would reflect Paul's deep interest in reaching both.

2. Luke presents a similar idea at a more deeply theological level in relation to the death of Jesus: "This Jesus, delivered up according to the definite plan of God ... you crucified ... But God raised him up" (2.23f and cf. 3.18 and 4.27f).

the gospel continues to make its way despite every human threat and obstacle,\(^1\) witnesses to its being "of God".

One cannot sharply define the limits of where this interest is consciously involved in Luke's presentation, but we do have an impressive picture of obstacles surmounted, apostles and missionaries who are never daunted, providential care and divine intervention, all of which aids the conviction that the Christian movement is indestructible, watched over by the hand of God and certainly "of God".\(^2\)

Now both these motifs seem to be at work in Luke's accounts of how the missionary front line moves from one city to the next as a result of persecution. The missionaries always bounce back with bold evangelism in the next city, and their geographical progress is not only the result of persecution but occurs also under the impulse of the missionary command of Acts 1.8. Paul and Barnabas are driven out of Pisidian Antioch (13.50), but that just

\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\]

1. The range of threats can be widened to include ship-wreck (27.21-6) and snakebite (28.3-6).

2. The \(\lambda \upsilon \tau \omega s\) of Acts 28.31 may well fit here as a freedom for the gospel preserved by God in the midst of the restraints imposed on Paul (cf. 28.20) rather than as a freedom granted by the Roman authorities on the basis of the political innocence of Christianity. Cf. Rengstorff, "Election", 190: "God's own triumph against all human resistance." Contra G. Delling, "Das letzte Wort" (1973) 193-204.

\(\pi \rho \rho \gamma \tau \iota \varepsilon \varsigma\) certainly points to the supernaturally given boldness of Paul's witness in a situation that would normally reduce a man to silence (cf. 4.13,29,31), and we may expect that \(\lambda \upsilon \tau \omega s\) will also indicate God's activity.

It is possible that \(\lambda \upsilon \tau \omega s\) may belong closely with \(\pi \rho \rho \gamma \tau \iota \varepsilon \varsigma\) and is meant to suggest that Paul's boldness in proclamation was not hindered by the constraint on his personal freedom and/or by the threat to his life which his coming trial posed: these constituted no obstruction to his missionary impulse.
means that they take the gospel to Iconium (v 51). Attempts on their lives are planned in Iconium (14.5), they flee to their next missionary destinations (vv 6f). In Thessalonica the civil authorities are disturbed and curb the missionary efforts of Paul and Silas (17.6-9), which sets them off to witness in Beroea (v 10). From Beroea they are projected into fresh territory (Athens - 17.14f) by rabble rousing Jews come from Thessalonica to disrupt the mission (v 13). The irrepressible mission is forwarded by even these events most designed to thwart it. 1

Now Paul's missionary journeying in general has been rightly related to the pattern of missionary itineration provided by the sending of the 12 and the 70 (Lk 9.1-6; 10.1-20) 2 and in particular the shaking out of the garments 3 in Acts 18.6 links the

1. At times the opposition seems to provide the momentum that keeps the mission moving (cf. Mt 10.23). This is less apparent in the second missionary journey where the impulse sometimes comes from a direct supernatural intervention (16.6-10 - perhaps this divine directive serves to reassure the reader that the other moves which seem to be occasioned by more human factors are equally of the divine will), and where Luke sometimes is concerned to show that the mission could continue in a place despite the worst that the Jews could do in opposition (18.18) and where Paul is sometimes allowed to come to the fore as a decision maker (15.36; 16.5; 18.20f). Nevertheless even here opposition sets the missionaries off into fresh territory in 17.10 and 14.

2. This is of course a qualified relationship since Paul does have long periods of settled ministry (e.g. 18.11; 19.10). However, despite such time markers, the general impression is of constant travel.

3. Shaking out garments (18.6) and shaking off dust from the feet (13.51) and wiping off dust from the feet (Lk 10.11) are various ways of achieving the same separation from the self-condemned group. In Acts 18.6 "your blood be upon your heads!" makes this clear, while in 13.51 the shaking off of the dust from the feet against the Jews is only a confirmation of the separation that has already occurred in the synagogue (v 46), given at the moment when the missionaries leave the town (cf. Lk 9.51 = "when you leave that town").
synagogue rejection scenes with the dominical missionary instructions about moving on from a town which disbelieves and rejects the missionaries (Lk 9.5; 10.11). Could it be that we should see the move from the synagogue to the Gentiles in the same light as the move from Pisidian Antioch to Iconium?

I suggest that just as persecution triggers the move from one city to the next in this missionary pattern, so hostility in the synagogue precipitates a re-direction of Paul's missionary efforts onto the "phase two" for the city: the reaching of the Gentiles. Paul went to the Gentiles just as he went off to another city. If the missionaries are driven out from one place they preach boldly in another. When their message is repudiated in the synagogue it is offered to the Gentile population. Paul is not daunted by synagogue opposition, rather it directs him on to a bold forward move in the universal mission. The synagogue rejection scene takes its place as part of the forward moving story of the spread of the word of God. Jewish unbelief is upstaged by the prospect of Gentile mission. The message is that the gospel preaching is irrepressible. Having harvested in the synagogue, the rise of active hostility signals the time to work in another field. The refusal to listen further indicates to Paul a job completed. Those willing to believe and receive the "glory to ... Israel" had already done so and the synagogue had become a place in which he was no longer received. Going to the Gentiles is what Paul was going to do anyway. His ejection from the synagogue merely occasions his projection into the next and already determined stage of the missionary work. The reader is carried

1. See p120 n 2
over the shoal of Jewish unbelief on the wave of the confidence and boldness of the missionaries.

We have already seen that Jewish rejection of the gospel is a matter to which Luke has a certain sensitivity - for which he feels it necessary to offer explanation. And while Luke is concerned in a general way to show that none of the opposition forces can stop the forward march of the gospel we may expect him to have a particular concern to show this in relation to the widespread Jewish rejection. Since the Jews were God's people and the messiah was their messiah, Jewish unbelief was the point at which the gospel looked most like it had reached a dead end. Faced with this situation, the "to the Gentiles also" of God's interest provides Luke with important freedom to manoeuvre.

What could so easily have appeared as a disaster for the gospel is given an entirely different face in Acts. The fact of widespread Jewish rejection of the gospel has a real possibility of giving the impression that the gospel has been "left out in the cold", with its claim to authenticity sorely questioned by the failure of those for whom it was supposed really to be destined to accept the messianic status of the Christ of Christianity. However, set against the background of the universal scope of God's plan which embraces Jews and Gentiles alike, the widespread Jewish rejection does not appear in quite such disastrous proportions. The universal scope of God's purposes scales down the significance of the unbelief.

1. See p 111 n 3. Franklin (Christ, 111) considers "that the Jewish refusal to believe" threatened "the credibility of the Christian proclamation which saw Jesus as God's eschatological act for Israel."
of some or even a lot of the Jews. When Luke can point out as well that always in each synagogue there are Jews who embrace faith in Christ, often in large numbers (13.43; 14.1; 17.12), and moreover that all this time there has been a very successful Jewish mission going on in Palestine and even beyond (2.41,47; 4.4; 5.14; 6.1; 8.6; (11.19); 12.24; 21.20), any suggestion of failure is further softened. God's purposes of "glory to ... Israel" and "revelation to the Gentiles" are shown to be essentially intact. The synagogue members hardened in their unbelief and hostile to the gospel message are the ones who miss out. They are the losers.¹ For the unbelieving synagogue, being turned away from by Paul, the announcement of the mission to the Gentiles is a pointed reminder that in what God is now doing they are not the only objects of his interest. God's purposes can flourish without them. The master's banqueting table will be filled (Lk 14.23f and cf. 13.28-30) without the need of those who reject the invitation (14.24).² Finally, when the hardening of Jewish opposition can become (in terms of the need for the gospel to reach in each place the Jews first and also the Gentiles) the very thing which in the divine plan catapults Paul into the Gentile phase of his work in a city, Luke has successfully rendered benign

¹ The same "you are the losers" which was argued in chapter 1 to be the force of Jesus' response to Jewish unbelief in Nazareth.

² I think that it is fair to concede that the extent of Jewish unbelief is in some way compensated for in Luke's thought by the coming of the Gentiles into the experience of salvation. If one must face the fact of Jewish unbelief one can also point to the new ground broken in God calling Gentiles to himself. The refusal of the invitation by some of the guests will not mar the banquet. The banquet will have no empty places just because they said no.
a matter of great potential embarrassment.

This being so, it is clear that Luke presents Jewish unbelief as the cause of the Gentile mission no more than he presents persecution in Pisidian Antioch as the cause of the mission in Iconium. As a matter of timing it is the rise of Jewish opposition which precipitates concerted Gentile mission in each city (a fact which Luke uses to good effect in dealing with the problem posed by the extent of rejection of the gospel in the synagogue). However, the plan of God is that in each place Jews first and also Gentiles should be brought to faith in Christ, so that he might be "revelation to the Gentiles" and "glory to ... Israel".
PART 2: The Function of Luke 21
CHAPTER 3

Luke 21: An Answer to the Temple Accusation

1. Mark 13 and Luke 21

It can plausibly be suggested that Mark uses his apocalyptic discourse\(^1\) in ch.13 to portray Jesus' final abandonment of the Temple. Thus, already with the cleansing of the Temple (Mk 11.15-19) we are encouraged to think of a symbolic destruction\(^2\) of the Temple, from the way in which the incident has been sandwiched between the cursing (11.12-14) and withering (11.20f) of the fig-tree.\(^3\) Now, after Jesus' final visit to the Temple (13.1), what had been symbolically enacted is publicly declared to be the prospect of the Temple (13.2). Then having left the Temple behind Jesus gives further private teaching to disciples on this matter as he sits on the Mount of Olives

\[ \text{Κατ' εὐντικον τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ} \] (13.3).\(^4\)

When, however, we turn our attention to the apocalyptic discourse in Luke (ch.21), we see at once that all the pointers to understanding the discourse as Jesus' final abandonment of the Temple are missing. The cleansing (19.45f) has lost the interpretative

\[ \ldots \ldots \ldots \]

1. The use of the "apocalyptic" is here merely conventional and implies nothing about the relationship of the material to the apocalyptic genre.

2. Perhaps we would remain closer to the text if we speak of a symbolic visitation in judgement of the Temple, which from the perspective of 13.2 can be seen to involve the Temple's destruction.


4. "... the eschatological symbolism of the setting" (Conzelmann, Luke, 79). Cf. Ezek 11.23, "And the glory of the Lord went up from the midst of the city, and stood upon the mountain, which is on the east side of the city", where the הָרָה הָרָה \( \text{winds} \) the Temple preliminary to its destruction. "From the circumstances it is clear that this is the Mount of Olives" (K. Baltzer, "Temple" (1965) 267). Cf. W. Zimmerli, Ezechiel I (1969) 234.
framework provided in Mark, and, with a glance at Luke's portrayal of the early Christians' use of the Temple, can most readily be understood as Jesus, the hero of the Temple, reclaiming it for its proper use as a house of prayer. The apocalyptic discourse is no longer linked with Jesus' final visit to the Temple: as he had done before (19.47f), so he continues afterwards (21.37f) to teach daily in the Temple. The "mystery of the Temple's doom" is no longer revealed from the Mount of Olives (Mk 13.3). Luke either fails to read Mk 13 in terms of Jesus' final abandonment of the Temple or he self-consciously deletes this interpretation. Since all three Markan pointers to this interpretation are missing, it is reasonable to suspect the latter.

1. Although the cleansing follows the lament over Jerusalem the two incidents are not to be linked in interpretation. The destruction will be by enemies (19.43) and Jesus, passionately wishing that it did not have to be (vv 41f), stands quite outside the process of devastation, announcing it with all the anguish of a Jeremiah (Jer 13.17 etc.). The cleansing of the Temple is by contrast the personal deed of Jesus and is followed immediately by Luke's note that (following the cleansing) Jesus taught there daily (19.47). Cf. Conzelmann, Luke, 77.

2. Lk 24.53; Acts 2.46; 3.3,8; 5.42; 21.26f,29; 22.17; 24.12,18, and esp. 3.1 "Peter and John were going up to the temple at the hour of prayer, the ninth hour."

3. The cleansing is followed by Luke's first report of Jesus' daily teaching ministry in the Temple. This suggests that Luke may have understood Jesus to be cleansing the Temple in the first instance for his own use. Cf. E. Lohmeyer, Temple (1961) 57; Conzelmann, Luke, 77. B. Gerhardsson, Memory (1961) 218, considers that Luke has in mind here "prophecies on how the springs of salvation were to be opened on the site of the Temple".

4. It is possible that we should add to this list the observation of D.R. Catchpole, Trial (1971) 130: "Luke has also softened (Mk 11.17) to (Lk 19.46) and therefore removed the suggestion of a permanent state of apostasy."

The matter of Jesus' relationship to the Temple comes up again in Acts 6.14 where the false witnesses set up to accuse Stephen before the Council say "we have heard him say that this Jesus of Nazareth will destroy this place, and will change the customs which Moses delivered to us." It has been well noted that Stephen's "defence" speech bears only the most tenuous relationship to these charges made against him.¹

Could it be that Luke is content to have Stephen's speech interact with the accusation in a far more sophisticated or perhaps even obscure manner precisely because, in the structuring of his work, he has provided elsewhere for his readers clear and emphatic refutation of these charges?

There is certainly such a refutation of the charge concerning Mosaic customs: if there were any substance at all in the accusation that Christians were concerned to change the customs delivered by Moses (Acts 6.14b), then it would be in the case of Paul (whose involvement is so much with Gentiles - esp. 22.21), that one might expect this concern to find its clearest manifestations. So it is that Luke gives most careful attention to showing that contrary to all accusation Paul does not teach the Jews who live among the Gentiles to forsake Moses (21.21), he lives in observance of the law (21.24), he could order his schedule to try to be in Jerusalem for the feast of Weeks (20.16), he was prepared to give public support to Jewish

¹. "Stephen is supposed to be answering the question whether he is guilty of the charge, but a very large part of his speech has no bearing on this at all!" Haenchen, Acts, 286. The general consciousness of the problem is reflected in Haenchen's outline of the different views on Stephen's speech (286-8). See for bibliographies of works on Stephen's speech Haenchen, Acts, 277f, and G. Wagner (ed) Bibliography (1975) ad.loc.
customs by paying the expenses of others taking vows (21.23-26), etc. 1

Then with regard to the Temple destruction charge: if

there is anything in the claim that Stephen expected Jesus to destroy

the Temple (Acts 6.14a), Luke's reader will expect to find at least

the roots of such an idea in the gospel teaching of Jesus, and if

he is looking for Jesus' attitude to the destruction of the Temple

there is just one place he can go - Lk 21. 2 I raise the question,

...........

1. Paul's obedience to the law as a faithful Jew is the dominant

theme of Acts 21.20-25.12. While the refutation is most emphatic

and explicit in the case of Paul it is also present more

pervasively in both the gospel and in Acts. So Jervell "Law", 139:

"in Luke's gospel every criticism of the law is missing. Jesus

did not alter anything; the law is permanently valid." Jervell

then illustrates this in a number of particular cases (139f). And

in relation to Acts, that "the life of the primitive church at

Jerusalem is depicted in the early chapters of Acts as determined

by universal adherence to the law" (Jervell, "Law", 138) is already

an implicit refutation of the charge that Jesus had been concerned

to change the customs delivered by Moses. For Luke's presentation

of a constantly positive Christian attitude to the law see Jervell,

"Law", passim. S. Sandmel, Jewish Understanding (1957) 186 suggests

that Luke omits whatever could imply disloyalty on Jesus' part

towards any Jewish institution.

Luke wants his readers to know that such a vow was no

novelty to Paul, no mere exercise in deceptive public relations,

so he establishes such a pattern in Paul's life by his terse note

at 18.18: "At Cenchreae he cut his hair, for he had a vow."

(Despite the difficulty of the Greek it does not seem likely that

the vow is taken by Aquila, as e.g. Braude, "Guide", 34.)

2. This is not to say that Luke does not elsewhere indicate the

"Christian" attitude to the Temple. The attitude portrayed in the

gospel is well expressed by Lohmeyer, Temple, 59: "The Temple,

the ancient sanctuary of the Jewish people, is also for the

Christian community the centre of its worship of God and the Lord

Jesus Christ."

Baltzer ("Temple", 272-77) gives Lk 13.35, ἔνα ἱερόν ἡ Ἱερουσαλήμ great structural importance in

what he considers to be Luke's concept of Jesus as the Ἰησοῦς

of the Temple. His whole case is however quite fanciful. Baltzer's

comment on 13.31, "Here, when Jesus is invited to leave, salvation

leaves with him" (274), is quite at variance with the obvious

connection of the pericope (13.31-33) with the journey motif. A

far more adequate commentary is provided by the words of (continued...)
has Luke ordered his material so as to make Lk 21 the clear and emphatic refutation of the accusation of Acts 6.14a? A final answer cannot be given prior to a careful exegesis of the relevant material in Lk 21, but there are indications which are already highly suggestive.

Firstly, as has been shown above, everything from Mark that would encourage an understanding of Lk 21 as Jesus' final abandonment of the Temple is absent from Luke.

Moreover, our reader can refer back only to Lk 21 simply because Luke has conveniently deleted both from the trial of Jesus (Mk 14.57f) and from the taunting of Jesus on the cross (15.29), the accusation concerning the Temple. If Luke wants to answer Acts 6.14a with Lk 21, this deletion is helpful in more than one respect. It provides for a simple 1:1 accusation/refutation pattern, which means that nothing interferes with the process whereby the reader who strikes the accusation of Acts 6.14a feels that he already knows better from Lk 21. Furthermore the deletion enables Luke to avoid the necessity of engaging in discussion of the complex issues raised by talk of a rebuilding of the Temple after three days.¹ Lk 21 has

2. (continued...) 9.51, "Jesus set his face to go to Jerusalem." Further, while ὁ ὅλωσις is certainly used frequently to designate the Temple, there are real difficulties with ὁ ὅλωσις Ἰουδαία (H. van der Kwaak, "Klage" (1966) 158-63 esp. 158, argues that ὅλωσις in Lk refers to Jerusalem and probably not even in Mt 28.38 to the Temple.), which must separate Jesus off from the Temple. The ὁ ὅλωσις μετὰ of 19.46 and the ἐν τοῖς τοῦ Πατρὸς μετὰ of 2.49 (if the reference is to the Temple) fit well Luke's positive attitude to the Temple, but ὁ ὅλωσις Ἰουδαία of 13.35 can only mean Temple if it has slipped past Luke's editorial pen, and thus can hardly become the basis of our understanding of Luke's theology of the Temple.

It is not enough for Baltzer to find links between Ἰουδαία and Jesus (275f). If they are there they could provide a motif which is quite without relationship to the Jerusalem Temple. Baltzer must show that Jesus is the Ἰουδαία of the Jerusalem Temple. The unlikelihood of this is already suggested by the way that Luke has removed from his Marcan precursor everything that would relate Lk 21 to a final abandonment of the Temple by Jesus (see above).

1. See Baltzer, "Temple", 270f for a very basic list of Christian temple concepts, and further G. Schrenk, Ἰεροσόλυμα (1965) 242-7.
little power to comment on the circle of ideas introduced by this notion and it seems that Luke, with his apologetic concern, prefers to deal with the question of Jesus' attitude to the Temple at a simple level, keeping a sharp focus on just the one issue: did Jesus have any plans to destroy the Temple?

We may add that it is in line with this limiting focus to observe that in the NT, only in the charge against Stephen is the connection between Jesus and the destruction of the Temple drawn with no associated linking of Jesus to a rebuilt Temple (Mt 26.60f, 27.40; Mk 14.57f; 15.29; Jn 2.19).\(^1\) Has the accusation against Stephen been formulated in a manner that suits the refutation in Lk 21?\(^2\)

I thus propose an approach to Lk 21 which will be alert to the possibility that Luke has edited the material to make more effective its functioning for his reader as an answer to the charge of Acts 6.14a.

Already in its Markan form the apocalyptic discourse has a certain suitability for responding to the accusation of Acts 6.14a. Its first suitability is that it is prepared to admit some relationship between Jesus and the destruction of the Temple. It wins a hearing because it acknowledges that the charge has not come out of thin air: Jesus did say that the Temple was to be totally destroyed (Mk 13.2; Lk 21.6).\(^3\) Its second suitability is that it leaves no possibility

\(^1\) In this connection we obviously cannot include Mk 13 and parallels.

\(^2\) Even if "change the customs ..." is a tendential rendering of the Temple restoration in the interests of reinforcing its polemical thrust (cf. E. Lohmeyer, Markus (1953) 326; Gaston, No Stone, 71), it will still suit Luke's purpose to reproduce this form for the reason indicated.

\(^3\) Quite a number of scholars want to see a common origin in the history of the tradition for Mk 13.2 and Mk 14.58 (with their respective parallels). Cf. list at N. Walter, "Tempelstörung" (1966) 41; also B. Lindars, Apologetic (1961) 66-8; J. Gnilka, "Verhandlungen" (1970) 18; etc.
of seeing Jesus as intending to involve himself personally in the fulfilment of his prediction. The link between the destruction and τὸ μαθήματος τῆς θυσίας (13.1) makes sure of that (Mk 13.14, absent from Lk.)

Lk 21 remains suitable in the same ways, but in what ways has it become more suitable under Luke's hands? There are a number of divergences in vv 5 & 6 from the Markan antecedent which seem to bear significantly on this question and we proceed now to an exegetical investigation of some of these divergences.

3. Luke 21.5f

Firstly, who are Luke's τῶν άνωτέρων (v 5)? Mark has εἰς τῶν μαθημάτων τριῶν (13.1), Matthew has οἱ μαθηματικοί (24.1) and it has been frequently assumed that Luke also understands the remarks on the Temple to originate from disciples. Certainly v 8 seems to indicate that the questioners in v 7 are disciples.

1. The argument of Walter, "Tempelzerstörung", 38-49, that Mk 13.14 is not located in the Jerusalem Temple seems hardly in need of refutation.

2. τὸ βασιλικόν achieves this end quite incidentally while, as will appear below, Luke seems to set out quite self-consciously to distance Jesus from the act of destroying the Temple.


4. Loisy (Luc, 491) following Wellhausen (Evangelium Lucae, 116) has argued that the use of διὸ κύριον καλεῖ by the speakers of v 7 shows that they are not disciples since in Lk the term is only found on the lips of outsiders. While it is true that disciples elsewhere address Jesus as κύριε or εὐχαριστάω (only used by Luke in the NT), we should not follow Loisy here.

Note firstly that there can be no dispute that, in Jesus' response, v 8f and vv 12-19 are directed clearly to disciples. Then further, as pointed out by T. Schramm (Markus-Stoff (1971) 174), Luke is utilizing διὸ κύριον καλεῖ from Mk 13.1 and has not independently chosen the word. In the Markan context it is clearly the address of a disciple. Now while Luke prefers to have on the lips of a disciple κύριε or εὐχαριστάω to express something of the disciple's own relation to Jesus, he certainly considered διὸ κύριον καλεῖ (continued...
and it is normal to think of the speakers in v 7 as the same as those who speak in v 5. There do however seem to be good reasons for adopting a different understanding of τινῶν.

It is strange that Luke should exchange Mark's clear εἰς τοὺς μαθητὰς for the vague τινῶν if he had disciples in mind. It is true that Luke is rather more fond of υἱῶν than the other synoptists, but this does not mean that he is prone to imprecision. His use of υἱῶν is rather, characterised by careful definition: by linking to a noun; by a following genitive of the group to which the υἱῶν belongs; by prepositional phrases etc., Luke makes clear what kind of υἱῶν we are dealing with.3

If the τινῶν are other than disciples there must be a change of speakers between v 5 and v 7. While this is not positively indicated it is made likely by the following observations: Luke seems to have deleted from the Markan account all indications of a

4. (continued...) an accurate word for the role adopted by Jesus (Lk 22.11), and in Luke διδάσκαλε on the lips of one who addresses Jesus has no negative content. It merely says less than κύριος or Κυρίων. The one instance where Luke seems definitely to have changed διδάσκαλος to Κυρίων (Mk 9.38; Lk 9.49) hardly establishes a rigid pattern. I consider therefore that it should be allowed that here in ch.21, Luke has let the Markan word stand, finding it not at all incongruous, though it is not his own natural choice of vocabulary.


2. The figures given by R. Morgenthaler (Statistik (1958) 149) are Mt 21 times, Mk 33, Lk 78. The difference between Luke and Mark is not so great when we consider the respective lengths of these gospels.

3. Only on four occasions in Luke is there lack of precision comparable to that at Lk 21.5: with reference to those who hold various opinions about Jesus in 9.7,8; to the prospective disciple of 9.57; to those who told Jesus of Herod's murder of the Galileans at 13.1 and to the one who asks about the number of the saved 13.23. Even the first two of these are hardly comparable to 21.5 because the imprecision is dictated by the constructions τινῶν ... τόλμων (9.7,8); τις ... ἐπίδρασις (9.57,61).
direct interaction between the speakers of v 5 and Jesus.\(^1\) So Mark's \(\alpha \dot{\jmath} \tau \omega\) \(^2\) and \(\iota \epsilon \gamma \eta \varsigma \varsigma \alpha \kappa \lambda \varepsilon\) \(^3\) (13.1) are missing as is the response eliciting \(\iota \dot{\delta} \epsilon \pi o \tau \kappa \pi \alpha \lambda \) and there remains nothing to

1. Cf. Zmijewski, Eschatologiereden, 75: "Jesus wird ... von ihnen nicht wie bei Markus direkt angesprochen."

2. If L. Hartman, Testimonium (1963) 43-45, was correct in thinking that Luke's work shows concern for a more "proper" use of genitive absolutes, we could rest content with the suggestion that Luke has deleted \(\alpha \dot{\jmath} \tau \omega\) here to conform to the classical requirements of the genitive absolute. There are however serious weaknesses in Hartman's case which may be demonstrated by his own statistics. According to Hartman (44) in the parts of Lk having parallel in Mk we meet the subject of the genitive absolute recurring with another function in the sentence less often than in the parts of Mark having parallel in Luke. However from his figures in note 4 we discover that the parts of Luke having parallel in Mark instance 11 cases, while the parts of Mk having parallel in Luke contain only 6 occurrences. So, contrary to Hartman, Luke is seen to have added 5 new instances to those already in his Markan source. Again from Hartman's figures (44 n 4, 45 n 1), the proportion of genitive absolutes with subjects recurring with some other function in the sentence is slightly higher for Luke's gospel overall than for Mark's gospel overall. The high proportion in the Lukan material with parallel in Mark of subjects of genitive absolutes recurring in prepositional phrases is suggestive, but is offset by the failure of this phenomenon to occur anywhere else in Lk.

Luke frequently allows a genitive absolute to refer to a following dative (e.g. Lk 7.6; 12.36; 14.29; 17.12; 22.10), and the kind that would have been present in Lk 21.5 would have been one of the easier kind where there is "a certain interval between the first and second occasion" of the peoples' appearance in the sentence (cf. Hartman,45).

In fact we may note that in Acts where Luke's style has much freer play he shows correspondingly greater freedom from classical constraints on the use of the genitive absolute (cf. BDF § 423).

Seven times Mk has a genitive absolute with subject recurring in the accusative or dative (5.2; 5.18; 9.9; 9.28; 10.17; 13.1; 13.3). In no other case has Luke corrected to classical genitive absolute form by omitting the subject's recurrence.

If Luke had been concerned for stylistic improvement we may suggest he would have followed the pattern suggested by his rendering in 8.27 of the genitive absolute with subject recurring in dative from Mk 5.2. In Mk 5.2 he found \(\iota \epsilon \gamma \eta \varsigma \alpha \varsigma \varsigma \kappa \lambda \varepsilon\) ... \(\iota \nu \gamma \eta \nu \tau \gamma \varepsilon \) ... \(\alpha \dot{\jmath} \tau \omega\) ... \(\iota \nu \nu \nu \tau \gamma \varepsilon\) ... Luke renders \(\iota \epsilon \gamma \eta \varsigma \alpha \varsigma \varsigma \kappa \lambda \varepsilon\) ... \(\iota \nu \gamma \eta \nu \tau \gamma \varepsilon\) ... \(\alpha \dot{\jmath} \tau \omega\) ...

3. It is suggestive that Luke has transferred Mark's \(\delta \iota \dot{\jmath} \epsilon \kappa \lambda \varepsilon\) to v 7 where those speaking are disciples, and there is meant to be a real interaction with Jesus.
indicate that the remarks of Lk 21.5 are addressed to Jesus at all.

Then, with regard to Jesus' comment (Mk 13.2; Lk 21.6), Mark prefixes 
\( \epsilon\pi\nu\tau\omega \) (i.e. to the disciple), Luke has only \( \epsilon\pi\nu\tau\omega \)
and there is nothing to indicate that the comment is directed to the 
\( \tau\iota\nu\nu\nu \) of v 5. It is quite otherwise when we come to v 7
where a definite interaction with Jesus is signalled by each one of
these following: \( \epsilon\pi\nu\rho\omega\tau\gamma\sigma\alpha\nu \) \( \alpha\nu\tau\omega\nu \); the
vocative \( \delta\iota\delta\alpha\sigma\kappa\alpha\lambda\epsilon \); the question form.

Luke's choice of a genitive absolute expression to introduce
the speakers in v 5 further strengthens the impression of \( \tau\iota\nu\nu\nu \)
whose remarks are merely the circumstance of Jesus' words and who are
distinct from those who speak to Jesus in v 7.

I therefore postulate a change of speakers from v 5 to v 7. The
\( \epsilon\pi\nu\rho\omega\tau\gamma\sigma\alpha\nu \) of v 7 picks up from the second person
reference \( \O\epsilon\omega\rho\epsilon\iota\gamma\epsilon \) in Jesus' words (v 6) but the scene in v 5 is a
tableau set up in front of Jesus, and in which he is not a participant,
but which provides the occasion and point of reference for what
follows. This is, we should note, just what we have in the previous
incident where Jesus sees the rich folk (v 1) and the widows (v 2)
putting their gifts into the Temple treasury. Jesus speaks to
neither - but what happens in front of him becomes the occasion for

1. It is true that in 21.8 Luke also deletes the reference to Jesus' audience (\( \alpha\omega\tau\rho\tau\omicron\sigma\varsigma \)). There however the audience for Jesus' words is already determined by the question in v 7. The omission is probably dictated by stylistic considerations: Luke saves Mark's \( \alpha\omega\tau\rho\tau\omicron\sigma\varsigma \) for v 10 where he uses it as a part of a structuring marker.

2. \( \tau\alpha\omega\tau\nu \) of v 6 is in Lk not "these things of which you speak", but "these things which you see".

3. The change would have been more clearly indicated if at the end of v 5 Luke had, rather than merely omitting Mk's \( \alpha\omega\tau\rho\tau\omicron\sigma\varsigma \), substituted for it \( \tau\omicron\iota\iota\mu\delta\epsilon\gamma\tau\omicron\iota\iota \). However this would not really have achieved Luke's purpose since it could have suggested the kind of secret disclosures which Luke wishes to avoid. The audience he has in mind is that already carefully designated in 20.45, \( \lambda\nu\kappa\alpha\sigma\nu\tau\omicron\iota\iota\mu\delta\epsilon\gamma\tau\omicron\iota\iota \), but Luke hardly wants to insert this mouthful. He is content to allow the reader to see from the continuation of the interchange that the \( \O\epsilon\omega\rho\epsilon\iota\gamma\epsilon \) (continued...
his remarks to the disciples and others listening.

If this is right, why is it that Luke has taken these remarks away from the lips of the disciples? It seems most likely that in Luke's mind the speakers of v 5 represent a sentiment for which disciples would be inappropriate spokesmen.\(^1\)

Jer 7 offers an instructive parallel. At the Temple (v 2 cf. 26.2,7) Jeremiah announces the impending destruction of the Temple (v 14 cf. 26.6,9) against a background of a false trust in the Temple which people were wont to express in the words "This is the Temple of the Lord, the Temple of the Lord, the Temple of the Lord." (v 4 cf. v 14). The possibility lies at hand that Luke wants the words spoken in Lk 21.5 to reflect a widespread false confidence in Temple and cult as marks of God's favour, which Jesus can then denounce in the style of a Jeremiah.\(^2\)

Our study of Luke 4 has already pointed up the importance for Luke of Jesus' conformity to the prophetic pattern. There it functions apologetically to explain Jesus' rejection in Jerusalem: Jesus is not discredited because he met with rejection, that is what characteristically happened to God's prophets. Here the prophetic pattern is available to provide a positive interpretation

3. (continued...) refers centrally to the disciples.

4. Cf. Zmijewski, Eschatologiereden, 89: " ... bildet der Ausgangspunkt für eine Belehrung ...."

5. J. Bowman, Mark (1965) 240, considers that there is in Lk a link between the incidents, provided by the \(\text{ε\sigma\tau\sigma\iota\nu\iota\alpha\iota\varepsilon\thetav\omicron\nu\tau\omicron\varepsilon\omicron\alpha\omicron\nu\omicron\omicr
of Jesus' relationship to the destruction of the Temple alternative to that suggested by "Jesus of Nazareth will destroy this place" (Acts 6.14a). Despite the misunderstandings of his own day (Jer 26.7-24 cf. 37.11-15), Jeremiah's words of doom against the Temple proceeded from no treacherous infidelity to Judaism, but rather represented its deepest and purest expression.

If Jesus' announcement of the destruction of the Temple is a prophetic denunciation of the generation of God's wrath (7.29) then it doesn't do to have disciples functioning as spokesmen for those being denounced.

It supports this suggestion, that Luke's \( \lambda \Theta \epsilon \iota \kappa \alpha \lambda \omicron \iota \varsigma \kappa \iota \kappa \omicron \mu \tau \omicron \iota \nu \) (21.5) is far more suitable than Mark's \( \tau \partial \pi \omicron \gamma \omicron \varphi \omicron \iota \varphi \omicron \iota \lambda \omicron \beta \omicron \omicron \iota \omicron \varsigma \iota \nu \) (13.1) for expressing a falsely based claim on God's favour. Whereas Mark's form need not refer beyond the apparent indestructibility of such a fortress-like structure, \(^1\) with Luke's words we are caught up in the religious significance of the presence of the Temple. \(^2\)

We have set before us the conviction that God is fitly honoured and his commitment to Jerusalem assured by the presence of a Temple made splendid by magnificent offerings. We meet Luke's usage, with respect to the Temple, of \( \kappa \alpha \gamma \mu \varepsilon \iota \varsigma \) and \( \lambda \nu \Theta \eta \mu \) to speak of the honouring of the God of Israel, in both 2 Maccabees and Philo. In 2 Mac 9.16 Antiochus, in vain seeking to turn aside

\[ \ldots \ldots \ldots \]

1. Cf. W. Grundmann, Markus (1968) 262: "das wie für die Ewigkeit gebaute Heiligtum".

2. Cf. Schlatter, Markus und Lukas, 365, "Bei diesem Ruhm des Tempels ist weniger an seine unerschütterliche Festigkeit als an seine Pracht gedacht, an die vielen Kostbarkeiten, die hier als Gabe Israels an seinen Herrn aufgehäuft gewesen sind. All das schützt den Tempel nicht von seinem Untergang."
the punishment of God which he is experiencing, offers νεών κολλήσεις ἀνθρώπους κοσμήσειν. Philo Gaium 23.157 shows Augustus paying honour to the God of the Jews in that ἀνθρώπους πολυτελεῖας το ἱερὰν ἡμῶν ἐκόσμυσε.

A due honouring of God became rather important for assuring his protection after the destruction of the Temple in 587/6 BC. After that event it no longer was so easy to consider that the very presence of the Temple guaranteed the security of Jerusalem on the basis of a simple election theology. It then becomes possible to think in terms of inducing God to strengthen his commitment to the Temple. It is against the background of this kind of thinking which we must set Josephus' words to John of Gischala in J.W. 6. 98-100. Josephus recounts that John could never fear capture, since the city was God's. Josephus seeks to undermine this confidence with his question, "... and do you hope to have God, whom you have bereft of his everlasting worship, for your Ally in the war?" (LCL).

There seems to be further evidence for seeing in Lk 21 a Jeremiah-like denunciation, in the Lukan addition in v 6 of ἐλεόσοντας ἡμῖν. Loisy draws attention to this Lukan addition and suggests that the author lets his readers see that many days have already gone by since the fulfilment.¹ This is hardly fair when a quick look at Luke's use of ἡμῖν shows that he has a strong stylistic preference for the plural. Grundmann notes that "days are coming" is a favourite Lukan expression,² and it seems to me that the

---

1. Luc, 491. Loisy is presumably arguing from the Plural ἡμῖν.

2. Lukas, 379. The idea occurs five times in the gospel, once Markan (5.35), others distinctly Lukan (17.22; 19.43; 23.29). In a typically Lukan manner the verbal form is interchangeably ἐλεόσοντας (5.35; 17.22; 21.6), ἡμῖν (19.43), ἐχοῦσάν (23.29).
appearance of this phrase, here and elsewhere is best seen in relation to the prophetic formula particularly favoured by Jeremiah. We thus have a further link with the pattern provided by the sixth-century denunciation by Jeremiah.


Leaving ch.21. 5 & 6, but still along the lines of the suggestion we have been exploring, it will be worth pondering Luke's change of Mark's τὸ βῆθα ἡ πόλις ἡ ἑρμιώσεις ἢ ἔστηκεν ὅπως ὁ δὲ (13.14) τοις κεκλουμένης ὑπὸ στρατεύσεως Ἰερουσαλήμ, τότε γνώτε ὅτι ἡ βίβλιον ἢ ἐρμίωσις ἁλτήρι (21.20). The first thing this change achieves is to remove the exclusive focus on the Temple. A tendentious reading of the Markan version could understand the wider devastation pictured as only a side-effect of what is properly directed at the Temple. Not so in Luke. He wants to allay any feelings that Jesus is expressing anti-Temple sentiments, so we read that it is on Jerusalem that ἐρμίωσις comes, and the Jewish people who experience ἐρμίωσις (v 23). Not Judaism but Jews are subject to judgement. There can be no theological rejection of the Temple here.

Secondly it can be seen that the change encourages the reader to understand ch.21 in the light of 19.41-44.

1. Cf. Zmijewski, Eschatologiereden, 89, who sees the phrase as conforming to Old Testament "Unheilswissagung". On the occurrence of the phrase in Lk 17.22b see further 399 and the works cited there, also R. Schnackenburg, "Lk 17, 20-37" (1970) 221 n 1.

2. This formula occurs once in Zechariah, once in Isaiah, three times in Amos and 12 times in Jeremiah, including an occurrence in 7.32 in a section which has many links to this chapter and more widely to Lukan emphases.

3. Lagrange (Luc, 522) may also be correct that "days are coming" prepares for the question of v 7.
(v 6) already echoes ἡ Ἰερουσαλήμ (19.43). οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται λῆσον ἵνα λῆσον (21.6) is very close to οὐκ ἄφησωσιν λῆσον ἵνα λῆσον (19.44). Now the change introduced at 21.20 adds to the common picture: Jerusalem surrounded by enemies.¹ If Luke is concerned to counter any suggestion that Jesus was against the Temple and sought its destruction, then this linking of Lk 21 to 19.41-44 assists him greatly. For there we have a picture of Jesus, passionately wishing that it did not have to be (vv 41f), standing quite outside the process of devastation (by οὐ ἐξθάλασσαι σοι, v 43), announcing it with all the anguish of a Jeremiah² (v 41 of Jer 13.17 etc.).

I conclude then that Luke's redaction of the apocalyptic discourse shows a number of features which tend to confirm the suggestion that Luke has self-consciously structured his work to direct his readers' attention to Lk 21 as the refutation of the accusation of Acts 6.14a.³

---

1. Verbally the material of v 20 only contributes κυκλομένην linking to περικυκλώσωσιν (19.43), but the ideas are so close that we might legitimately consider 21.20 a summary of 19.43.

2. Compared to Mk 13, the change in Lk 21.20 to Jerusalem reinforces the Jeremiah pattern. Note that it is for his prophecy against the city that Jeremiah is considered worthy of death (Jer 26.11).

3. This rather presupposes the writing of Luke/Acts together - or at least detailed planning and the thought that they would be read in relation to each other.
CHAPTER 4

The Temple Accusation as Anti-Christian Jewish Polemic

1. The Existence of the Polemic

Preliminary considerations have suggested that Luke has the Temple charge very much in mind in the redaction of Lk 21, and it is to the nature of this accusation which we now turn our attention.

We should first consider whether Luke does give expression to a coherent accusation. Could it not be that he has merely produced in an unreflecting way an anti-Temple, anti-Mosaic sentiment with no precise content, but which serves adequately as a foil for what he wants to say about the continuity of Christianity with Judaism? It is difficult to see how one could categorically exclude such a possibility. However, if taking Luke's precise wording seriously does produce a clear, coherent and historically appropriate charge, and if, moreover, this charge can be shown to fit organically into a pattern of anti-Christian Jewish polemic which made use of a claimed word of Jesus about destruction and rebuilding of the Temple, then we may feel ourselves justified in considering that Luke accurately represents a definite Jewish polemic against Christianity.

It is now our task to seek to demonstrate the existence of a Jewish anti-Christian polemic which makes use of a claimed word of Jesus about destroying and rebuilding the Temple. In the nature of things the case must rest almost entirely on inference

1. This could be the case for instance if we had here an instance of Christianity seeking to explain to itself its appropriation of the Jewish Scriptures, and making use of a "Heilsgeschichte" concept to that end.
from the New Testament itself. Elsewhere there is very little to help us, but this is only as we should expect with a charge which would rapidly lose all relevance as the destruction of the Temple became an event of the past.

Within the gospel tradition, however, when we compare the different forms in which the Temple accusation is preserved, it is at once obvious that we have here more than mere random divergences because of a history of transmission. It is not fortuitous that Matthew, who alone allows that what the witnesses said may have been a genuine word of Jesus, should save the words from any sense of personal threat by Jesus against the Temple by having the sentence begin \( \delta v x m a \) (26.61). When compared with the

1. I cannot accept Gaston's claim (No Stone, 70 and n 1) that this use of \( \delta v x m a \) represents no more than a translation variant. Gaston feels that Matthew represents more accurately than Mark (14.58) the sense of any underlying Galilean-Aramaic use of the imperfect. This conclusion is reached, however, on the basis of a vague use of the word "modal". The modal use of the Galilean-Aramaic imperfect is of course well established (e.g. W.B. Stevenson, Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic, Oxford, 1924, 50), but in fact neither Gaston's authorities (J. Jeremias, Abendmahlworte (1960) 202; G. Dalman, Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäischen, Leipzig, 1905, § 61, I, a and d (p 264)), nor those cited by his authorities (Stevenson, Grammar, 49f; H. Odeberg, The Aramaic Portions of Bereshit Rabba II, 93, 146-50) know a single example of the use of the Aramaic imperfect with a sense that we might translate into Greek with \( \delta v x m a \) plus infinitive.

The observation of P. Joüon, Evangile (1930) on Mt 7.4, that " \( \pi \alpha \zeta \varepsilon \rho e \zeta v \) your brother" (Mt 7.4) = \( \pi \alpha \zeta \delta v x s w \lambda e \gamma e v \) your brother" (Lk 6.42), may well point, as Gaston implies, to an underlying use of the Aramaic imperfect, and if so to a translation of the imperfect by \( \delta v x m a \) plus infinitive. What Gaston fails to note is that, because of the construction with \( \pi \alpha \zeta \), we are dealing here with a distinctive use of \( \delta v x m a \) which can in no way be transferred to the Aramaic underlying Mt 26.61. We may draw attention to the distinctiveness of the use of \( \delta v x m a \) here by pointing out that \( \pi \alpha \zeta \delta v x s w \lambda e \gamma e v \) is not a question about one's ability to speak in the way mentioned, but a question about the appropriateness of speaking in such a way. We may perhaps speak of an elliptical construction where we are to supply after \( \delta v x s w \) "to be so foolish, imperceptive, insensitive (or the like) as to". In any case it is evident that the use of \( \delta v x m a \) in Lk 6.42 can in no way illuminate that in Mt 26.61. (continued...)

unelaborated form reflected in the taunt of Mk 15.29 and elsewhere, the $\chi\epsilon\varphi\rho\sigma\omicron\gamma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ of Mk 14.58 surely indicates an attempt at interpreting this difficult saying, and in the process, we might expect, rescuing it from an unacceptable interpretation. Without entering into the complexities of Johannine thought, we can at least say that with his version of the logion, set on the lips of Jesus following the Temple-cleansing (Jn 2.19), any personal threat by Jesus against the Temple is doubly precluded. Jesus lays no claim to the destruction, only to the restoration and in any case his words find their fulfilment in his death and resurrection and not in the fate of the Jerusalem Temple. Luke omits the charge from his trial narrative but shows a real concern to refute the rather similar charge laid at the feet of Stephen (Acts 6.14).

Bultmann is surely right in speaking of "the embarrassment of the tradition" concerning the Temple destruction charge. Here we have not merely marks of a reflective wrestling with a difficult saying of Jesus, but material that has been shaped as a reflex and we must conclude that it has been used in polemic.

1. (continued...)

The Matthean redaction results in a sense approximating Mt 12.6: "something greater than the temple is here". Cf. R. Hummel, Aus einandersetzung (1966) 93.

1. O. Cullmann, "Opposition" (1958-9) 67 attributes these words or their equivalent to Jesus, but offers no detailed defence of this claim.

2. R. Bultmann, John (1971) 126. C.H. Dodd (Tradition (1963) 91) speaks of "a saying about the destruction of the temple ... current in oral tradition [which] was something of an embarrassment to the Church".

3. The polemical use of the Temple-destruction and renewal (continued...)
Since the gospels and Acts portray the use of the logion by those intent on Jesus' death (Mt 26.61; Mk 14.58), by those who mocked him on the cross (Mt 27.40; Mk 15.29) and by those who brought Stephen to trial (Acts 6.14), the assumption most ready to hand is that the polemical use of the logion is made by Jewish opponents of Christianity.¹

Another possibility has however been proposed by Simon,² who feels that the Markan form of the accusation reflects a conflict within Christendom between Jewish and Gentile Christians. The actual wording of the logion is said to express the Jewish Christian view which associated the hope of Jesus' return in glory with the restoration of the Temple. Gentile Christians, in whose eyes Christianity has left behind such cultic concerns, could only believe that such words could be falsely attributed to Jesus, and it is for this reason that we read in Mk 14.57 that the words are reported by false witnesses.

Simon's case would be more convincing if Mk 14.58 were in fact an unambiguous expression of Jewish Christian hope for a

3. (continued...) logion is of some importance to Gaston (No Stone, 69, 72, 74, etc.); cf. earlier R. Hoffmann, "Zerstörung" (1914) 138f. O'Neill (Theology (1961) 74) says "there is evidence from other parts of Luke-Acts that Luke believed that this was a general charge against Christianity", (A judgement omitted from the second edition (1970).) J. Jervell ("James" (1972) 202 n 19) criticises this suggestion on the basis that "Luke presents the Jerusalem congregation so as to preclude general accusation". It will become evident, however, in the course of this study that Luke's presentation is precisely in the face of such accusation.

¹. So Gaston, ibid., and generally.
new Temple in the time of the messianic reign. One wonders if this can be the case when M. Goguel can virtually reverse the roles and tell us that the charge is put on the lips of false witnesses because Jewish Christians, attached to the Temple, couldn't believe Jesus said such a thing.\(^1\) Everything turns on what we are to make of \(\chi\epsilon\rho\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\iota\omicron\rhoos /\chi\epsilon\rho\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\iota\omicron\rhoos\). If the removal of the old for the provision of a new Temple would already have been recognized in New Testament times as part of a complex of eschatological events,\(^2\) then the Jewish Christians will have no difficulty with \(\chi\epsilon\rho\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\iota\omicron\rhoos /\chi\epsilon\rho\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\iota\omicron\rhoos\) as differentiating the present Temple from that which will come down from heaven like the city of 2 Apoc. Bar. 4.2ff and 4 Ezra 10.53f.

But the great problem for Simon's case is that \(\chi\epsilon\rho\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\iota\omicron\rhoos /\chi\epsilon\rho\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\iota\omicron\rhoos\) is really no problem for the Gentile Christian either. If he belongs in Pauline circles, he may be expected to be already familiar with a circumcision made without hands:

\[
\pi\epsilon\rho\iota\nu\omicron\omicron\iota\omicron\mu\iota\omicron\nu \quad \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\nu\omicron\omicron\iota\omicron\mu\iota\omicron\nu \quad \chi\epsilon\rho\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\iota\omicron\rhoos\quad (\text{Col 2.11}).
\]

Indeed the whole process of his appropriating the patterns that belong to the Jewish Messianic movement of which he has become a part, is a process of spiritualizing concepts and ideas.\(^3\) In fact it would not be unreasonable to suggest that the \(\chi\epsilon\rho\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\iota\omicron\rhoos /\chi\epsilon\rho\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\omicron\iota\omicron\rhoos\) of Mk 14.58 reflect exactly this process. For

\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots\]


2. See below for a discussion of this point.

3. This is already true of the first Jewish Christians who had to come to terms with a dying messiah.
we have already mentioned Col 2.11, we might also compare λ'θευς ζωντες and οίκος πνευματικός of 1 Pet 2.5, and the ἄλλος ἐστιν, τὸ σώμα ἐν ὑμῖν ... στρατόν and ῥυμαί ... νοῦς Ἐκκλησίας of 1 Cor 3.16; 6.19 and 2 Cor 6.16, and finally πεθάνοντες ρώμη πνευμόνωτε σώματος ληφθήναι in Jn 2.21.

As well as simply marking the contrast, χειροποίητος has possibilities for expressing quite an anti-Temple sentiment. As a substantive the word is regularly used in the LXX to designate idols. χειροποίητος could easily align the Jerusalem Temple with the temples of idols. It is instructive to cite Barn. 16.1,2 in this regard where the Jews are said to be πλακώμενοι ὑπὲρ τῆς ὁικοδομής τῆς ἐκκλησίας ... ὡς ὁ θεὸς ὁ θεὸς Ἐκκλησίας. ἄχειρίδιον τὸ ἐν τῇ Κυρίῳ ... The uses of χειροποίητος at Acts 7.48 and 17.24 are also to be noted in this connection. Now in the light of these considerations, even if Simon were right about the primary sense of Mk 14.58, it would seem most unlikely that Gentile Christians would respond by denying the authenticity of the logion when the far more profitable possibility of reinterpretation lay at hand. The words could have no potential to embarrass Christians vis-à-vis Jewish and we therefore feel compelled to set aside Simon's explanation of the setting of Mk 14.58 on the lips of false witnesses.

1. That the thought of being built with hands could strongly call to mind idolatry is vividly illustrated in Barn. 16.7. Ps-Barnabas wishes to use the contrast ὁικοδομήν ναός εἰς χειρός (v 7)/ πνευματικόν ναός ναός (v 10), but that which he wishes to describe as ὁικοδομήν ναός εἰς χειρός is rather unexpectedly the person before his conversion to Christianity: "The habitation of our hearts ... was the house of demons (v 7)." How can this be described as "made with hands"? The argument is simple: εἰς ἰδίαν ἀνθρώπου ... εἰς λαόν· ἀνθρώποις!

2. W.G. Kummel, Promise (1957) 101; Gaston, No Stone, 74; G. Klinzing, Umbaute (1971) 203 n 1, point to the anomaly which seems to be implied if we understand ἄρα αὐτῶν (continued...).
It seems therefore that we are justified in seeing a Jewish anti-Christian polemical usage of the Temple destruction logion reflected in the form of the gospel tradition, and it now becomes our concern to discover in what form the logion constituted an argument against Christianity, and then where the weight of the argument lay.

2. Destruction only or Destruction and Renewal?

B. Lindars offers suggestions on both these matters. According to Lindars the Temple destruction charge stood originally without mention of any rebuilding. The mention of a rebuilding is

2. (continued...) of the Christian community: the spiritual temple was not built until after 70 AD! However the problem is easily solved when we observe that the spiritual interpreters are no more interested in a literal destruction than in a literal Temple.

1. This conclusion does not stand in formal contradiction to the view of W. Marxsen (Mark (1969) 167f) that the whole logion took its rise from the primitive community's new self-understanding, though one might wonder why the logion caused so much embarrassment in the gospel tradition and provoked the varied responses that are evident, if its genesis could be so simply explained. However, Marxsen is surely wrong in thinking that Mark is the first to speak of an actual destruction (168). Every New Testament context requires a (mis)understanding of the logion as relating to the destruction of the fabric of the Jerusalem Temple. To sustain Marxsen's view we must say that this whole (mis)understanding has permeated the material as a secondary development at a period later than Mark's redaction, which seems most unlikely.

2. A memory of the Jewish polemic may be embedded in Gos. Pet. 7.26, "we were sought for ... as wishing to burn the temple". Cf. Gaston (No Stone, 69) who also considers (144) that Christians are included among the other Minim as "those who stretched out their hands against the temple (γυναίκας) (t. Sanh. 13.5)".

3. Apologetic, 67.
to be regarded as "frankly modelled on the resurrection, in order to meet the challenge of an unfulfilled prophecy of the destruction of the temple." "The church had to suffer considerable embarrassment" from "the taunt that the temple is still standing." So only the first half of the logion is used as an argument against Christianity, and the argument serves to strike a blow against the credibility of Jesus by pointing to a notable prophecy of his which had not been fulfilled.

Is it, however, really likely that Christians added the second member to the Temple destruction logion as an apologetic move? Surely this would hardly provide the kind of answer that would cut much ice outside the Christian community. The critic is being asked to believe that "Temple" is a cryptogram for Jesus' own body on the basis of a rather dubiously produced "more complete" form of the prophecy, which furthermore depends for its application to Jesus on one being sufficiently impressed by the shared pattern of destruction and renewal and on a happy three day coincidence. Even then it is only saved for the opponent from the realm of unfulfilled prophecy if he should accept the Christian assertion that Jesus had returned to life again. A further problem arises if we understand the unfulfilled prophecy to indicate Jesus as the agent of the Temple's destruction. The reinterpretation then produces

1. Even this is perhaps too much, since in the case of Jesus only the common element of destruction is open to secular scrutiny!

2. Even the force of this coincidence is greatly reduced if "in three days" has the imprecision in Semitic speech attributed to it by J. Jeremias, "Drei-Tage-Worte" (1971) 221-9; cf. J.B. Bauer "Drei Tage" (1958) 354-8.

3. As Lindars appears to do (Apologetic, 61).
the extraordinary statement that Jesus will destroy himself.
Surely unacceptable to the primitive Christian community! If on
the other hand the unfulfilled prophecy is that the Temple will be
destroyed, the hypothesis is at once undermined by the need to
produce a secondary explanation for the attribution of the destruc-
tion to Jesus in every New Testament occurrence except Jn 2.19.
The inappropriateness of this supposed apologetic move is already
pointed up by the verisimilitude of the account of the use of the
two-membered statement in the mockery of Jesus on the cross (Mt
27.40; Mk 15.29). It is a strange apologetic that leaves the most
natural sense of the words as that favoured by the opponents.

There appear, then, to be real difficulties in the way
of accepting Lindars' suggestion. My arguments have been directed
in particular against the idea that "I will build the Temple in
three days" (or similar) is an apologetic addition to answer the
charge of unfulfilled prophecy, but where does the unfulfilled

1. We can hardly defend it from the Johannine, "No one takes it
from me, but I lay it down of my own accord. I have power to lay
it down, and I have power to take it again." (Jn 10.18). Not only
is this statement less extreme, more importantly it has its signi-
ficance as a qualification on the analogy of the good shepherd
(10.11-16). Jesus, like the good shepherd, lays down his life
for his sheep (v 11). In both cases the willingness to die marks
the depth of commitment to the sheep. However, there is a point
beyond which the analogy breaks down. The death of the good
shepherd can never be anything but a mishap. Overtaken by circum-
cstances he dies in a valiant, if unsuccessful, attempt to protect
the sheep. Quite other with Jesus, whose death occurs as a voluntary
self-offering which constitutes part of a well ordered plan.

2. Mt 26.61; 27.40; Mk 14.58; 15.29; (Acts 6.14).

3. And that quite apart from questions of historicity.

4. It was not at all obvious to Matthew (26.61) that Jewish
objection had already been met by the mention of a raising up in
three days.
prophesy view stand if the completion does not itself serve as evidence for it?  

One might suggest that Lindars is not entirely satisfied by his own account of the nature of the polemic against Christianity when he says of the function of the Johannine use of the Temple destruction logion (Jn 2.19) that it "also serves to take the treason out of the charge at the trial."Ironically enough the Johannine form of the saying which Lindars considers the most original actually contains no prophecy of the destruction of anything - Temple or body! The prophetic component is restricted to the "raising up again" which on Lindar's analysis is secondary.

I am unable to see in the New Testament account any trace of the supposed Christian embarrassment about an unfulfilled prophecy of the destruction of the Temple. Mk 13 and parallels are very happy to be able to offer such a prophecy, while the point at issue in the various gospel settings of the Temple destruction logion is not a prophecy of the Temple's destruction (cf. Jesus ben Ananias in Jos. J.W. 6.300-309), but whether Jesus himself threatened to carry out the Temple's destruction.  

1. If the unfulfilled prophecy was of the Mk 13.2 kind, then one may suspect that things in Jerusalem through the period were sufficiently disturbed from time to time to make people wary of saying too loudly that the temple had escaped the fate to which Jesus had consigned it. 

Even if the agency of Jesus in the destruction is pressed, the same point can be made when we recall that Christians assigned more and more the prerogatives of God to Jesus who was conceived as seated at the right hand of God in the place of rule. There would be no problem attributing to Jesus a destruction of the Temple by the Romans when there is available the biblical precedent of attributing to God the destruction by the Babylonians (Jer 7.14f; Ezek 24.21).  

2. Apologetic, 68.
3. Ibid.
At this point I do not consider that we have ruled out the possibility that the second half of the logion is a Christian addition. The case for the Christian addition of the rebuilding clause, in the interests of reinterpreting the whole to apply to Jesus, could be presented with far greater plausibility, as part of the process of development of the self-understanding and theology of the early Christian movement, i.e. as an interpretation developed for use within the church and not outside.

It is reasonable to think that Christians, in their growing consciousness of themselves as the people of the new covenant, applied to Jesus' death and resurrection the destruction and renewal pattern provided by the exile experience and the prophetic promise of a new covenant; that as they reflected on any words Jesus may have said about a destruction of the Temple, they came to feel that these words found their true application in Jesus' own death and resurrection. This thought could be reinforced by the parallel between the religious significance of Jesus for the early Christians and the traditional function of the Temple as meeting point with God.¹

However, even if this were the case, I would argue that there is reason to think that both parts of the logion were already present in the form used by the Jewish opponents.

¹ This process would seem to produce most naturally a word like "This temple will be destroyed, and in three days I will raise it (or it will be raised) up again." It is a difficulty for the hypothesis that no such form is preserved. One could argue that, in the tradition, only the trial accusation was available for development since Mk 13.2 and Mt 23.38 could not be detached from the literal Jerusalem edifice, but this necessity does produce what seems to me an impossible attribution to Jesus of his own death. (Jn 2.19 in its present form lacks any prophecy of the destruction of the Temple for one to build on.)
We will consider first the use in Mk 15.29 of the saying as part of the mockery at the cross. While Lindars may argue that the addition of the rebuilding clause impairs the verisimilitude of the trial narrative, this is certainly not the case here. The point of the statement here (in the sense we are to understand it to have had in the minds of the mockers) depends upon the two-membered form. The second member certainly makes possible the supreme irony, but it is also required by the point of the mockery. It is Jesus' claim to be an achiever - not to be a destroyer - that gives force to the mocking demand that he now σωτήριον σεκυτον κτι. (v 30). We may underline this point by setting out the parallelism between the mockery of the passersby and that by the chief priests and scribes.

The destruction/rebuilding has the same function in the mockery as does the claim to save, and to be the Christ, the King of Israel.

1. Apologetic, 66: "when a promise to rebuild /the Temple/ in three days is added, /the charge/ sounds captious, not worth serious consideration."

2. Cf. Lindars, ibid., 69: "As a taunt of the enemies of Christ, it is clearly applied directly to the Resurrection with Johannine irony. The reader knows that the real temple was indeed rebuilt in three days."

3. Cf. R. Eisler, Messiah (1931) 495: "any Herostratus could destroy the most splendid edifice of this kind by wanton incendiari..."
It is my own view that this parallelism provides good evidence for thinking that the destruction/rebuilding statement was understood as a messianic programme. However, for our purposes here, it is sufficient that it is a positive claim to achievement that is being thrown in Jesus' face as being contradicted by his unhappy fate on the cross.

This could be treated as novelistic verisimilitude, but it would be remarkable that Mark has so cleverly manufactured this use in mockery of the Christian extension of the original Temple destruction charge, particularly if we are impressed by the alleged failure of verisimilitude in the far more important trial scene. Rather than crediting Mark with having thought up the critical sense in order to exhibit the ironical sense, it is far more plausible to consider that he made use of the ironical sense against the background of an actual Jewish usage of the critical sense.

If the attributing of a Temple destruction claim to Jesus is a perverting of a word of Jesus about the Temple's destruction (cf. Jn 2.19) then another consideration has relevance here. If the saying about the destruction of the Temple is already connected to a saying which links Jesus to the building of the new Temple,

1. It seems preferable to speak of a messianic programme, rather than an implied messianic claim. The question "what kind of messiah is Jesus?" seems as important for the gospels as the assertion that he is the messiah (e.g. Mk 8.27-33; Lk 24.21 cf. vv 25f). In contemporary Jewish speculation we know of competing messianic expectations and patterns of eschatological hope, and a prospective agent of eschatological events would need to be identified not merely by the claim to be messiah etc., but also by the messianic programme to be associated with this claim.

2. It is difficult to attribute the "I will destroy ..." to Jesus himself. M. Goguel (Vie, 493 cf. "Temple" (1929) 134-6) does so, but feels compelled to add, "Jésus n'a pas songé à une agression contre le sanctuaire." Eissler's attempt to do so (Messiah, 494-500) does not receive the support of even Brandon (Zealots, 252) who is sympathetic to so much of Eissler's approach.

3. Cf. e.g. the reconstruction of Hoffmann, "Zerstörung", 134-6.
then this makes understandable the attribution to Jesus of a claim to destroy the Temple as a completion of the parallel. While a sheer perversion of a simple Jeremiah-like prophecy of the Temple's doom cannot be ruled out, the success of slander is its approximation to the truth, and we may consider that the transfer provides some evidence that the rebuilding clause is already linked.

Acts 6.14 which lacks the rebuilding clause may nevertheless offer indirect evidence for it already belonging with the destruction clause in Jewish polemical use. In Acts 6.14 we certainly have a two-membered form of accusation and Gaston may well be right in suggesting that the second accusation might be a polemical twisting of Jesus' statement about the new Temple. A new Temple could certainly be understood as a transformation of the cult which threatened the existing practice of "Mosaic" customs.

1. No Stone, 71. The point is taken up by G. Theissen, "Tempelweis­sagung" (1976) 145. Theissen, however, attributes the transformation to Stephen.

2. Gos. Thom. 71 is rightly understood by Gaston (No Stone, 152) to have been shaped as a conscious contradiction to the double statement of Mk 14.58. But this is hardly to show that it goes behind the Mk 14.58 form to a more primitive sentiment which "knew the Temple saying only in the sense of a destruction", as Gaston proceeds to assert.

   Whatever else we may say, the logion is in fact firmly committed to the two-membered form.

   Another example in Gos. Thom. of formulation in conscious antithesis to the synoptic tradition is found in logion 14, where fasting, praying and alms-giving are treated in the order of Mt 6.1-18, and in turn rejected as evil.

   In the case of logion 71, the designation by Mark of Mk 14.58 as false witness is an open invitation for the Gospel of Thomas to offer us "what Jesus really said", in accord with the claimed nature of the work as set out at the beginning: "These are the secret words which the living Jesus spake and Didymos Judas Thomas wrote them down."
3. Possible Senses

At this point we will find it helpful to consider some senses which the logion could take and which are suggested by the available background material. On the basis of the above, it will be the two-membered logion to which we give attention.

Only two of the sources considered bring together the ideas of destruction and rebuilding of the Temple in a way that does not depend on the events of 70 AD. 2 Mac 14.33 offers us the oath of Nicanor: "I will level this precinct of God to the ground (τοῦ θεοῦ σηκόν εἰς πεδίον παγώσω) and tear down the altar, and I will build here a splendid temple to Dionysius (ἰερὰν ἐνταφύλαξ τῷ Διόνυσῳ)." This is an attractive parallel to our logion, but the kind of threat that belongs on the lips of a Gentile power figure and could with no plausibility be attributed to the historical Jesus or thrown up in polemic against the early Christians.

In the Babylonian Talmud (b. Bat. 3b and 4a) legend has Baba b. Buta advising Herod to pull down and rebuild the temple. To avoid problems with Rome he is to send slow messengers asking permission, and, Baba b. Buta tells him (4a), "In the meanwhile you can pull down the Temple and rebuild it (יְשַׁלֵּם נְבֵי [נְבֵי] לְרֹאשׁ)." We may compare Josephus' use of κατασκευὴν with regard to Herod's renewal of the Temple (Ant. 15.388). Now it is not impossible that Herod's effort could be treated as a kind of paradigm for the mode of fulfilment of the

1. The same possibility has also been observed by Theissen, "Tempelweissagung", 145.
kind of hope expressed in Tob 14.5, and thus that would be understood as a composite deed of renewal. This possibility is not to be overlooked in any quest for a sense for the words on the lips of Jesus, but it does not seriously commend itself as a trial accusation and less as a polemic. Such an understanding would make the accusation into a far too positive statement. In the trial context we would then be shut up to seeing the whole point of the accusation as an attempt to pin on Jesus a messianic claim, and this, it will be argued below, is most unlikely, at least in the Markan redaction.

(Eisler's suggestion, that Luke omitted the charge from his gospel out of concern lest it be understood as a charge of sorcery, causes us to ask whether the trial accusation should bear this sense. While the response of the Jews to the Johannine version of the logion (Jn 2.20) may suggest a thinking about magic for its own sake, in the trial narrative an accusation of sorcery would surely be linked to an alleged act of sorcery, not a merely intended ....

1. To be contrasted with the building of the Second Temple, which is to endure to .

2. I assume that Mark's awareness of the force of the contemporary Jewish accusation will keep him from putting it in a setting which forces on it some different interpretation. While his setting will not be aimed at expounding the charge, it will be consonant with the contemporary accusing sense of the logion.

3. Messiah, 495.

4. i.e. activity directed to no other end than to impress. Cf. the temptation (Lk 4.9ff) that Jesus throw himself from the pinnacle of the Temple in order to be rescued by the angels.
one (cf. Lk 11.15). In any case it is hard to see such an accusation having continuing impact in the early church. It seems unnecessary therefore to follow this suggestion further.)

4. Destruction as Judgement of God by Enemies

If we may isolate it for the time being, a destruction of the Temple is in Jewish circles a most readily understood expression of God's wrath on his covenant people. In Old Testament, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha we find again and again that violation of the Temple is considered to be a consequence of the sin of God's people and their leaders. Such an understanding forms the basis in Micah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel of their prophecies of the Temple's doom (Mic 3.9-12; Jer 7.12, 13f; Ezek 24.21 cf. vv 6ff). It finds a reflection in the prayers of Dan 9.16f, Tob 13.9 cf. v 10 and Bar 2.26. It is recorded again in the Qumran document CD 1.3. It is in pseudo-prophecy in Adam and Eve 29.5f and As. Mos. 2.8 - 3.2 and cf. vv 13f. Jdt 8.18-21 generalizes the lesson of the sixth century destruction of the Temple. As. Mos. 6.9 applies it to the damage to the Temple when Varus, governor of Syria, quelled a Jewish rebellion in 4 BC (Ant. 17.286-98). 2 Mac 5.17-20 (and cf. 10.4), in relation to the desecration of the Temple by Antiochus Epiphanes IV, enunciates the principle that Temple and City share the brunt of the anger of God against the sin of the inhabitants. Pss. Sol. 2.2f brings Pompey's trampling of the altar under the same rubric. In their turn T. Levi 15.1 and Sib. Or. 4.115-9 understand the destruction of the Temple in 70 AD in this same way, which is also the understanding of

1. This survey is meant to be representative rather than exhaustive.

Finally, Dan 9.26 (cf. Zech 14.2) expects a destruction of the Temple in an eschatological context\(^1\) and probably (cf. v 24 and v 16) finds the same connection between destruction and sin.

The material here surveyed is important not only in showing how readily the Temple's destruction would be understood in terms of sin and judgment, it also exhibits a uniform understanding of the type of judgment to which a Temple destruction belongs. Damage to the Temple is understood in relation to a judgement that takes the shape of an experience of conquest by an invading foe. Precisely this concept of judgement makes it natural to think of the fabric of the city sharing the fate of the people.

5. Destruction as Judgement of God by Saints/Messiah

Neither the Messiah nor the saints are ever pictured as taking part in an assault on the Temple,\(^2\) but they are thought of as being involved in the execution of judgment. There is judgement on the Gentile nations (Ps 2.8f; 110.5f; 149.7; Isa 9.4f; 11.14; Enoch 62.2-5; Pss. Sol. 17.27; 2 Apoc. Bar. 72.2 etc.), then there is judgement on the wicked in the midst of God's people (Ps 72.14; Isa 11.3-5; T. Levi 18.2f; T. Jud. 24.6 etc.). The concept of conquest adequately characterizes the understanding of the judgement in many of the references to Gentile judgement\(^3\) (e.g. Ps 2.8f, 110.5f, \ldots).

1. In Mk 14.58 the destruction is almost certainly to be viewed as eschatological because of its connection to Jesus, who is consistently portrayed in eschatological terms. The replacement in such a short period reinforces this point.

2. Mal 1.10 is only a particularly dramatic way of criticizing the corrupt practices in the Temple worship of the time.

3. We may discern a development towards a notion of judgement abstracted from any "realistic" portrayal, so that the terms in which the judgement is portrayed self-consciously become images and not portrayals of what may be concretely conceived. (continued...)
149.7; Isa 9.4f, 11.14; Pss. Sol. 17.27), but not so when the judgement of the wicked in the midst of God's people is envisaged. Such an internal judgement is portrayed in ways which are better seen as controlled by the notion of the rule of the ideal king in righteousness (cf. esp. Ps 72). The Messiah is not thought of as needing to conquer Jerusalem to establish his dominion there, and so the images of the devastation of war do not enter into the portrayal of judgement there, and we do not easily think of the fabric of the city being destroyed in such a judgement. So not only is the destruction of the Temple not predicated of the Messiah, it may even be said to be a foreign body to such portrayal as there is

3. (continued...) In many cases it is not immediately obvious how far the process has gone. 1 Enoch 48.9 may serve to illustrate a developed case. The kings of the earth are delivered into the hands of the elect, burn before the face of the righteous and as lead in the water sink before the face of the righteous. Cf. in the New Testament, "the furnace of fire" (Mt 13.42) and "the outer darkness" (Mt 8.12) with no sense of contradiction.

An aspect of this development is the move to a more transcendent understanding of the eschatological intervention, to the point where a "realistic" portrayal in terms that belong to the normal historical process becomes pointless. The focus on supernatural intervention eclipses all interest in normal human processes. A case in point is the judgement scene in 1 Enoch 62.1-5, where the Elect One sits on his throne of glory with all the kings and the mighty and the exalted of the earth before him.

1. One can of course speculate that the rise of Herod to power by the conquest of Jerusalem encouraged a pattern of thought that that was the way to royal power in Judaea. Cf. Jos. J.W. 2.261f "... the Egyptian false prophet ... collected a following of about thirty thousand dupes ... proposed to force an entrance into Jerusalem and ... to set himself up as tyrant of the people." The presence of the Roman garrison in Jerusalem could also encourage one to view Jerusalem as an object of military action.

However even if such considerations could be shown to have shaped concepts of the Messiah's rise to power, there is no evidence that this exerted any influence on concepts of messianic judgement.
149.7; Isa 9.4f, 11.14; Pss. Sol. 17.27), but not so when the judgement of the wicked in the midst of God's people is envisaged. Such an internal judgement is portrayed in ways which are better seen as controlled by the notion of the rule of the ideal king in righteousness (cf. esp. Ps 72). The Messiah is not thought of as needing to conquer Jerusalem to establish his dominion there,¹ and so the images of the devastation of war do not enter into the portrayal of judgement there, and we do not easily think of the fabric of the city being destroyed in such a judgement. So not only is the destruction of the Temple not predicated of the Messiah, it may even be said to be a foreign body to such portrayal as there is

3. (continued...) In many cases it is not immediately obvious how far the process has gone. 1 Enoch 48.9 may serve to illustrate a developed case. The kings of the earth are delivered into the hands of the elect, burn before the face of the righteous and as lead in the water sink before the face of the righteous. Cf. in the New Testament, "the furnace of fire" (Mt 13.42) and "the outer darkness" (Mt 8.12) with no sense of contradiction.

An aspect of this development is the move to a more transcendent understanding of the eschatological intervention, to the point where a "realistic" portrayal in terms that belong to the normal historical process becomes pointless. The focus on supernatural intervention eclipses all interest in normal human processes. A case in point is the judgement scene in 1 Enoch 62.1-5, where the Elect One sits on his throne of glory with all the kings and the mighty and the exalted of the earth before him.

¹. One can of course speculate that the rise of Herod to power by the conquest of Jerusalem encouraged a pattern of thought that that was the way to royal power in Judaea. Cf. Jos. J.W. 2.261f "... the Egyptian false prophet ... collected a following of about thirty thousand dupes ... proposed to force an entrance into Jerusalem and ... to set himself up as tyrant of the people." The presence of the Roman garrison in Jerusalem could also encourage one to view Jerusalem as an object of military action.
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However even if such considerations could be shown to have shaped concepts of the Messiah's rise to power, there is no evidence that this exerted any influence on concepts of messianic judgement.
of the Messiah's judgement in the midst of his people.¹

Against this background the attribution of the destruction to Jesus in Mk 14.58 becomes particularly striking and calls for special explanation. It must be admitted at once that the pattern presented above is not without exceptions and we turn to these to find material more congenial to the thought of Mk 14.58. 1 Enoch, Psalms of Solomon and the Qumran documents provide the relevant material.

1 Enoch is a composite work² and one may question the legitimacy of synthesizing materials from different sections of the

1. If it were possible to accept H.J. Schoeps' account of the "religionsgeschichtliche Genesis" of the Ebionite opposition to sacrifice in the Temple (Juden-Christentums (1949) 220-42), then the pre-history of that movement might offer us the possibility of a Messiah who would destroy the Temple. However, Schoeps' evidence is disputable at best and drawn from such separated periods that any sense of historical continuity is highly questionable. In particular his identification in Dan 9.26 of a Jewish apocalyptic expectation that the Messiah/Son of Man would destroy the Temple is exegetically untenable. (This is not to deny that Schoeps' understanding of the verse may have surfaced in, say, the Qumran community, where, it will be shown below, the prevailing ideas would have been compatible with such a view.)

Gaston (No Stone, 151) offers no evidence to support his view of an older application of Isa 10.34 to the Messiah who would destroy the Temple. While he suggests that Zealots applied Dan 9.26 to the Messiah (460ff), he does not offer, nor can I imagine, any appropriate sense for such an application. With every allowance for "charismatic exegesis" (458, cf. 462) there is just nothing to encourage any suggestion that zealots in any sense attributed the destruction of the Temple to the Messiah.

book. However, we may at least say that the materials on which we draw now from different sections of the work all stand in continuity with the undoubtedly ancient Ten Weeks Apocalypse (93.1-14 and 91.12-17), where we read in 91.12:

And after that there shall be another, the eighth week, that of righteousness, 
And a sword shall be given to it that a righteous—judgement may be executed on the oppressors, 
And sinners shall be delivered into the hands of the righteous.

No Messiah is mentioned, but we may see that the saints here gain the ascendancy in something akin to a civil war. (Cf. 93.9 where the previous week is characterized by the rise of an apostate generation, who, we may be sure, are to be counted with the oppressors and sinners of 91.12) Along the same lines is the encouragement to the righteous in 96.1: "suddenly shall the sinners perish before you, And ye shall have lordship over them according to your desires".2 Compare also the corresponding woe on sinners in 98.12: "Know that ye shall be delivered into the hands of the righteous, and they shall cut off your necks and slay you." In 50.2 "the righteous shall be victorious in the name of the Lord of Spirits", and some of the vanquished will repent and be saved, yet without honour (v 3). In 38.1-5 the coming of the Righteous One coincides with the time of judgement, but in this context there is lacking any sure use of military metaphor in relation to the judgement within God's people. So, in 1 Enoch, the Messiah does not yet need to conquer Jerusalem to establish his dominion there, but we may be moving in that direction.

2. That fellow-countrymen are in mind is indicated by their description in vv 4-8.
Pss. Sol. 17.6-8 takes us a step further. It envisages Jerusalem in the hands of usurpers:

But, for our sins, sinners rose up against us; They assailed us and thrust us out; What thou hadst not promised to them, they took away from us with violence.

(7) ... They set a (worldly) monarchy in place of (that which was) their excellency;

(8) They laid waste the throne of David in tumultuous arrogance.

The usurpers incur judgement at the hands of a Gentile (Pompey), but this leads in turn to a regime under Gentile influence the better: "The king was a transgressor, and the judge disobedient, and the people sinful (v 22)". It also leads to the persecution of the pious who flee for their lives (vv 18ff). The programme for the coming Davidic king includes the hopes expressed in vv 24-7:

And gird him with strength, that he may shatter unrighteous rulers, (25) and that he may purge Jerusalem from nations that trample her down to destruction.

Wisely, righteously (26) he shall thrust out sinners from (the) inheritance, He shall destroy the pride of the sinner as a potter's vessel.

With a rod of iron he shall break in pieces all their substance, (27) He shall destroy the godless nations with the word of his mouth;

At his rebuke nations shall flee before him, And he shall reprove sinners for the thoughts of their hearts.

It is remarkable that this language, so reminiscent of Ps 2, should describe in the first instance an attack on Jerusalem. Jerusalem the holy city has almost become an outpost of the heathen nations


2. There is corruption in the text of vv 16f, but it at least seems clear from these verses that Gentile influence is in mind.
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and thus an object of the Messiah's conquest, before it becomes the place where he rules. The corruption of people and rulers in Jerusalem is such that their judgement by the Messiah is described in parallel with the judgement of the nations. When therefore we read of the profanation of the Temple in Pss. Sol. 8.12f,¹

They plundered the sanctuary of God, as though there were no avenger.

(v 13) They trod the altar of the Lord, (coming straight) from all manner of uncleanness;
And with menstrual blood they defiled the sacrifices, as (though they were) common flesh.

a background is set in which there would be no inappropriateness in suggesting that the Temple should suffer in the Messiah's conquest over the evil regime in possession of it.

When we turn to the Qumran material we feel a sense of continuity with these ideas from Pss. Sol. Only now the material expressing them is far more abundant and far more explicit. Those who have control in Jerusalem are characterized as "the congregation of the men of falsehood" (1QSa 5.1f), "the congregation of scoffers in Jerusalem" (4QIsa b 2.10), the ungodly of the covenant" (1QM 1.2).

It is the time of "the dominion of those who speak smooth things" (4Q Nah 2.4 cf. 4QIsa c 2.10f). We read of "The Spouter of Lies who led many astray that he might build his city of vanity with blood and raise a congregation on deceit" (1QpHab 10.9f), and of "the House of Judgement" from whom God will deliver "the House of Judah"

¹. This profanation relates specifically to the period before Pompey, but 17.21f, while not directly mentioning the priesthood, certainly suggests that in the eyes of the author of Pss. Sol. 17 the situation was no better than that of 8.12f.
That the Temple is caught up in the wickedness of the Jerusalem regime is indicated in 1QpHab 12.7:

"Jerusalem where the Wicked Priest committed abominable deeds and defiled the Temple of God" (cf. also CD 4.18; 5.6; 1QpHab 9.4f; CD 6.16; 12.1f).

The strongest possible sense of (physical) schism exists between the Qumran Covenanters and the regime in Jerusalem. We may assume that it is the Teacher of Righteousness, a founding figure for Qumran, who speaks of how they banished him from his land like a bird from its nest (1QH 4.8f), while those who would enter the community are called upon to separate from the congregation of the

---

1. We cannot follow Gaston (No Stone, 126f) in identifying the "House of Judgement" with the Jerusalem Temple, in 1QpHab 8.2 cf. 10.3. It may be possible to speak of the Covenanters as having been rescued from the Temple if one had in mind their initial "enlightenment" about the falseness and worthlessness of what goes on in the Temple. But here, that would be to read a perfect tense for an imperfect (יִזֹּן אֱלֹהֵי בָּנָי), and in the light of the reason given for their rescue (their labour and faithfulness towards the teacher of Righteousness) we cannot in any case be dealing with their entry into the Community. I suggest rather that the text represents a situation in which the "House of Judgement" constitutes a threat to the Covenanters from which God will deliver them because of their faithfulness to the Teacher of Righteousness. (For the use of hiphil of יָזַן, יָזַז with the sense "to deliver from the threat posed by" see 2 Sam 22.18; Mic 5.5; Ps 18.18,49; 35.10; 59.2,3; 143.9; Prov 2.16.)

To save Gaston's sense we would have to understand יָזַז very elliptically as "from the judgement coming upon the house destined thereto."

A. Dupont-Sommer's view (Qumran (1961) 263 n 3 and 265 n 3) that "the house of judgement" is "the tribunal before which mankind will be judged at the end of time", is unlikely in view of the imagery of a house built from gain through wickedness contained in Hab 2.9-11. These verse from Hab are quoted in 1QpHab and "house of judgement" in 1QpHab 10.3 is part of the pesher on them.
men of falsehood and to unite under the authority of the Sons of Zadok (1QS 5.1f). CD 4.2f speaks of "the converts of Israel who departed from the land of Judah", while the location of the community in the wilderness witnesses to a locus of life separated from Jerusalem.

Despite this deep rift and a strong tendency among the Covenanters to sublimate their Temple attachment through an understanding of their own Community as the Temple of God, and their works of the law as the acceptable sacrifices, Jerusalem loses for them nothing of its sanctity as the Holy City. So in 4QDibHam 4.2ff we read: "Thy dwelling place ... a resting-place in Jerusalem, the city which thou hast chosen from all the earth that Thy name might remain there for ever." The War Scroll (1QM) also indicates the continuing centrality of Jerusalem for the Qumran community. In the surviving text it is not said in so many words, but it is clear enough that Jerusalem is to be conquered in the first phase of the eschatological battle and is to be the centre and base from which the remainder of the war against the nations will be waged. This may be seen from the following. First, as a preliminary to the opening battle "the exiled sons of light return from the Desert of the Peoples to camp in the Desert of Jerusalem." (1QM 1.3). The mention of returning exiles and Jerusalem already suggests that a return to the Holy City may be in view. After

1. See the studies of B. Gärtnert (Temple (1965) 16-46) and Klinzing (Umdeutung, 50-166). See further p 173 n 1 and appendix 4.

2. M. Baillet ("Recueil Liturgique" (1961) 250) has drawn attention to the lack of sectarian bias throughout this document, but that is not at all to say that its ideas are foreign to the Qumran community. With the support of the other evidence we may safely see here the continuing significance of Jerusalem in the piety of the Covenanters.

the first phase of the war there are instructions for the arrangement of Temple worship (1QM 2.1-6)\(^1\) which would make good sense in relation to a relocation of the Community to Jerusalem. That such a relocation occurs is confirmed in 3.10f: "the trumpets of return from battle against the enemy when they journey to the congregation in Jerusalem". Jerusalem has become home again for the Covenanters. Moreover, Jerusalem as the fortified centre from which the battle is directed, lies behind the directive in 7.3f that "No boy or woman shall enter their camps, from the time they leave Jerusalem and march out to war until they return". Thus, despite their present separation from Jerusalem as a place polluted, the city remains for the Covenanters the Holy City of the end-time.

One point at which the Qumran community stands closer to the thought of IEnoch than Pss. Sol. is in the emphasized role played by the saints in the eschatological war. The messianic role in the battle is acknowledged (1QSb 5.23-29; 1QM 11.4-7; 1QIsa\(^a\) 8-10. 8-24; 4QTest 9-13), but the emphasis falls squarely on the role of the saints as the army of the Lord (1QM passim; 1QH 4.26f; 6.29f; 1QS 10.19; 1QSa 1, 20f; 1QpHab 5.4).

There are indications that the regime in Jerusalem may have been thought of as contaminated by Gentiles: they "followed the festivals of the nations (4QHos\(^b\) 2.16); "They exchanged (true teaching) for lips of uncircumcision, and for a foreign tongue of a people without understanding" (1QH 2.18f).\(^2\) And at least for some purposes the regime was bunched together with the Gentiles: "for they

\(^1\) Gaston suggests (No Stone, 126) that this sacrificial worship would take place not in Jerusalem but in the battle-field. However, since the worship relates to the whole Congregation and not just the army (2.1.3-5), and since the army leaves the Congregation behind to go out to war (3.11; 7.3f; cf. also the conscription arrangements of 2.7-10 (Y. Yadin, War (1962) 65-70)), we can be sure that sacrifice in the army camp is not in question.

\(^2\) Compare also 4QpNah 1.1: "... a dwelling place for the ungodly of the nations".
are not reckoned in His Covenant" (1QS 5.11). The universal classification of men as either "sons of light" or "sons of darkness" (1QM 1.1 and often) certainly leads to a lack of distinction between the Gentiles and the apostates in Jerusalem, and in the eschatological battle the apostates are simply considered the allies of the nations (1QM 1.2). A secret festering hatred was encouraged against those in Jerusalem: the rules for the master of the community include "everlasting hatred in a spirit of secrecy for the men of perdition" (1QS 9.21f). It is not always clear against whom precisely the Covenanters are expressing their hatred when they dream of wielding the sword of God in the day of vengeance.1

But in the following we may at least say that those transgressors of the Covenant in Jerusalem are included: 1QH 6.29f; 4.26f; 1QM 1.2. In 1QS 9.23 the direction of the master of the Community to zeal "for the Precept whose time is for the Day of Revenge", seems to point to a participation by the community in this revenge on the "men of perdition" (cf. 9.21f) in Jerusalem,2 as does 10.19f: "I will not grapple with (נָעַבָּד) the men of perdition until the Day of Revenge, but my wrath shall not turn from

.........

1. If we should translate 4QpNah 4.3 with Vermes: "this concerns Manasseh in the final age, whose kingdom shall be brought low by Israel", then this would be a paradigm statement of the Covenanters' military aspirations against the regime in Jerusalem. However, there is a measure of uncertainty about the translation. נָעַבָּד is more often taken as "kingdom over Israel" (J.M. Allegro, DJD 5 (1968); E. Lohse, Texte (1971)) although there is no support from the OT or Qumran for נָעַבָּד in this sense. Another possibility is "his kingdom will fail in Israel". This seems linguistically acceptable, though there are no available instances in the Old Testament or Qumran of נָעַבָּד for comparison. The main point in favour of translating "by Israel" is the identification in 3.5 of "Israel" with the Covenanters. ("Israel" also occurs in 1.8 and 1.12 but the texts are too incomplete to provide a certain sense.)

2. CD 6.15 in context shows that "men of perdition" at least includes the apostates in Jerusalem, though on other occasions it may have a wider reference.
the men of falsehood, and I will not rejoice until judgement is made." Since we have already seen above that Jerusalem is to be taken in the first phase of the eschatological war, we may conclude that the judgement on Jerusalem runs parallel to and is conceived in the same terms as that upon the Gentile nations at the hands of the Covenants.¹

For our purposes it is of interest to note some Qumran references in which the fabric of the city is closely linked with the wickedness of those in possession of it. The application to Jerusalem in 4QTest 22ff of Joshua's curse on the rebuilding of Jericho (Josh 6.26) is striking. It continues (25f): "They have rebuilt Jerusalem and have set up a wall and towers to make of it a stronghold of ungodliness ...." Then in 1QpHab 10.9f we read of "The Spouter of Lies who led many astray that he might build his city of vanity with blood ...."² The Temple was certainly regarded as defiled (1QpHab 12.8f) and unfit for use (CD 6.11-14).

There is no direct evidence in the Qumran documents for an intention to destroy the Jerusalem Temple. On the basis of Allegro's reconstruction of the text, Gaston puts forward the possibility that 1QpIsa³ may reflect a belief that the messiah will destroy the Temple, but admits that "the text is too fragmentary".³ I have

¹. This aspect of the Covenants' aspirations may have been missed because of the attribution of the function of judging Jerusalem to "the chief of the kings of Greece" (CD 8.11) or "the army of the Kittim" (1QpHab 9.7 and cf. 4QpNah 1.3). However, in Pss. Sol. 17 we already have a judgement at the hands of the Gentiles (vv 8-15), and then a further judgement at the hands of the Messiah (vv 23-7).

². We may compare 1 Enoch 89.73, where the impression is given that the Second Temple was polluted by impure bread on the table right from the time of its erection; also T. Levi 16.1, where it is said of the whole post-exilic period "I have learnt that for 70 weeks ye shall go astray, and profane the priesthood, and pollute the sacrifices."

³. P.D. Hanson, Apocalyptic (1975) 161-86, considers that contemporary with the construction of the Second Temple, there was a visionary group condemning the whole enterprise.

³. No Stone, 151f.
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already shown (p 167 n 1) that Gaston's identification of "the house of judgement" with the Temple in 1QpHab 8.2 & 10.3 is not well founded and thus his further tentative suggestion that 10.4f describes the judgement of the Temple cannot be followed. The "reorganization of Temple worship" in 1QM 2 might seem at first blush to preclude its destruction. However, this would be a hasty judgement. The unpublished Temple Scroll contains directions for the building of a Temple whose requirements would not at all be satisfied by Herod's Temple. It would then be quite fitting that Herod's Temple should be destroyed in the judgement inflicted by the Covenanters on Jerusalem, and a new one built up out of the ruins. It is really no argument against this suggestion that it would be an impossible task in the short period available in the midst of the war schedule. The whole War Scroll (1QM) witnesses to an expectation of divine help to a degree that made practical considerations well nigh irrelevant. Thus, while this falls far short of a proof

1. Ibid. 126f.
2. See p 169 n 1.
4. Ibid., 138.
5. For a discussion of the plan of the war in 1QM see Y. Yadin, War, 18-37.

We need also to reckon with the possibility of a Temple/City coming down ready-made from heaven as in Rev 21. In 5Q15, 1Q32 and 2Q24, as well as other fragments, we are certainly dealing with the remains of a literary piece of the genre of Ezek 40-48. However, it is not clear how the City and Temple are to be provided.

6. If we may accept a close relationship between Qumran and the Essenes, it is instructive to set alongside the evident militaristic ambitions of the War Scroll Philo's words in Quod Omn 78: "As for darts, javelins, daggers, or the helmet, breastplate or shield, you could not find a single manufacturer of them, nor, in general, any person making weapons or engines or plying any industry concerned with war, ..."

1. Ibid. 167 n 1.
that the Covenanters entertained any intention of destroying the Temple, it does indicate how well such an intention would mesh with what is known of their views.¹

This material which we have reviewed from 1 Enoch, Pss. Sol. and Qumran may all be termed sectarian,² and, with the possible exception of 1 Enoch, schismatic.³ And it would seem that it is to these sectarian sources that we must look for materials congenial to the sentiment of Mk 14.58. While the "godly" in Jerusalem itself may well anticipate a judgement at the hands of the Gentiles, only sectarian who are in some sense schismatic are likely to anticipate a military judgement on Jerusalem at the hands of the righteous and/or the Messiah. Further, as Gaston has pointed out,⁴ while it is easy to imagine a Samaritan Messiah setting out to destroy the Jerusalem Temple, we may be sure that only schismatics who continue to revere Jerusalem as the Holy City could envisage a re-establishment of the cult there in a renewed Temple.

Since our interest is in the force of the accusation against Jesus and against the early Christians, it will be of some importance for our use of Qumran materials in our inquiry that we be able to assume that the general thinking of Qumran-like groups was not just a jealously guarded secret of the groups, quite unknown in the wider community. There is no doubt that the greatest care

¹ The material gathered here on the Qumran attitude to the Temple has relevance to the question of whether the Covenanters offered sacrifice. A detailed consideration of the question is outside the scope of the present study. However, since the view being presented here would be overturned by Qumran sacrifice in the Jerusalem Temple, that possibility is considered with reference to Jos. Ant. 18.19 in appendix 4, where there is also a bibliography on Qumran sacrificial practice and a brief statement of my own view.

² Dupont-Sommer, Qumran, 296,337 has drawn attention to the "Essene affinities" of 1 Enoch and Pss. Sol.

³ Qumran requires no documentation. In Pss. Sol. see Ps 17.6 and Ps 18.

⁴ No Stone, 150.
was taken to preserve Community teaching as exclusively for the initiated, but there are a number of factors which encourage us to believe that the general ethos, if not always the specific teachings of the community, would be known to a wider public. We draw attention to the following:

1. The movement had had quite a long history by middle first century.

2. A critical attitude to the Temple, which forbade normal participation in its worship, could not be disguised.

3. Their distancing themselves from the community at large was by its very nature a public matter.

4. The rules relating to apostasy and expulsion (IQS 7.16-25, etc.) must have sent some disgruntled Covenanters back into the wider community; such apostates would have made something known of what they had abandoned.

1. IQS 4.6 speaks of "faithful concealment of the mysteries of truth". For the Essenes we read (Jos. J.W. 2.141) of an oath "to report none of their secrets to others, even though tortured to death."

2. We assume here a close relationship between the Qumran community and the Essenes. For an outline of the state of the debate see J.A. Sanders, "Scrolls" (1973) 120-125. Sanders speaks of "the total omission of reference to /the Teacher of Righteousness/ in the classical sources" on the Essenes (124). Could it be that Jos. J.W. 2.145 contains just such a reference: "After God they hold most in awe the name of their lawgiver, any blasphemer of whom is punished with death"? Dupont-Sommer (Qumran, 31 n 3) has also offered this suggestion.

3. At least from the Hasmonean period and probably a good deal earlier. Sanders, "Scrolls", 120f lists the various datings suggested for the founding of the community by those who accept identification with the Essenes.

4. This remains true, however we construe the difficult text in Jos: Ant. 18.19.

5. Josephus has them living "in every town" (J.W. 2.124), but portrays their life as entirely self-contained within their own community (with the sole exception of the adoption of other (continued...)
5. Philo (Quod Omn 12) and Jos. (J.W. 2.119-161)
certainly have a good awareness of the general shape of Qumran-like attitudes. If Josephus' was from personal experience (Life. 11), then this was an experience available to others as well.

6. While it is hard to imagine it of the Qumran Covenanters, there were folk of Essene background taking part in the affairs of the wider community (Jos. J.W. 2.567; Ant. 13.311; 15.371-8; 17.346 etc.) and thus facilitating a public awareness of Essene attitudes.

5. (continued...) men's children) even to the extent that those evicted are said to starve to death (143f). Philo repeats this impression of separation and adds to it by informing us that the Essene communities avoid large centres of population (Quod Omn 76) and had no commercial interaction with the outside world (78).

Cf. 1Q5 5.14-20.


1. The failure of Philo and Josephus to record the militaristic hopes of the Essenes does not necessarily indicate the success of the Covenanters' attempts to maintain confidentiality, nor does the failure of the authorities to deal savagely with the potential insurrection (contrast the characteristic response of Felix to those led out into the desert in Jos. J.W. 2.258-60).

For Josephus, who stands strongly opposed to religious messianism, these future hopes would have seemed an unfortunate blemish on the otherwise model stance of these people on practical piety and submission to authorities. (It is notable at what length he writes of the Essene party compared with his brief dismissal of Sadducees and Pharisees - in the Loeb edition Essenes occupy more than seven pages of J.W., Sadducees and Pharisees warrant less than one between them!). Since their pattern of life was anything but militaristic, Josephus could well have deliberately omitted what for him detracted from these moral exemplars, and from his point of view would appear to stand in contradiction to their manner of life. We may suspect that what he and others "outside" would not have known was how central to the movement were its dreams of vengeance.

Again, "Philo has to be read critically, for he wanted desperately to show how Judaism met and surpassed all the best tests of goodness and virtue of his own day. We must especially be cautious about his words on the Essenes simply because they must have come closer than any other sect to his own highly spiritualized ideal of the Jewish Life." (Sanders, "Scrolls", 125).

From the point of view of the authorities, the practical pacifism and low profile of the Qumran groups would weigh more heavily than the whispers that would undoubtedly have reached them of the "crackpot" views which the groups held about the future.
I am not of course arguing for the kind of public knowledge of Qumran teaching which would make it possible to claim that the accusation (Mk 14.58) sets out to identify Jesus as a Qumran Covenanter, only that Qumran-type thinking would be a sufficiently known quantity for it to provide the background against which the accusation is historically intelligible. This appears to me to be justified by the above considerations. Before we consider further the implications of this Qumran background for understanding the particular point of the accusation in Mk 14.58, we turn our attention once more to the Temple restoration statement.

6. Eschatological Temple Renewal

Once granted that the restoration statement was part of the logion used in accusation, it would seem unnecessary to argue at any length that the restoration of the Temple, in the accusing sense, is to be understood against the background of hopes for an eschatological renewal of the Temple. For a Christian sense, we may consider applying it to the community or to Jesus Himself, but these are not real options in the accusation, where the sense must be controlled by a formal identity between the Jerusalem Temple to be destroyed and the Temple to be renewed. Gaston has argued, on the basis of the Zion traditions,¹ that a renewed Temple was of minimal importance in the eschatological expectations of the period. His argument is less than convincing but it is sufficient here to note that even he is obliged to admit that "there is evidence that some groups expected a new temple in the age to come."²

1. No Stone, 105-112.
2. Ibid., 162.
To indicate the existence of a hope in the eschatological renewal of the Temple we draw attention to the following. The vision in Ezek 40-48 of a New Jerusalem and Temple "nourishes hope with pictures which can never be fulfilled in any actual Temple here below."¹ Isa 2.1-4 offers a future prospect of an elevated Temple as "the focal point of all nations".² Hag 2.6-9 suggests a glorious eschatological renewal of the embarrassingly inadequate Zerubbabel Temple. That such a hope was not just a short-lived enthusiasm is shown by the incorporation of this Haggai expectation into Tobit’s apocalyptic survey of future history (14.5). The possibility that this hope was about to be fulfilled in the Maccabean period lies behind the hopes expressed in 2 Mac 2.17f.³

Before 70 AD it was not normally anticipated that the provision of the glorious eschatological Temple would involve the removal of the old Temple. However, it seems that we do have one genuine pre-70 AD instance of such an expectation in 1 Enoch⁴ 90.28f:

And I stood up to see till they folded up that old house; and carried off all the pillars, and all the beams and ornaments of the house were at the same time folded up with it, and they carried it off and laid it in a place in the south of the land. And I saw till the Lord of the sheep brought a new house greater and loftier than the first, and set it up in the place of the first which had been folded up: all its pillars were new, and its ornaments were new and larger than those of the first, the old one which He had taken away, and all the sheep were within it.

1. Schrenk, ἰερὸς, 239.
2. Ibid.
3. The time of gathering in v 18 is in v 7 (cf. v 5) the time for the recovery of the tabernacle, ark, and altar of incense, hidden by Jeremiah (v 5), and further, the time when the glory of the Lord and the cloud shall appear (v 8), as it had done to Moses and at Solomon's dedication of the Temple.
It is true that where they may be distinguished in 1 Enoch 85-90, "house" refers to the city and "tower" to the Temple. But there are some indications in the text that the distinction clearly made in 89,50 (and cf. v 73) is not consistently maintained and that there is a certain merging of the two concepts. Frequently the two function together as a unity, having the same things predicated of them: both are forsaken by the sheep (v 54); forsaken by God (v 56); destroyed (v 66) and restored (vv 72f). Then there are some stylistic touches which encourage us in the direction of treating "house" and "tower" as synonymous. In v 66 "They burnt that tower and demolished that house" looks like synonymous parallelism. In vv 72f work is commenced on the reconstruction of the "house". The work is interrupted, then recommenced, then, surprisingly, what is said to emerge from their labours is not "house" but the "tower": "They began again to build as before, and they reared up that tower." The third stylistic touch is in v 67 where we read: "I became exceedingly sorrowful over that tower", not because it (i.e. the tower) had been destroyed but, "because that house of the sheep was demolished".

In v 51, "those sheep ... forsok their house" refers to the aftermath of the separation of the Northern Kingdom. Now, against the background of the accounts in Kings and Chronicles, the only sense in which Jerusalem can be said to have been forsaken is that the people stopped coming there to the Temple to worship.

1. P. Volz, Eschatologie (1934) 217 has pointed this out against J. Jeremias, Weltvollder (1930) 38f. Gaston, No Stone, 111, is keen to press the distinction.

2. This verse and the preceding one exhibit the uses of synonyms: "to slay and to destroy"; "the lions and tigers"; "eat (sic.) and devoured".

3. The people did forsake the "house of David" (1 Kgs 12.19), but this act is firmly linked with Shechem (v 16 cf. v 1) and can hardly be termed a forsaking of Jerusalem.
in that same context in v 54 the "house" becomes the "house of the Lord" (cf. 1 Kgs 12.27), it is hard not to feel that we are dealing with a Temple concept.

Even if one allows in general that there is a certain merging of concepts, the words in 90.29, "all the sheep were within it" may seem to point to "city" and not "Temple" and suggest that the clear distinction of 89.50 can be applied here in 90.28f. However, this impression cannot be sustained in the light of 89.36, where it is said of "a house" which must be the Wilderness Tabernacle, "that sheep became a man and built a house for the Lord of the sheep, and placed all the sheep in that house". Here, despite the fact that it (inconceivably) holds all the "sheep", the "house" is certainly a sanctuary.

A final consideration with regard to the nuance of "house" in 90.28f is a possible literary relationship with 1 Mac 4.45f. The dismantling of the old "house", laying it by in a convenient place, and the provision of a new one in its place, are strongly reminiscent ..........

1. It may offer some clarification of the uses of "tower" and "house" to suggest that at times in the imagery of 1 Enoch all Jerusalem has become the Temple = "house", while the "tower" has become the mercy-seat. (Cf. 1 Enoch 89.50, "the Lord of the sheep stood on that tower", with Ps 80.1, "Thou who art enthroned upon the Cherubim"; and 1 Enoch 89.73 "they began again to place a table before the tower", with the position of the table for the bread of the presence (Ex 40.22). "House" and "tower" can then be used as synonyms with the mercy-seat as the essence of the Temple standing symbolically for the whole Temple. This symbolism is not disturbed by the historical lack of the ark from the Second Temple.

2. We cannot be sure that the existing text of 1 Maccabees is older than this part of 1 Enoch; however, 1 Maccabees certainly uses older documents, among which Eissfeldt (Introduction, 578) includes an account of the deeds of Judas.

3. "Near": which is translated by Charles "in the south", is literally "on the right" which idiomatically comes easily to mean "near at hand", "accessible" or "convenient". Since we have a translation history to allow for in both cases this brings the sense very close to the ἐμπρόσθεν of 1 Macc 4.46.
of the same actions with regard to the profaned altar of burnt offerings in 1 Mac 4.45f. It may be that in 1 Enoch the author uses the literary model provided by this description of the demolition and replacement of the profaned altar to portray the coming destruction and renewal of "the house". Such an exercise would have particular point if the posture here is critical to that purification, and we are being offered an eschatological alternative. Be that as it may, if there is a connection between these verses and 1 Mac 4.45f, then cultic profanation is very much in view and the thought of the writer is not far from the Temple which is for him the primary object of profanation (1 Enoch 89.73).

If this analysis of 1 Enoch 90.28f is unacceptable, then it is post-70 AD before we can certainly point to a hope that assumes the removal of the old Temple for the provision of the gloriously renewed eschatological Temple. At that stage the destruction clause is inevitable and it is of more interest that the hope should have

1. Schrenk, Enoch, 239, already links 1 Enoch 90.28f to the profanation of the altar when he says, "It is to the effect that the unpretentious house of Zerubbabel, which has now been desecrated by the Syrian, will be replaced in the Messianic period."

If historical experience plays any part in shaping the hope expressed in 1 Enoch 90.28f, then the Maccabean experience of profanation and renewal in the Temple offers itself for these purposes as a recent and dramatic national experience.

2. It is not possible here to pursue this possibility, which is offered merely as a tenative suggestion. In 2 Macc 2.17f the purification of the Temple by Judas seems to stand as a possible first instalment of the hoped for eschatological renewal of the Temple. (Cf. p 177 and n 3.)

3. It is possible but not certain that 1 Enoch 91.13 presupposes the removal of the old Temple. Also, if we press for a literal sense of destruction for נ"ן ו"נ in Dan 9.26, then 9.24 may imply the provision of a new Temple after the destruction of the old. However, such an understanding would raise many problems. If Charles, Pseudepigrapha, 313 is right that T. Levi 15.1 is a genuine prediction, then it represents an anticipation of destruction. Josephus J.W. 6.300-309 tells of Jesus b. Ananias heralding the demise of Temple and City. If Koch is right to date Tg. Isa 52.13 - 53.12 as pre-Christian (see below p 186 n 2.); this would provide another instance where the removal of the old Temple is assumed. (continued...)
survived at all. The very survival of the hope shows that despite the expressions (arising out of Hag 2) of the hope in terms of a continuity between the existing Temple and the eschatological Temple, there was no deep commitment to such a continuity.

This is as we might expect of people whose religious memory included the destruction of Solomon's Temple and its replacement by the Second Temple, or nearer to their own time, people who had had their Temple virtually demolished and rebuilt in Herod's building campaigns.

Even in expressions of future hopes before 70 AD there is much that expresses the discontinuity between the present and the ultimate Temple. Haggai himself sets a shaking of "the heaven and the earth and the sea and the dry land" between his Temple and the eschatological Temple (Hag 2.6); and the kind of radical renewal that elevates mountains (Isa 2.2) and transforms nature (Ezek 47.1-12) is in general antipathetic to historical continuity. 2 Mac 2.5-8 already anticipates that the ultimate Temple will include the Tabernacle, Ark, and Altar of Incense which were missing from the Second Temple. From Qumran 5Q15, 1Q32, 2Q24 and other fragments are remains of a literary piece of the genre of Ezek 40-48. They manifest an eschatological hope for a Temple and City radically different from the Jerusalem of their day. In a rather different way, the Temple Scroll, containing instructions for the building of a Temple, looks forward to the

.........

3. (continued...)

We may take 2 Apoc. Bar. 32.2ff as a paradigmatic expression of the post-70 AD hope in vaticinium ex eventu form: "But that building will not remain, but will again after a time be rooted out, and remain desolate until the time. And afterwards it must be renewed in glory, and perfected for evermore."

.........

1. See p 172 n 3.
replacement of the Jerusalem Temple. Wis 9.8 introduces us to the idea that the Jerusalem Temple was μήματος θεού ἡ ἡγεμόνεσσα. This idea, extended to the whole city, played a part in removing any sense of ultimacy from the destruction in 70 AD:

2 Apoc. Bar. 4.2-7. Dost thou think that this is the city of which I said: "On the palms of my hands have I graven thee"? This building ... is not that which was prepared beforehand ... and I showed it to Adam ... again also I showed it to Moses on Mount Sinai when I showed him the likeness of the tabernacle and all its vessels.

McKelvey rightly notes that the context in 2 Apoc. Bar. implies the future descent of the heavenly Jerusalem to the earth. Unfortunately we cannot be sure of the emergence before 70 AD of the notion of the

1. Also 4QFlor 1.6 may plausibly be understood as referring to a literal eschatological Temple, built by God himself. This view is argued most carefully by G. Klinzing (Umdeutung, 80-87). D. Flusser ("Notes" (1959) 99-104) has a similar view. Cf. J. Allegro, "Fragments" (1958) 352; J. Carmignac, Textes II (1963) 282 n 14. The concept of community as temple is found here by: H. Kosmala, Hebrecter (1959) 373; J.A. Fitzmyer, "2 Cor 6,14-7,1" (1961) 278; O. Michel and O. Betz, "Gezeucht" (1960) 9; Gärnter, Temple, 30ff; J.M. Baumgarten, "Exclusion" (1972) 95. J.D. Amusin ("Iz kumranskoj antologii eschatologičeskich tekstov (4Q Florilegium)" (1965) 59) thinks that "a human temple" emphasizes the "spirituality" and "humanity" of this sanctuary (according to Z. Kapera, "Review" (1967) 145-9).

2. Cf. also Odes. Sol. 4.2 "For Thy sanctuary Thou designedst before Thou didst make special places."

3. Charles, Pseudepigrapha, 482 is surely mistaken in considering that the earthly Jerusalem is here derided. It is certainly contrasted with the one to be revealed, but that is in order to show how it is possible that the Holy City could have been destroyed. The suggestion that the section serves to show the lack of ultimacy of the destruction does better justice to the context than does McKelvey's suggestion (Temple, 33) that the concern is "to make it plain that the city in question will not be made by the hand of man and thus will not suffer the fate of its predecessor." Baruch's questions in 3.5-9 are concerned with the possibility that the destruction represents an ultimate finality. He is in effect reassured that the City which was destroyed was not the city which really mattered. The overarching question here, and obviously behind the recounting of the destruction in 6.1 - 8.5, is "how can that destruction have been allowed to take place?"

4. Ibid., 33. Cf. Apoc. Ab. 29 ("the place prepared beforehand for them, which thou sawest devastated in the picture", translation by G.H. Box, Apocalypse (1919)); 4 Ezra 10.53f; 2 Enoch 55.2.
archetypal Jerusalem/Temple coming down to earth as the end-time City/Temple.¹

Since it is clear that a continuity between the Second Temple and the eschatological Temple is no essential component of pre-70 AD eschatological hopes, this hope would easily incorporate a destruction of Temple and City when formulated by any who had other reasons for considering such a judgement to be imminent.²

7. Messiah as Temple Restorer

We have yet to give specific attention to the agency of a messianic figure in the programme of destruction and renewal. It has already been shown that while there are no certain instances before 70 AD of an anticipated destruction of the Temple by the Messiah, the idea comes as no surprise against the background of Qumran-like thinking. With regard to the building of the eschatological Temple, it is generally assumed that this was infrequently, but from time to time quite definitely, attributed in Jewish tradition to the Messiah.³ However Gaston has made a sharp attack on this assumption and we must consider afresh the evidence for connecting the Messiah to the rebuilding of the Temple.⁴

1. Before 70 AD we do have "the present Jerusalem" and "Jerusalem above" of Gal 4.25f. This presumably is linked to the idea of an archetypal Jerusalem, and the context implies that "Jerusalem above" is thought of in some sense as an eschatological entity. This is suggestive, but falls short of giving us confidence that the end-time descent of the City was hoped for prior to 70 AD.

2. The Qumran Covenanters come to mind at one, also cf. p 180 n 3.

3. Hummel (Auseinandersetzung, 93) and Klinzing (Umdeutung, 204 n 13) may be offered as representatives. Str-B I, 1004f is regularly cited as the authority for this view. Jeremias (Weltvollender, 35ff) has argued for a Messianic building of the Temple from the ancient oriental pattern of enthronement and cult renewal - a pattern which he applies to the entry of Jesus into Jerusalem and the cleansing of the Temple. His argument is too speculative to be convincing.


5. For another recent assessment in the light of Gaston's (continued...)
We begin with a look at the material which Gaston attempts to discredit. Tg. Zech 6.12f reads:

Thus said Yahweh of hosts: this man, Messiah is his name, will be revealed and grow and build the temple of Yahweh. He will build the temple of Yahweh and he will exalt its splendor and he will sit and rule on his throne, and there will be the high priest by his throne, and the kingdom of peace will be between them.¹

Gaston points out that there is little change from the Masoretic text. The Masoretic text does not, he argues, express a hope that the Messiah would build the Temple.² Therefore, we can have no confidence that such a hope finds expression in the Targum.

Now while we can agree that the changes from the Masoretic text are few, they do seem to be of the greatest importance for showing that the Targum does in fact express a messianic hope. In the Targum נַנֶּֽי (branch) has become יְהַבְּשֵׁךְ (Messiah), which at once disposes of Gaston's difficulty that the figure only becomes the Messiah. For this rendering the targumist has sacrificed the verbal link in v 12 between נַנֶּֽי (branch) and נֵלָע (he will grow up), which has by contrast been faithfully preserved in the LXX רָצְבִּית and רֵבָּקָה. This would seem to make best sense if our targumist felt an overriding obligation to point up for his readers the messianic prophecy which he saw here. We should consider further that the very phrase יְהַבְּשֵׁךְ יְהַבְּשֵׁךְ points to an absolute understanding of the word נַנֶּֽי.

5. (continued...) attack see D. Juel, Messiah (1977) 172-97. He stands opposed to Gaston, but is unable to confidently identify an early tradition of messianic Temple building.

1. The translation is that of Gaston, ibid., 149.

2. Ibid., 149 and n 2; the anointing of Zerubbabel and Joshua is located after the completion of the Temple; actually God builds the Temple; the prophecy is not fulfilled and Zerubbabel's name is deleted from the text. It is not entirely clear how Gaston relates these various points.
(he will be revealed) is another change from the Masoretic text which introduces a word with wide ranging eschatological connections and thus encourages a messianic understanding.

It is difficult to be sure what is meant by מ"ל נמה.\(^1\) Does the splendour belong to the Messiah or to the Temple? If Gaston is right to translate "and he (i.e. the Messiah) will exalt its (i.e. the Temple's) splendour", then there is another consideration which may be relevant here. If these verses of Zechariah were understood messianically before the destruction of the Second Temple, then the building of the Temple would have been understood as an improvement of the existing structure (cf. Tob 14.5: εἰς τὸν θυσίαν...οἰκοδομήθη εἰς τὸν θυσίαν). Could it be that "he will exalt its splendour" already belongs to a pre-70 AD targum tradition and explains the sense in which one could speak of the Messiah building the already existing Temple? Since we can offer no reasons for preferring the one translation to the other, this remains conjectural, but certainly possible.\(^2\)

Gaston dismisses the reference in Tg. Isa 53.5 to the Messiah building the Temple as simply a gloss from Tg. Zech 6.13,\(^3\) but this will hardly do. In the Targum as it now stands, the messianic building of the Temple is an integral part of the whole section Isa 52.13 - 53.12, as Hegermann himself points out.\(^4\) The only sense in which we may speak of a gloss is that Hegermann has made a good case

1. J. -J. Brière-Narbonne (Exégèse (1936) 60) translates "lui-même portera la Gloire".

2. As Jué (Messiah, 190) notes, מ"ל נמה is used as a designation of the Messiah before the Christian era. This increases the likelihood that the targum represents a pre-Christian tradition.


for the present Targum on this section being a radical revision of an earlier Targum which followed closely the Masoretic text. ¹ This merely confirms a somewhat later date for the extant Targum on Isa 52.13 - 53.12, which is already suggested by its suitability as anti-Christian polemic. ² The use of Tg. Zech 6.13 in Tg. Isa 53.5 confirms the messianic understanding of Tg. Zech 6.12f argued above and indicates that this understanding of the Messiah's role in restoring the Temple was sufficiently widespread to be made the basis of reinterpretation in Tg. Isa 53.5.

⁹ Levr. Rab. 9.6 offers as a possible explanation of the phrase "Awake, O North" in Cant 4.16, that "the Messianic King (נַחֲמָה יַחֶרֶן) whose place is in the north will come and rebuild the Sanctuary which is situated in the south." According to Gaston "it is not clear whether the reference is only to Cyrus or also to a future Messiah".³ This uncertainty seems to be quite unnecessary.

¹ See Stone, 149.


³ K. Koch, "Messias" (1972) 117-148 has more recently argued for a pre-Christian dating of the existing Targum Is 52.13 - 53.12. Hegermann's case remains the more plausible. However, should Koch be correct we would have here not only an early instance of the Messiah being associated with the building of the (eschatological) Temple, but also a reference where the need for the rebuilding is linked with the profanation of the existing structure, and presumably the implication that the existing structure is marked out for destruction. Koch considers the viewpoint to be similar to that of the Qumran community (136).

1. Ibid., 66-94, esp. 79f.


³ No Stone, 149.
standard designation of the Messiah¹ (see Gen. Rab. 1.6; Ex. Rab. 35.5; Lev. Rab. 34.8; Num. Rab. 13.2 and often). Only once (Esth. Rab. 2.1) is Cyrus termed anointed (and then not נֶשֶׁר יָרָן) and then only in a quotation of Isa 45.1, and furthermore, in a passage where the focus of interest is obviously quite elsewhere than on his anointing.

In Lev. Rab. 9.6 two other alternatives are provided for understanding "Awake, 0 North". They are as a reference to the return of the northern exiles or as a reference to the eschatological coming of Gog from the north. The parallels in Num. Rab. 13.2 and Cant. Rab. 4.16.1 make quite clear what we would already expect: that it is the eschatological return rather than the sixth century return of exiles which is in view. Thus we have two eschatological explanations and will expect the third also to offer an eschatological rather than an historical event. This is in any case quite clear in Cant. Rab. 4.16.1 where the three are not alternatives, but aspects of a single complex of eschatological events.

Thus, despite Gaston's reservations, Lev. Rab. 9.6 offers us a clear instance of a Jewish tradition that ascribes the rebuilding of the Temple to the Messiah.²

Sib. Or. 5.414ff reads:

For there shall come from the plains of heaven a blessed man (15) with the sceptre in his hand which God has committed to his clasp: (16) and he has won fair dominion over all, and has restored to all (17) the good the wealth which the former men took (18). And he has destroyed every city from its foundations with sheets of fire, (19) and burnt up

1. A reference which both unambiguously identifies נֶשֶׁר יָרָן as the Messiah and predicates of him the building of the Temple is Gen. Rab. 97 where, we are told that Solomon built the first Temple, Zerubbabel built the Second Temple and נֶשֶׁר יָרָן will rebuild the Temple. It needs to be noted, however, that this is part of the exposition of Gen 49, and therefore belongs to what is considered to be a younger recension (H.L. Strack, Introduction (1931) 218).

2. The tradition is associated with R. Eliezar, a Tannah of the first and second centuries (J.J. Slotki, Index volume to the Soncino Talmud, London, 1952).
the families of men who before wrought evil, (20) and the city which God loved he made (21) more radiant than the stars and the sun and the moon; (22) and he set it as the jewel of the world, and made a temple (23) exceedingly fair in its fair sanctuary, and fashioned it (24) in size of many furlongs, with a giant tower (25) touching the very clouds, seen of all, (26) so that all the faithful and all the righteous may see (27) the glory of the invisible God, the vision of delight .... (32) It is the last time of the saints, when God accomplishes these things. (33) God the sender of thunder, the Creator of the great Temple.¹

Gaston disqualifies this passage² by identifying the ἄνη ἐκείνης of line 414 with "God who accomplishes these things, God the sender of thunder, the Creator of the great Temple (lines 432f)". The only basis for this identification is the predication of the building of the Temple both of God and of the "blessed man". It seems preferable, however, with Volz,³ to compare lines 108-110 where a similar double attribution occurs and where there can be no question of identity, and to understand lines 432f in terms of God acting through the instrumentality of the Messiah. The attributing of deeds both to God and to his instruments is characteristic of the Old Testament,⁴ and is the most natural reading here. Thus, contra Gaston, we have expressed here a hope at the end of the first century AD⁵ that the Messiah would build the eschatological Temple.

1. Line 422 is mutilated but the general sense is not in doubt.
3. Eschatologie, 181f.
4. Isa 45,1-7 may be cited as an example of the close interweaving of the roles of God and of his instruments in the achieving of his purposes.
5. For the date see J.J. Collins, Oracles (1974) 75.
Finally with regard to Gaston's case, it may be worth setting alongside his judgement that "the Messiah ... is never connected either with the new Temple or the renewed cult",¹ a quotation from Targum Onkelos on Gen 49.11:

Israel will go round about his /i.e. the Messiah's/ towns, the people will build his temple, the just will be round about him and be observant of the law under his instruction.²

The Messiah here is not the builder, but the text exhibits just the "royal chapel" concept which Gaston is happy to acknowledge of the first Temple, but will not admit of the eschatological Temple.³

A passage not considered by Gaston is Sib. Or. 3.286ff:

And then the God of heaven shall send a king (87) and shall judge each man with blood and flame of fire. (88) There is a royal tribe, whose family shall (89) never stumble: and this in the circuit of times (90) shall have dominion and shall begin to raise up a new shrine of God. ... (94) and then the Temple shall be again as it was before.

I have argued in appendix 5 that this material expresses an eschatological hope under the guise of a description of the sixth century restoration. If this is so, there still remains some little problem about reading the detailed contours of the future hope out of the description.⁴ Nevertheless, against the background of either Antiochus Epiphanes IV's impoverishment and profanation of the Temple or the

¹. No Stone, 150.
². The translation is that of J. Bowker, Targums (1969) 284.
³. No Stone, 147f.
⁴. Collins, Oracles, 38f makes too much of this reservation.
destruction of 70 AD, it would seem that the hope expressed here must include a messianic act with regard to the Temple.

If we are to accept a second century dating, and be guided by the understanding of 1 Enoch 90.28ff offered earlier, it would be possible to see here an understanding of where the future lay after the profanation of the Temple (i.e. in a replacement of the profaned structure) - an understanding given expression before an alternative procedure was adopted by Judas Maccabeus. Whatever the virtues of this suggestion, we can with some confidence speak of a messianic renewal of the Temple in Sib. Or. 3.286ff.

It appears therefore that a messiah who builds the eschatological Temple is far better attested in Jewish tradition than Gaston will allow. Tg. Zech offers us what could be a pre-70 AD expression of the tradition. Tg. Isa is a later witness to the acceptance of this tradition. In Lev. Rab. 9.6 the tradition is associated with a Rabbi who flourished at the end of the first and the beginning of the second centuries AD. Sib. Or. 5 gives us a late first century expression of the hope within Egyptian Judaism. Then finally, in Sib. Or. 3 it is even possible that we have an expression of this hope which takes us back to the Maccabean period.

1. I argue in appendix 5 that these are the two possible backgrounds for these lines, but that the second century BC date is to be preferred.

2. If S. Zeitlin's reconstruction is followed (Judaean State I (1962) 79f; Prolegomena (1933) ch.5, following H. Willrich, Juden (1895) 27ff and 77ff), then the construction of the Temple at Heliopolis by Onias III in 169-8 BC offers another view of where the future lay in terms of the construction of a replacement Temple. However, see the reasons put forward by V. Tcherikover (Civilization (1966) 275-81) for following Josephus' later account in Ant. 13.62ff; 12.387. See also M. Delcor, "Temple" (1968) 188-193 and the works there cited.

3. The concept of a messianic rebuilding of the Temple would be very near at hand if, as A. Schalit (Herodes (1969) 472-482, esp. 475) maintains, Herod rebuilt the Temple as part of a conscious attempt to fulfil the messianic pattern. However, Schalit's view remains conjectural and in particular he fails to produce any solid (continued...)
Now, even though we have argued the case for the existence of a Jewish tradition associating the Messiah with the building of the eschatological Temple, it is worth pointing out that even if the building of the eschatological Temple is offered as a deed of the Messiah for the first time with reference to Jesus, the notion is perfectly intelligible against the background of first-century Jewish thought. It is clear enough that there was an expectation of a glorified eschatological Temple. Anyone offering to produce it would easily be understood to be promoting himself as the agent of eschatological events.

Perhaps the most obvious comparison is with the "Egyptian false prophet" in the time of Felix mentioned by Jos. Ant. 20.169-72 and J.W. 2.261-63. With an obvious attempt to duplicate the Exodus pattern, this man led his followers, by a circuitous route, from the desert to the Mount of Olives where at his word the walls of Jerusalem were to fall, and having taken the City he would τοις Ἰουσαφᾶς ἔφυγεν. Similar is the "certain imposter" in the days of Festus who promised his dupes "salvation and rest from troubles if they chose to follow him into the wilderness." (Ant. 20.188).


1. We may compare Ant. 20.97ff: a certain Thudas "persuaded the majority of the masses to take up their possessions and to follow him to the Jordan River. He stated that he was a prophet and that at his command the river would be parted and would provide them an easy passage".
In J.W. 2.259 Josephus speaks of deceivers and imposters, under the pretence of divine inspiration fostering revolutionary changes, they persuaded the multitude to act like madmen, and led them out into the desert under the belief that God would there give them tokens of deliverance.

In a detailed study of the revolutionary prophets in Josephus, P.W. Barnett argues that these prophets believed that if only the signs could be made to appear then the hand of God would be activated and, perhaps, other signs would follow, bringing in their train the mighty act of redemption which would set them free.¹

So, whether in directly messianic or other categories, pre-70 AD Judaea was quite familiar with the notion of agents who would enact or precipitate eschatological events.

Finally, in this respect O. Betz² rightly draws attention to 2 Sam 7 and its messianic interpretation in 4QFlor. While the exegetical techniques of Qumran do not guarantee that for the Covenanters, "if the Nathan prophecy is given an eschatological interpretation, the building of the house (i.e. Temple) is a messianic duty",³ it is true that the messianic interpretation of 2 Sam 7 means that, from v 13, a messianic building of the Temple was ready to hand to be incorporated into any suggested messianic programme.⁴

² Betz (1968) 88ff.
³ Ibid., 90.
⁴ If O. Michel and O. Betz ("Gezeugt", 10f) were right in finding in 4QFlor 1.13 a reference to the Messiah saving Israel = the fallen tabernacle of David = the "sanctuary of men" of v 6, then we could almost say that a messianic building of the Sanctuary was attested here. However, Michel and Betz do not make clear how it is possible to construe vv 12f in the way suggested, and the identification of the sanctuary of v 6 with the community is at least disputable. (See p 182 n 1.)
8. Messianic Programme of Mark 14.58

The need at this point is to draw together the results of our survey of this background material, in so far as they may impinge on our understanding of the Temple accusation.

It seems clear that we must understand the proposed destruction of the Temple in terms of a judgement for sin. Further, the agency of the Messiah in the destruction is a notion that sits most comfortably against the background of the kind of schismatic sentiment of which we have an example in the Qumran community. Then, the rebuilding of the Temple is to be viewed as the provision of the eschatological Temple of Jewish hopes. We can say that it had probably already been suggested in some circles that the provision of the new Temple would involve a destruction of the old, and in any case this is the natural form for an eschatological Temple expectation to take in the minds of those who on other grounds expected a judgement on the existing structure. The connection of the Messiah with the rebuilding of the eschatological Temple is well established in Jewish tradition and may even be indicated as early as the second century BC.

Even without this background, if the eschatological Temple were being offered as a deed of the Messiah for the first time in relation to Jesus, the idea would have been easily intelligible against the prevalent more general notion of agents who would enact or precipitate eschatological events.

Against the background of these conclusions I want to ask now: what is the particular force of the Temple accusation in the context of the "trial" scene of Mk 14?

The view has a certain currency, that the accusation
represents an attempt to pin on Jesus a claim to be Messiah. 1
The argument runs: since the Messiah was connected in Jewish
tradition with the building of the eschatological Temple, Jesus'
claim to do so was an implicit claim to be the Messiah. The interest
of the High Priest's second question (V 61b) in the messianic
identity of Jesus is thought to confirm this view.

Now whatever we may think of the historical realities
at the "trial", there seems to me to be one serious objection to
understanding the accusation this way in the Markan redaction.

In Mark the accusation is embedded in the section vv 55-61a,
the main thrust of which is to show that despite every effort to
uncover a cause for condemning Jesus as worthy of death, he shines
through as transparently innocent. Every attempt to make him out a
criminal turns out to be based on false evidence.2

There is a measure of contrast between this section and
the following, vv 61b-65. Jesus' silence in answer to the High
Priest's first question (v 60) gives way to an extended confession
of his own messiahship in answer to the second question (v 61b).

...........

1. E.g. Goguel, Vie, 494; V. Taylor, Mark (1966) 567 and most
insistently O. Betz, Jesus, 89f. In this sense the charge would
have no use in the later Jewish polemic.

2. Note the repetitions: v 56, "many bore false witness"; "their
witness did not agree"; v 57, "some ... bore false witness"; v 59,
"not even so did their testimony agree". Gn1ka, "Verhandlungen", 19f,
recognizes that vv 58f are a repetition and concretization of v 56.
Also note v 61, "He was silent" - there was no charge to
answer (G.S. Sloyan, Trial (1973) 48: "Jesus' innocent silence").
This observation holds true whether we adopt the view of
E. Schweizer (Mark (1971) 325) that v 57b and 59 are specifically
Markan additions, or that of Brandon (Zealots, 253), who considers
that the negation of the witness comes from an earlier Jewish
Christian apologia, or some other view of the pre-history of the
material.
Vv 61b-65 provide a positive counterpart to the negative role played by vv 55-61a. When every accusing claim about Jesus is shown to be groundless, he publicly admits his messiahship. If they are to condemn him it must be for that, for there is nothing else of which he stands guilty.¹

Now, if the point of the accusation in 14.58 were to show that Jesus implicitly claimed to be Messiah, then, in the sense in which they were concerned to affirm it, the accusation would have to be regarded as in fact true of Jesus. It would then not be possible to use it as a sample of the many slanderous accusations made against Jesus, all of them palpably false.² It seems therefore that the point of the accusation must lie elsewhere.

My rejection of the view that the intention of the accusation in 14.58 is to show that Jesus claimed to be Messiah, does not mean

1. Cf. Jn 8.46: "Which of you convicts me of sin? If I tell you the truth, why do you not believe me?" (Cf. v 40: "now you seek to kill me, a man who told you the truth").

2. Goguel (Vie, 494) has already implicitly recognized the force of this objection, when he admits that Mark, who considered the accusation false, failed to see what Goguel considers to have been the force of the accusation in 14.58 at the historical hearing before the High Priest.

J.A. Kleist, ("Witnesses" (1947) 321-23) quite misses the evangelist's intention when he concentrates attention on the technical inadmissibility of the evidence. The evangelist mentions the contradiction to show that the claim was false and slanderous. D. Plooij ("Temple" (1930) 37) is equally wide of the mark when he understands false witness as true but irrelevant witness.
that the accusation is not to be understood in messianic categories. The conclusions of our background study would suggest that we must understand 14.58 in relation to the sphere of eschatological and messianic ideas. The point is rather that it is the supposed programme of Jesus that constitutes the accusation. In the eyes of the accusers the intentions are criminal, quite apart from any questions of messianic identity. Perhaps we can go further and say that, on the understanding of the accusers, one could reject Jesus' claim to be Messiah on the basis of this being his messianic programme. At least we may assume that this is how the accusation functioned in Jewish polemic.

I have already suggested that the thought of Mk 14.58 is best illuminated by setting it against the background of Qumran-like thinking. Now we are somewhat accustomed to expressing Qumran views from an insider's vantage point. For the purposes of the accusation, however, we are interested in seeing things through the eyes of a person who stood somewhere in mainstream Judaism and felt himself integrally part of the Jewish body corporate. The message that such a person would receive from the accusation would be to the effect that Jesus was threatening a take-over in Jerusalem by those who followed him as their messianic leader. A militaristic vengeance was to be wreaked on the representatives of normative Judaism for not adopting the aberrant views of the schismatics. The Temple was to be

1. This word is not meant to suggest a monolithic structure that does not allow for the great freedom and diversity of thought that existed in first century Judaism. I mean it rather to point to those who were bound together by the orthopraxy of the Temple and Synagogue, as opposed to groups in schism like that at Qumran.

2. A view according to which the pious in Jerusalem are just as guilty as the flagrant sinners.
destroyed in the vain hope that God would miraculously help them build a new and better eschatological Temple for the use of the elect.

Now this kind of sentiment had been muttered privately in places like Qumran for a good while and, I have argued above, not without the informed public having some idea of what they were thinking. But at Qumran the messianic figure was still awaited in the future and the absence of any military preparations made it possible to regard this as crazy thinking unrelated to any practical threat. In any case their disquiet had been rumbling for just so long that it was not to be taken too seriously. They were just religious people with a few funny ideas.

However, it was different in the case of Jesus. Here was a public figure, a charismatic figure with quite a following, furthermore a present leader with a programme to offer, not just an anticipated future leader who still belonged to the realm of speculation. Even after the death of Jesus this messianic programme would present a far more realistic face than that offered by Qumran. Christians were convinced that Jesus was alive. They were engaged in active recruiting to their cause. And a certain civil unrest seemed to accompany their proselytizing. Thus, the charge effectively stigmatized the Jesus movement as revolutionary and unfaithful to the orthopraxy of Judaism.

It would seem therefore that the accusation against Jesus in Mk 14.58 has a sense which would have plausibility both as a genuine accusation against Jesus at the "trial" and also as a later Jewish polemic against the spreading Christian movement.


Through the course of the above discussion we have been
directed by a concern to discover whether the accusation against Stephen in Acts 6.14 is the expression of a genuine Jewish polemic against Christianity. I will therefore now draw attention to certain features of that accusation in an effort to compare its sense with that which has been proposed for the Jewish polemical usage of the Temple accusation reported in Mk 14.58.

It is worth noting that a number of aspects of the accusation could be equally directed against the thought of the Qumran community. "Words against this holy place" (v 13) could describe well the Covenanters' conviction that the Temple was polluted. "Words against ... the law" (v 13) and "change the customs which Moses delivered to us" (v 14) would be how the introduction of the Qumran liturgical calendar would appear to an adherent of the Jerusalem Temple.¹ "Destroy this place" (v 14) is not actually attested at Qumran, but fits the militaristic dreams of vengeance prevalent there. All of this suggests that Stephen's Christianity is being caricatured in categories which would fit a movement characterized by Qumran-like ideas.

In the accusation Stephen is said to be anticipating a future act of Jesus, belonging presumably to the period when he

¹ A brief outline of the main features of their calendar is given in Vermes, Scrolls, 42ff.

Christians were of course under suspicion on a far wider front that Qumran, so far as their faithfulness to the Mosaic ordinances. However, since in religious disputes the distinctives tend quickly to become the essentials, we ought not too quickly to conclude that Christians would be considered proportionately that much the worse. Compare the attitude to the Samaritans.

In any case it is worth noting that, with the exception of circumcision, such Ἰκαν as are given precise content in Luke/Acts all have to do with the Temple (see p200 n2).
returns to the earth (cf. Acts 1.11; 3.20). He will destroy the Temple and change the Mosaic customs. The accusation against Stephen is distinguished from Mk 14.58 in two major respects: the Temple renewal clause is missing from Acts 6.14; and in its place we find καὶ ἀλλὰ τὰς ἐν τῷ θεσμῷ τιμίαν. The most likely explanation which can be provided for this change is that "and will change the customs etc." represents a deliberate distortion of the Temple renewal logion in the interests of making the force of the criticism that much more explicit.

It is true that this could be more certainly asserted if the transformed logion had been completed with: "and introduce new customs" or some such phrase, retaining the balance between the two halves of the logion. It is also true that τὰς ἔθες in Acts 6.14 has a far wider compass than the new Temple which would be expected to ensue from the replacement of the Temple. However, it seems possible to provide an account of the development from the two-membered Temple logion to the two-membered Acts 6.14 statement, an account which does justice to these discrepancies.

We begin by noting that the building of a new Temple as a schismatic intention would appear as a threat to the cultic ἔθες.

1. If we could be more confident that there was to be a new Messianic Torah (See W.D. Davies, Setting (1964) 109-90 and the earlier works listed 109f; R. Banks, "Law" (1974) 173-85 and the additional works discussed there; E.P. Sanders, Paul (1977) 478-80 and the additional works listed 479 n 25.), these words could express such a hope, but this will not be their force as an accusation against Stephen.

2. In Acts 6.14 as it stands, τὰς ἔθες is to be understood broadly of the whole Jewish practice of life under the law (v 13: "words against this holy place and the law" and cf. in the case of Paul, 21.21: "you teach all the Jews who are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, telling them not to circumcise their children or observe the customs.").
There would indeed be some advantage for polemic in reproducing the
dominical saying in a form which accentuated its unacceptability
by specifically noting this proposed change of cultic . Such a transformed version of the logion, speaking of Temple would soon attach to itself a wider understanding of in
the face of suspicions of Christian abandonment of circumcision
and other aspects of the law. Now since this broader understanding of would obscure the original balance of the two halves
of the logion, the use of can probably be explained as
reflecting this stage of the development. There would at this point
no longer be any consciousness of balance between the two members of
the logion to exercise control over the words used, and so can come in with no sense of ill fit.

In Luke/Acts, when it comes to defending Christianity's
allegiance to , the defence consists specifically in
the practice of that have a link with the Temple. This

1. What seemed to the ancients to be the self-evident impiety of
changing ancient customs is, I think, well reflected in Josephus' account (in Ant. 15.267-88) of Herod's innovations and the consequent attempt to assassinate him. Any attempt to dislocate Temple observances would appear very much in this kind of light.

Philos Mig 90 speaks of "customs fixed by divinely empowered men greater than those of our time", and climaxes his argument against a solely allegorical interpretation of the law with the remark, "Why, we shall be ignoring the sanctity of the Temple" (92).

2. Lk 1.9 has Zechariah faithfully playing his part κατα τὸ ἔθνος γῆς ἑσπαρείως . Lk 2.42 exhibits Jesus and his parents on their way to Jerusalem κατα τὸ ἔθνος γῆς ἑσπαρτῆς - to take part in Passover. In Acts 21.21 Paul is under suspicion of telling Jews not to circumcise their children nor γάρ εἰς ἐραστικήν. He shows his innocence by associating himself with the Nazarite vow of a group of men (v 23f), a procedure which involved arrangements in the Temple (v 26) and culminated in an offering there (v 26).

Finally, Paul's claim in 28.17 to have done nothing against the people, ἡ ἡ γάρ ἐκεῖν τῶν ἐπισκόπων is to be set against the claim in 21.28 that he had brought Greeks into the Temple and thus defiled the holy place. (Luke makes it quite clear to his readers that the claim is based on a misunderstanding (v 29)).
may be variously explained. However, if it reflects the (notional or actual) central position of Temple \( \xi \bar{\eta} \) within the Jewish \( \xi \bar{\eta} \) considered as a whole,\(^1\) it shows how easily what was earlier in the polemic a reference to Temple \( \xi \bar{\eta} \) could be broadened to include the whole range of Jewish \( \xi \bar{\eta} \). There is just a possibility that Luke's emphasis indicates that he was aware that the Christian attitude to Temple \( \xi \bar{\eta} \) remained at the heart of the force of this polemic.

What alternative do we have to understanding "will change the customs which Moses delivered to us" as having arisen as a derivative of the Temple renewal statement? We can quite happily understand "he will destroy this place" as an abbreviated form of the Temple logion, and even see therein a sharpening of the polemic. The understanding of "will change the customs, etc." is rather more of a problem.

While it seems right to understand \( \xi \bar{\eta} \) here as the same \( \xi \bar{\eta} \) from which Paul is accused of encouraging Jews to apostatize (Acts 21.21 etc.), it makes little sense to offer as a future deed of Jesus what is already thought to have been put into effect among the Christians.\(^2\) The accusation against Stephen is to show that he is "against ... the law" (6.13) now, not to show that he thought it would be replaced by some new dispensation in the future. The thought that Christians may have abandoned the Jewish law is worked out most fully in the case of Paul,\(^3\) but Luke's obvious

\[ \ldots \ldots \ldots \]

1. Cf. the quotation from Philo on p 200 n 1.

2. A similar point is made by J.C.O'Neill (Theology (1970) 90): "He could have promised the future destruction of the Temple, but if he thought the Law should be abrogated he would have proceeded to do so straight away." O'Neill attempts to solve this problem in terms of an analysis of sources. The future \( \lambda \lambda \lambda \xi \varepsilon \) also impresses J. Jervell ("Beschneidung" (1976) 77 n 44).

3. It is claimed of Paul: "you teach all the Jews who are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, telling them not to circumcise their children or observe the customs." (Acts 21.21)
concern to underline the Jewish piety of Christianity, from its beginning, suggests that Jewish suspicions of lawlessness relate to the Christian movement from its inception. To do justice to the future tense, it seems to me that we have to understand a future forcible suppression of Jewish customs by the returning Jesus. Now, if this is not to be understood in relation to a word about Jesus destroying the Temple, taken in a literal militaristic sense, it is difficult to suggest an alternative source. Even with the change in the sense of \( \varepsilon O \gamma \), the two activities (Temple destruction, and change of \( \varepsilon O \gamma \)) belong firmly together as aspects of a single future messianic act of Jesus: Jesus will return, conquer Jerusalem, destroy the Temple and establish a regime that will forcibly suppress the existing Jewish customs in favour of some Christian innovation.

This close connection between the two, while not confirming the specific derivation which I have offered, does encourage the view that "will change the customs etc." arises out of the polemical force of the Temple logion in some way or other.

I therefore conclude that the polemic of Acts 6.14 is a derivative of the form in Mk 14.58; that it remains fundamentally the same polemic, but that it nevertheless shows the kind of marks of development which we might reasonably have expected to occur in the course of frequent and effective use of the polemic.

..........  

1. Especially for a reader in the post-70 AD situation, the destruction of the Temple must appear as a concrete military act and in no sense a quasi-metaphysical act whose basis is theological and which lacks concretely defined content. Still less can we be content with a purely metaphorical understanding, when we see the concern elsewhere in Acts to distance Christianity from all that is revolutionary (e.g. 21.37f and 5.35-39). There is no reason to suppose that the idea of the destruction of the Temple has lost in Acts 6.14 any of the literalness which we have seen it to have had in the use in the Jewish polemic of the two-membered logion.
10. **Summary**

We are now in a position to bring together the results of this section in so far as they bear on what Luke had in mind when he set up the relationship in his work between Lk 21 and Acts 6.14.

It has been shown that there was a Jewish polemical use against Christians of the Temple legion and that the form used seems to have mentioned both Temple destruction and Temple renewal. Qumran offers the best background for illuminating the force of the polemic. Jesus is being characterized as a schismatic threatening a take-over in Jerusalem by those who followed him as their messianic leader. A militaristic vengeance was to be executed on the Jews for not adopting the aberrant views of the schismatics. And the Temple was to be destroyed in the vain hope that God would miraculously help them build a new and better eschatological Temple for the use of the elect. The change effectively stigmatized Christianity as revolutionary, and unfaithful to the orthopraxy of Judaism.

The basic sense of the polemic seems to remain unaltered in Acts 6.14. However, here the form of the polemic has undergone development in two directions. The wording has been modified to accentuate the unacceptability of the sentiment said to have been expressed by Jesus (and in the process the mention of the new Temple drops out of sight). Also there has been a subtle shift in the force of the polemic to broaden its reference to take in the whole range of Jewish ἔθνη that seemed to be under threat from the Christians.

We are justified in considering that Luke accurately represents in Acts 6.14 a definite Jewish polemic against Christianity and it appears that he has in mind precisely to refute this polemic in his redaction of Lk 21.
A full and detailed exegesis of the material of Lk 21 is beyond the scope of the present work. Nevertheless it does seem necessary to offer at least a tentative outline of the material of Lk 21 to see how it functions as a refutation of the polemic which we have discovered to be operating in Acts 6.14.

There are two main reasons for pursuing this concern. Firstly, if I am able to show that the material of Lk 21 is illuminated by my suggestion about its connection with Acts 6.14, then this in turn will increase our confidence that the connection has been rightly perceived. Then, secondly, it seems right to outline an understanding of Lk 21 against the background of the polemic, because the implications for our understanding of the chapter appear to be quite far-reaching.

This study concentrates on just the few verses and phrases which seem most important to the overall understanding of the material, and it could be that certain details of the exegesis would need some revision in the light of a more complete study of the text.

We have already seen how Lk 21 relates Jesus to the destruction of the Temple via the model provided by Jeremiah and how the possibility of any personal hostility from Jesus towards the Temple is carefully excluded. It is now our concern to show how the words of Jesus present the "true" orientation of the Christian disciple to the destruction of Jerusalem.

1. **Answer to v 7**

   We begin from the common-place observation that Luke in v 7 has sharply focused the question of the disciples onto the
timing of the destruction of the Temple. \(^1\) The \(\sigma\epsilon\omega\tau\beta\zeta\alpha\) of Mk 13.4, which can be understood as expanding the reference of the question to all the eschatological matters to be discussed in the ensuing material, \(^2\) has been deleted by Luke. Mark's \(\sigma\nu\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\varepsilon\alpha\) which could be taken to connote the completion of the whole complex of eschatological events \(^3\) has been exchanged in Lk for the neutral \(\chi\nu\varepsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\nu\).

Given this sharp focus in v 7, how are we to view the material set on the lips of Jesus as an answer to the question, and to this end what are we to make of the transition to v 8? \(^4\) The link between answer and question is already difficult in Mk, but there it is at least eased by the broader statement of the question, which gives some grounds for Jesus launching into something which is at least superficially rather like an "apocalyptic" outline of the future leading on to the eschaton.


\(^2\) Lagrange (\textit{Luc}, 522) expresses the minority opinion that the Markan question relates only to Jerusalem (also Godet, \textit{Luke II}, 257). Lagrange thinks that Luke wants to avoid any possible misunderstanding of Mark's form as alluding to the last things. However this very admission with regard to Luke's intention shows the ease with which the Markan words can be understood in the wider sense.

\(^3\) Especially when linked as in Mk with \(\tau\alpha\varsigma\tau\varsigma\ldots \pi\nu\tau\alpha\). T. Schramm (Markus-Stoff, 174) argues that in Luke's own usage \(\sigma\nu\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\sigma\tau\varepsilon\alpha\) has no eschatological overtones. However even if we grant this in general, it is quite another matter to claim that Luke saw no eschatological overtones in the use of the word in Mk 13.4, given its context in a chapter that is evidently about eschatological matters.

\(^4\) It gives us added confidence to ask for the nature of the thought sequence from v 7 to v 8 when we observe that the Lukan v 8 is no piece of untouched Markan tradition. Stylistic and content changes indicate that the verse has received careful perusal.
It is easy to see how the soldiers surrounding Jerusalem (v 20) could be the sign asked for in v 7, but it is not satisfactory merely to note that the answer to the question is not given until v 20.\(^1\) Studies of Lk 21 regularly note the marks of Luke’s careful editorial activity and it seems inconceivable that the question should be followed by 13 verses that have no relevance to the question preceding.\(^2\)

M. Smith\(^3\) offers a structural outline of the material of the dominical discourse which suggests that vv 8f show us what are not the signs and then vv 10b-26 what are the signs to be expected.\(^4\) The initial promise of this suggestion for relating the question to the discourse is at once vitiated when we ask, signs of what? The prophetic figures and quasi-messiahs as we know them from Josephus\(^5\) would do very well historically for signs of the coming destruction of the Temple. (Compare the way Josephus seeks to lay the blame for the City’s destruction at the feet of the "intrusive fourth school of philosophy": the revolutionary philosophy (Ant. 18.9f),

1. As e.g. T.W. Manson, Sayings (1949) 324 and cf. Leaney, Luke, 259. Ellis (Luke, 243) suggests "The question asks when; the answer (8-36), much broader, tells the meaning of the destruction."

2. Zmijewski (Eschatologiereden, 94 n 98) is surely right to reject the suggestion of Schmid (Lukas, 303) that the misfit of question and answer results from Luke being bound to his Markan "Vorlage".

3. M. Smith, Parallels (1951) 98.

4. Godet (Luke II, 261) had earlier offered the suggestion that vv 8-19 are "the apparent signs which must not be mistaken for the true signs" of the destruction of Jerusalem. V 20 then gives the true sign. However it does not seem possible to understand the \(\gamma\nu\mu\lambda\alpha\) of v 11 as spurious (cf. v 25 and further vv 29-31).

5. E.g. J.W. 2.258 (cf. Ant. 20.167f); J.W. 2.261 (cf. Ant. 20.169f); J.W. 6.312f; Ant. 20.97f, 188.
and speaks of the "revolutionary" prophets as "no less than the assassins ruining the peace of the city" (J.W. 2.258). In any case the point here is not that one should not see them as signs, but rather that one should not follow them. Further, at least some of the signs of vv 10b-26 are undoubtedly signs of the eschaton, which hardly fits the restriction of the question in v 7 to the sign for the destruction of the Temple.

Both R. Geiger and J. Zmijewski in their recent studies on Lk 21 are conscious of this problem of linking question and answer. Both resolve the problem by insisting that the reference of v 7 must be wider than to the destruction of the Temple. Zmijewski's solution involves going back behind the question to the έλευσιον of v 6 which he suggests cause the whole range of events of "coming days" to be in mind. He then says of v 7 "Vielmehr wird nun gefragt, ob es etwas gibt was anzieht, dass es sich bei der Tempelstörung (entsprechend) bei den anderen geschichtlichen Ereignissen (γ'νέες) innerhalb der 'dem Ende vorlaufenden Zeit' (der 'kommenden Tage') wirklich ... um eschatologisch zu verstehende und auszudeutende Ereignisse handelt."

2. Zmijewski, Eschatologiereden, 78f, 90, 93-97.
3. Geiger (Endzeitreden) does not, however, appear to have come to a consistent point of view on the question. She accepts Marxsen's statement about Luke's alteration of v 7 to refer only to the Temple's destruction (168) but she considers v 7 as a question that envisages the cosmic fulfilment (35 n 22) and regards it as "kaum ratsam, Lk 21,7 noch ganz zum Einleitungsgespräch über den Tempel zu ziehen" (165).
4. Zmijewski, Eschatologiereden, 90 and 94.
5. Ibid., 94f.
The suggestion is ingenious but in the end it seems like a counsel of despair. The idea would have had more plausibility if the first ῥῆρα of v 7 had been made to agree with the γὰρ of v 6. Then we could be confident that the question of v 7 asked about the ἔλεος ἡμᾶς rather than more precisely about the events involved in the destruction of the Temple. The question would then be, "when will these (days) be?" But this is not the case.

Zmijewski's authority for taking γὰρ as pointing to a whole sequence of events is A. Schlatter. He has however misunderstood Schlatter. Schlatter thinks that the phrase μὴ ἔριζεν τοῦ γὰρ τὸ νῦν τῶν ἐξερρήσεων in Lk 17.22 points to a whole sequence of events. In his judgement the phrase reflects a Palestinian usage (presumably in its use of γὰρ). Zmijewski has taken a passing comment that ἔλεος αἰ γὰρ (21.6) is also a Palestinian form, to mean that Schlatter considers that the phrase also points to a whole sequence of events. Zmijewski adduces no other evidence, and it is at once clear that Luke's other uses of the idiom "coming days" offer no support for his suggestion.

2. V 8 and its link to v 7

In attempting to offer an alternative solution to this problem, it will be helpful at this point to set aside for the moment the larger question of the relationship of the whole body of

1. Ibid., 90.
2. A. Schlatter, Lukas (1931) 392f.
3. In Lk 19.43 and 23.29 the reference is once again to the destruction of Jerusalem. In 5.35 it is to the time for fasting after the bridegroom is taken away. In 17.22 the reference is to "die konkrete Gegenwart der angesprochenen Gemeinde" (Zmijewski, Eschatologiereden, 399).
the material to the question and to concentrate our attention on the relationship of v 8 to the question of v 7.

The distinctly Lukan features of v 8 are the addition of ὄναρος ἡμείς ἤπειρον ἐν εἰμι ἀπόκ and the deletion of the Markan καὶ πολλοὺς πλανήτους.

According to Creed, ὄναρος ἡμείς warns against all preaching of the near approach of the end,¹ a view which enjoys wide acceptance. However when we consider that the "time" we have been encouraged to focus on is, in the context, that of the destruction of the Temple (ἐλεύθεροι ἡμέραι (v 6); πόρος ... ἐστί (v 7); τὸ σημεῖον ἐτέν μελλον ταῦτα (v 7)), it seems most natural to understand ὄναρος in that way here.² This possibility is encouraged further when we see that in v 20 the encircling soldiers, unlike the claims of the messianic figures, do indicate that ἡμείς ἤφειρον ἢ ἡμείως ἀφι.³ At that point the ὄναρος has in fact ἡμείως.⁴

If it is right to suggest that the ὄναρος is that for the destruction of Jerusalem⁵ then we have here messianic figures who announce that the time is ripe for the destruction of Jerusalem. This makes good sense if our reader may be expected to have in mind the polemic which suggests that the Christian messiah was to lead

1. Creed, Luke, 254f. Zmiżewski, Eschatologiereden, 101 and 115, lists the various suggestions that have been made by the exegetes. They all agree in linking the ὄναρος to the end-time.

2. R.A. Knox (Gospels (1946) 11) relates all of Lk 21 except vv 25-8 to the destruction of Jerusalem!


4. For a full understanding of Luke's thought the ἐγγυώσαθ αἰ of v 28 and the ἐγγυτέρευσαν of vv 30 and 31 need also to be related to these verses, but the immediate parallel is between v 8 and v 20.

   We may further compare the ἐλεύθεροι ἡμέραι of v 6 with the ἡμέραι ἐκλεκτής of v 22.

   Perhaps it is not so much that the messianic claimants necessarily get the timing of the ὄναρος wrong, but rather that they mistake the method of the ὄναρος.

his followers in an attack on Jerusalem, to wreak vengeance, to destroy the Temple and forcibly set up a Christian regime. ὃ καὶ ἔφθασσε ἐκτὸς ἔτη ένοεν declares that the time for the messianic uprising has arrived.¹ μὶθ επεσάμην ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ then follows on naturally with a quite literal sense:² it forbids the following of such messianic war leaders into battle. Their call for armed attack on Jerusalem is in no way to be heeded.³ The background of the polemic also makes good sense of Luke's omission here of the Markan καὶ καλεῖ καὶ πλακάζει. Luke is not about to play into the hands of the polemicists by admitting in this way that many Christians were of such a revolutionary bent. Luke would rather have his readers to understand that the attitude of Christians is that formulated by Jesus - they are not personally hostile to the Temple and they distance themselves from any thought of insurrection.

From this same perspective we now turn our attention to the στρατηγείον of v 7 and call to mind the use of that word to denote a signal for action.⁴ For somebody alert to the possibilities of thinking in terms of a Christian insurrection, v 7 sounds very like a question about arranging a signal for the disciples to gather for the assault on Jerusalem.

Having made the suggestion I hasten to add that it is not at all likely that for Luke the question did positively give

1. For a similar idea at Qumran see 1QM 11.7f, "By the hand of Thine anointed ... Thou hast revealed to us the jtimesj of the battles of Thy hands." Cf. 13.14; 17.5; 18.10.

2. Zmijewski (Eschatologierden, 102) and Easton (Luke, 309) understand a Hebraising expression, or terminus technicus for discipleship, but do not produce any examples of such a use - such a sense has to be extrapolated from the use of ἐν ἑαυτῷ ἐνίσχυ in this way.

E.E. Ellis (Luke, 243) seems to imply a literal "following after" when he says of Ἐγείρετε: "this seems to be someone claiming to be Jesus' representative who announces Jesus' (secret) presence".

3. Some exegetes have suggested that Mk 13.6 may already (continued...)
expression to this militant anti-Temple view. This would not have suited his purpose since it leaves open the suggestion that despite Jesus' words of caution, there were strong pressures within the Christian movement towards such views. It seems more likely that a purposely vague question allows Jesus to oppose the view (and thus shows what the Christian view really is) without forcing the disciples to be the spokesmen for that view which Luke requires the opportunity to refute.¹

The disciples could have been asking about a signal for the insurrection or they could have been asking about a sign that gives warning. V 8 indicates that a Christian will have no interest in the former and v 20 gives an answer to the request for the latter.² V 8 does not so much answer the disciples' question, as make clear

3. (continued...) express opposition to messianic revolution, e.g. J. Schniewind, Markus (1958) 134. W. Manson, Luke (1930) 232 asks re Lk 21.8, "Is there any suggestion here that Christians ... will inevitably become embroiled with their fellow-countrymen who ... wish to precipitate the Messianic reign by force?"

4. BAG, 755.

1. Luke does at times allow the disciples to be spokesmen of or to ask questions which reflect views which are not straightforwardly the "correct" view (e.g. Lk 9.49,54; 24.21; Acts 1.6). However, we should not think of a rather careless device to provide occasion for Jesus to express a contrary view. Lk 9.49 and 54 can only be asked by disciples. Lk 24.21 and Acts 1.6 do not so much highlight the misunderstanding of the disciples as identify them solidly with traditional Jewish hopes. It is their genuinely Jewish hope which they look to Jesus to fulfil (cf. the birth narratives, passim). It may not be a simple matter to see how Jesus fulfils these hopes (thence the questions) but it is these hopes which he does fulfil.

2. Does the instruction to flee (v 21) underline Luke's concern to show that Christians are more interested in knowing how to keep clear of, than in being directed to precipitate the destruction of Jerusalem?
that that understanding of the question which presents itself
to the polemicist is no part of the Christian's concern. Jesus sets
his face against the question in that sense.

We miss in Lk 21.8 the genuine concern of Mk 13.5f that
Christians not be led astray. Mark's βλέπετε μὴ καταπεκτεῖν ἀναρρήσθη is a real word of warning. It is doubtful whether Luke's βλέπετε μὴ ἁπλωθεῖν ἀναρρήσθῃ is. Luke seems rather to be dealing with an unreal possibility. Mark's characteristic use of βλέπετε for warnings (4.24; 8.15; 12.38; 13.5; 13.9) heightens its intensity here. This is not so for Luke. βλέπετε is not his word for warning. He allows it to stand in Lk 8.18 and it occurs in Acts 13.40 in Paul's sermon but elsewhere he uses προετοιμάζετε for this purpose (Lk 12.1; 17.3; 20.46; 21.34; Acts 5.35), and changes his Markan "Vorlage" accordingly (Mk 8.15; 12.38). Luke's change of ἔχει μὴ πληρωθεῖν to μὴ ἁπλωθεῖν already takes away from the Markan picture something of the sense of real possibility and this is confirmed by Luke's deletion of Mark's καὶ πολλοὶ πληρωθεῖσθαι. Luke's Christians will not be led away in any such direction.

Nor is Luke concerned in v 8 to offer the coming of the pseudo-messiahs as an event in the eschatological timetable (contrast Mk 13.21-3). Their coming seems to have no significance in Luke's scheme of things, so that while the eschatological prophets, which we know of from Josephus (and cf. Acts 4.36f and 21.38), and/or

1. W. Marxsen, Mark, 171: "Everything hinges on refusing to be misled (vss. 5-6)"; E. Häenchen, Weg (1968) 440: "nun erwartete man weitere pseudomessianische Bewegungen, die auch für Christen eine verführerische Kraft haben konnten"; W.L. Lane, Mark (1974) 456: "the ever present danger that the people of God may be led astray".

2. This is of course a subjective judgement. However it seems to me that where Mark produces a word picture in which a concrete ῥος appears leading people astray, Luke, by his use of the passive, reduces this to a theoretical and abstract notion.
the zealot messianism that inspired the stand against Rome (Jos. J.W. 6.312f) may well have been Luke's justification for taking over from the tradition the positive statement ἐλεύθερος ὑμῖν, it is none of his concern to point to any of these movements as such, but to distance Christianity from all such movements. Luke's one concern here is to tell us that Christianity is not such a movement.

To come this far we have assumed all too easily that those who come in in 8 ἐν τῷ ἑνεμώνιῳ κυρίῳ are in fact pseudo-messiahs. Most exegetes make this identification, but there have been significant challenges to the view.

Ellis' in his all too brief note has offered the suggestive alternative that we have here someone claiming to be Jesus' representative who announces Jesus' (secret) presence. Ellis seems to achieve this sense by understanding ἐγώ εἰμι as "I am here", and regarding the words spoken after λέγοντες as indirect speech. The sense of the verse then becomes rather like that of Lk 17.23, "And they will say to you, 'Lo, there!' or 'Lo, here!' Do not go, do not follow them."

Now the comparison with 17.23, while it shows that Ellis' understanding produces a sentiment which Luke is capable of expressing, also highlights a problem with Ellis' view. For while in 17.23 the


2. Ellis is building on the work of D. Daube, Judaism (1956) 325-9, who in turn builds on W. Manson, ΕἸ-MM (1946) 137-45.
surrounding verses fit in with a concern for looking for (a manifestation of) Jesus, the context in ch.21 does not link up at all well with this interpretation of v 8. Only v 27 offers any possibilities and it is too remote. Also the stress on time in its context demands that its first emphasis fall on the timing of the manifestation of Christ and not on the public (as opposed to private) nature of that event.

Other things count against Ellis' understanding. We would expect ὁμιλοῦν if we are dealing with indirect speech,¹ and this expectation is confirmed by the definite case of indirect speech in Lk 22.70 where the text reads ἕβαλεν ὁμιλοῦν ἐμάκρισεν·. Then also, Ellis offers no parallel for translating ἐμάκρισεν as "I am here"² and it remains doubtful whether the words can bear this sense.

1. Note that Luke drops the ὁμιλοῦν from Mk 13.6. It must be said that neither Ellis nor his sources (i.e. Daube and Manson) actually say that we have indirect speech here. (Ellis' rendering "I am here" seems to imply it (Luke, 243). C.E.B. Cranfield (Mark (1959) 395) takes Manson to be assuming indirect speech.) However, it seems, in my judgement to be required if they are to preserve their point of departure, viz. the functioning of ἐκ τοῦ ἐμάκρισεν to announce the personal divine presence. Their case for understanding ἐκ τοῦ ἐμάκρισεν in this way is based on instances where the speaker is himself, or is at least the bearer of, the divine presence. It is by nature a self-disclosing statement. On this basis, if the speech in 21.8 is direct then the speaker must announce himself as the personal divine presence, which is not what Manson, Daube and Ellis are concerned to say. If on the other hand we have indirect speech in 21.8 then there is at least a sense in which Jesus remains the one who expresses the sentiment: "saying that I am here (as the personal divine presence)". Even then Lk 21.8 cannot be said to fit the pattern in an entirely satisfactory manner. (See below.)

2. Ellis is probably dependent on Daube's translation of ΧΡΩΜΗ as "God's own person will be present" (Judaism, 327). However in the Passover Haggadah which Daube (326) is quoting it is evident that the "will be present" must be contributed by the total context and not by the ΧΡΩΜΗ. This is clear from the parallel between "I and not an angel", and "I and not a seraph", and "I and not another". The "will be present" can equally supplied or left out of all three statements. (I would offer as a translation of ΧΡΩΜΗ here: "I who announce my own personal presence"). When Manson (ἘΡΩΜΗ, 139) paraphrases "the Christ is come, the Parousia has arrived", he fails to appreciate that the examples which he adduces to show that ἐκ τοῦ ἐμάκρισεν announces that the divine presence is here, only imply the "is here" (continued...)
One of the motivations behind Ellis' suggestion is to be able to understand ἔγνωμαι μου of a representative of Jesus. The traditional understanding is "claiming my office" (Since ἔγνωμαι was understood as a claim to be messiah, it seemed natural to conform ἔγνωμαι μου to the same sense). A number of exegetes have, however, felt dissatisfaction with this traditional understanding and have sought an alternative. The difficulty has been to avoid a contradiction between ἔγνωμαι μου and ἔγνωμαι.

It is not generally disputed that ἔγνωμαι refers to a messianic figure but there is another possibility suggested by the close connection drawn by Norden and others between the use of the formula ἔγνωμαι and the prophetic figures mentioned by Celsus (Origen Cels. 7.8f) who announced themselves, "I am God (or Son of God or Holy Spirit). I have come: for already the world is perishing ...". It could be that ἔγνωμαι signals a kind of

---

2. (continued...) in so far as the words are spoken by the one who is himself the divine presence. Cf. V. Taylor, Mark, 504: "in the Gospels and Acts ἔγνωμαι is almost always the speaker's affirmation".

---


2. J. Wellhausen, Evangelium Marci (1903) 108:"Sie kommen in meinem Namen' (d.h. sie sind Christen) widerspricht dem, dass sie sagen, sie seien selber der Messias.

prophetic possession¹ which enables the prophet to announce in the
name of the deity that ὅ ἐπὶ ἡμᾶς τὴν ἐπιφανείαν. Despite its considerable
attractions this possibility seems to run aground on the κύριος which
connects the two phrases. If ἐγὼ ἡμᾶς merely alerts one to the
presence of the deity who has a message to present, it will not be
set side by side with (i.e. connected by κύριος to) the message being
delivered. On the other hand as soon as the ἐγὼ ἡμᾶς becomes
properly part of the message, then we have at least some kind of
messianic claim by the speaker.

The incongruity of people coming in the name of Jesus (and
so by definition recognising Jesus as the Messiah) but claiming
themselves to be Messiah, can be resolved if they are claiming to be
the returning Jesus.² That we have no knowledge of any such claimants
must count against this suggestion, though not decisively.³ More
important in the present study is what we have seen to be the absence
in Lk of Mark's genuine concern that Christians be not led astray.
This could hardly be the case if Luke had in mind here people operating
within the Christian community and claiming to be Jesus redivivus.
Luke's lack of concern meshes far better with a reference to something
that remains totally outside the Christian movement. Luke's handling
of the Q material behind Lk 17.23f may offer a further indication

1. Cf. Loisy, Luc, 492, "une sorte de formule sacramentelle dans le
language mystique de certains cultes pour signifier l'épiphanie
divine en un individu donné." However Loisy feels that by adding
κύριος ὅ ἐπὶ ἡμᾶς τὴν ἐπιφανείαν Luke modifies the sense so that we should
think more of a traditional messianic claimant.

2. The possibility was raised by Wellhausen (Evangelium Marci, 108)
and has gained a certain popularity (e.g. Grundmann, Markus, 263;
Schweizer, Mark, 266f).

3. Taylor, Mark, 504.
that his concern in 21.8 is not likely to be with those who claim to be the returning Jesus. If Zmijewski's reconstruction\(^1\) is along the right lines\(^2\) then Luke takes up Q material which raises the possibility of pseudo-messiahs claiming to be Jesus returned\(^3\) and uses it to address quite another problem, so that the idea of messianic claimants drops completely from sight. It is certainly true that the terms in which Jesus' return is presented in Lk (9.26; 17.24 and v 30 in context; 19.15 and cf. Acts 1.11) leave no real possibility for messianic figures to claim to be this Jesus returned. Luke, unlike the other synoptics has no mention of νεωσθήσεται.

Here it should be said that Luke does present the messianic claimants of Lk 21.8 in some relationship to the returning Jesus. Since in the polemic it was implied that Christians expected Jesus to return and head up an insurrection, this possibility provides the background against which v 8 is set. However, it is not that these figures claim to be Jesus, rather it is that these are the kind of people that the returning Jesus will not be like. The Christians know better than to think that they might find the returning Jesus among such proponents of militant messianism. Jesus has shown them clearly that this is not his way.

\*\*\*

1. Following in part Ph. Vielhauer ("Gottesreich" (1957) 51-79 see 67f) and J. Lambrecht (Markus-Apokalypse (1967) 101-103).

2. Eschatologiereden, 397-429 esp. 415f and 424-27.

3. The possibility of Christians going in search of some hidden Christ (Lk 17.23 cf. Mt 24.26) and also the relevance of the appeal to the nature of the coming of the Son of man as an event visible to all men depends rather on the false messiahs being represented as the returning Jesus.
From our discussion it already appears unlikely that Luke will have used ἐν τῷ ἀναστάσει μου to mean "pretending to be me (i.e. Jesus)."¹ Klostermann's "auf meine Autorität hin"² produces a straight contradiction in the text, as does the "as Christians" of Wellhausen's understanding.³ E. Schweizer's less precise "with an appeal to me and to my words"⁴ cannot stand without ἐγὼ εἶμι being understood of a claim to be Jesus redivivus, nor can the understanding of ἐν τῷ ἀναστάσει μου along the lines of the LXX references to prophets/false prophets who spoke ἐν τῷ ἀναστάσει κυρίου.⁵ We seem to be left with only the traditional understanding.⁶

It may be concluded therefore that there are no barriers in ἐν τῷ ἀναστάσει μου λύγοις ἐγὼ εἶμι to the understanding of Lk 21.8 offered above.

1. Is this what H. Conzelmann ("Geschichte" (1959) 218) means for the Markan understanding?
3. Evangelium Lucae, 117, though Wellhausen may mean this as an implication of the phrase, rather than as its meaning.
6. It would be good to be able to show that this traditional understanding does not involve quite such an alien sense for the words ἐν τῷ ἀναστάσει μου as is sometimes supposed. Appendix 6, on Luke's use of ἐν τῷ ἀναστάσει, makes some attempt to meet this need.
3. Beyond v 8

It is now time to move beyond v 8 into the main body of the material which ostensibly offers the answer to the question of v 7.

In our consideration of v 8 it has already been possible to see how the Jewish polemic provides the background which clarifies the significance of v 8 with regard to the question of v 7. Now as we widen the focus of our investigation we may expect that it will be necessary to relate the material considered not only to the question in v 7 but also to the hidden agenda provided by the unspoken question: what role would Christian disciples seek in the destruction of Jerusalem?

There are a number of difficult structural questions, the answers to which largely shape our understanding of what Luke is concerned to achieve in the discourse. There is the vexed question of the relationship between the disturbances mentioned respectively in vv 9, 10f and 25f. Then, there is the need to determine where the parenthesis beginning with v 12 should be terminated. Finally there is the question of the nature of the transition from v 24 to v 25.

Now we could proceed at this point by stating what seems to be the whole shape of Luke's intention in the discourse and then set out to show that such an assumption produces coherent answers to these questions and integrates the material. However it seems to me that we can have greater confidence in the thesis if we move in the opposite direction, i.e. if we seek to answer the questions first directly out of the text, and as far as possible without appeal to what I hope to be able to show is the shape of Luke's intention. Then, when we go on to interpret Luke's intention, it may be that it will be possible to see that the interpretation not only makes sense of the material, but comes rather closer to being demanded by
the material.

We begin by looking at the disturbances mentioned in v 9, vv 10f and vv 25f. Various suggestions have been offered concerning the relationships between them. Some of these will be considered more carefully at a later stage, but for the moment it will suffice to draw attention to the continuity and the development towards a climax which seems to characterize the relationship between the descriptions.

First we compare v 9 with vv 10f. The continuity is to be found in the wars that are part of both scenes. However in v 9 the linking of αὐτοκαταστροφὴς with Mk's πολέμος encourages us to think of smaller scale local affair's rather than "global" conflicts. Then, when we come to vv 10f there can be no doubt that we have events on a larger scale than some minor disturbances in the Roman Empire. Now the impression is of widespread major wars. V 10 represents an escalation of the situation of v 9. Further development can be seen in the introduction of the dimensions of natural catastrophe and of supernatural accompaniments (v 11). In v 9 we think naturally of human initiative, in vv 10f, while there is still an active role for man, there seems to be some deeper causality coming into play.

1. For Grundmann (Lukas, 380) the disturbances of v 9 = those of v 10, which are to be separated from the "cosmic" disturbances of v 11. For Schmid (Lukas, 313) vv 25f continue vv 10f and herald the parousia. For Zmijewski (Eschatologiereden, 124) vv 10f refer to the destruction of Jerusalem.


Mark's ascending parallelism between 13.7 and 13.8 already indicates development from the material Luke employs in v 9 to that used in vv 10f.
If we now compare vv 10f and vv 25f, the impression of continuity and development is confirmed. For continuity we can point to the presence of signs (v 11, v 25), natural disturbances (v 11, v 25), the involvement of heaven (v 11, vv 25f), the involvement of the nations (v 10, v 25). However, the marks of development are even clearer. In vv 25f there is no more mention of wars. The active role of mankind has disappeared completely. A situation is portrayed where men are totally the recipients of the experience. Further, while it is not clear whether the signs in v 11 are forward looking or whether they relate to the significance of the political and natural turmoil being experienced, in vv 25f we have an intensely forward looking situation, where there is great anxiety about what is about to happen. That "the powers of the heavens will be shaken" (v 26) suggests that we have reached the climax of the sequence we have traced from v 9 through vv 10f to vv 25f, and that we have reached the end of the sequence is confirmed by the consequent coming of the Son of man (v 27). It may also be fair to find a further mark of development in the change from "signs from (φαινομένα) heaven" (v 11) to "signs in (ἐν) sun and moon and stars" (v 25). In vv 25f the situation is described largely through the subjective experience of those to be affected. By this means Luke heightens the dramatic intensity of that scene beyond what is achieved by the more objective and

1. It is notable that the causes of people's anxiety in vv 25f are matters not included in vv 10f.

2. W.C. Robinson, Way (1962) 75; Zmijewski, Eschatologiereden, 125 n 123; contra Geiger, Enzeitreden, 171. The contrasting "and upon the earth" (v 25) would encourage this view, possibly also the close link in v 11 between the signs and φαινομένα.
stereotyped (biblical) expressions of vv 10f.¹

If these observations are correct then it will be important that our understanding of ch.21 and these verses in particular do justice to the continuity, development and intensification which we have been able to map from v 9 to vv 10f to vv 25f.

We turn now to the question about the parenthesis: vv 12- ?

The two possibilities are that the parenthetic section ends with v 19 or that it continues to v 24. The studies tend not to address the question directly and we must infer their answers from such things as whether vv 10f are taken to relate to the destruction of Jerusalem or to the parousia.²

Let us consider first the possibility that v 25 is where the text resumes after the parenthesis. There is nothing at the beginning of v 25 which could actually mark resumption so we must

1. Perhaps the significance of this heightening is all the greater for being "merely" literary: Luke can in 23.30 use in relation to the destruction of Jerusalem the same technique of description through the experience of those involved.

2. If vv 10f relate to the destruction of Jerusalem (e.g. Zmijewski, Eschatologieden, 124) then the parenthesis must end after v 19. If the verses relate to the parousia (e.g. H.W. Bartsch, Wachet (1963) 120; Geiger, Endzeitreden, 170-172) then the parenthesis is probably thought to end with v 24. Conzelmann (Luke, 128-30) appears to end the parenthesis after v 19 and to deal with vv 20-24 as something like another parenthesis: "a polemical excursus about matters which are mistakenly included among the eschatological events" (128).
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of vv 20ff, even less than that of vv 25f resembles that of vv 10f, but here there is not the same problem. Vv 20ff deal with the destruction of Jerusalem and since the question in v 7 is directed to this matter, and vv 10f must be understood to contribute to the answer, the first sense that offers itself for vv 10f is that which comes from seeing there the setting for the destruction of Jerusalem.\(^1\)

The chief matter in view has been the destruction of Temple/City and v 20 offers itself as a return to the matter in hand after the digression of the parenthesis.\(^2\)

It may be concluded that the end of the parenthesis can with some confidence be located after v 19.

We have already given preliminary attention to the relationship between v 9 and vv 10f, and we must now give this matter further attention.

The sense of progression we have noted from v 9 to vv 10f to vv 25f already inclines against any easy identification of the warfare anticipated in v 9 and that of v 10. Grundmann minimizes the difference by making v 11 a period of cosmic disturbances coming later than the political disturbances of v 10.\(^3\) However even without the events of v 11 the vocabulary of v 10 already suggests something on a larger scale. And in any case this division is not

\begin{enumerate}
\item From the pattern of development from v 9 to vv 10f to vv 25f it already seems likely that v 10f must be something less than the immediate prelude to the parousia. It is notable that that which distresses in vv 25f is not present in vv 10f and the wars of v 10 find no mention in v 25. The distress at the time of the fall of Jerusalem (v 23) belongs to a military context (v 20, v 24) which links it to v 10. Everything in vv 10f happens on the earth, but vv 25f introduce us to bigger dimensions: "the powers of the heavens will be shaken" (v 26).

\item A link between v 20 and v 8 has already been noted and compare further the ἐκ τῶν ἐκ ... τοῦ of v 9 with the ἐκ τῶν ἐκ ... τοῦ of vv 20ff.

\item Grundmann, Lukas, 380; Similarly Conzelmann, Luke, 128f.
\end{enumerate}
encouraged by the text: there are no time markers to separate the periods; even the multiple use of verbs is literary and not a way of separating events; the clauses are linked neither by καί nor δέ, creating very much the impression of a simple list.

Another consideration that counts against a simple equation of the wars of v 9 with those of v 10 is the different ways in which the wars are handled in the respective contexts. In v 9 the interest is in the τέλος and the wars are what happen. In v 10 the interest is in the wars, but is redirected to the persecution and witness by the device of asserting the priority in time of the period of persecution and witness.

Then, as well, a problem in the time sequence is created by identifying the two war references. If we equate them then the events of vv 12-19 are brought in before the "wars and insurrections" of v 9. Now even if the choice of ἄμεταστασίας is for the sake of the insurrection leading up to the destruction of Jerusalem, the plurals are generalizing and we can hardly exclude from the content of πολέμους καὶ ἄμεταστασίας the various disturbances

1. The extra verb added by Luke is to provide a singular verb to govern the neuter plural nouns he has added to the list.

2. E.g. G. Harder, "Geschichtsbild" (1952-3) 76, and the majority of exegetes. However cf. J.A.T. Robinson, Redating (1976) 29: "The 'wars and rumours of wars' have no obvious reference to Vespasian's campaign against the Jewish extremists"; B. Reicke (Prophecies (1972) 130f) draws attention to the wars of Rome against the Parthians (AD 36 and 55) which inspired the Jewish nationalists to violent activity.
that characterized the period 30-70 AD. Whatever may have been the limitation of Luke's knowledge, he is aware of certain disturbances in the period and indeed shows some interest in them (Lk 23.19; Acts 5.36,37; 21.38).

Finally, the new beginning (τότε ἐληλυθὼν αὐτῶν) inserted by Luke at v 10a into his Markan "Vorlage" encourages us to find some distinction of function and/or content between v 9 and v 10.

For these different reasons we will expect an adequate understanding of Lk 21 to make a clear distinction between (as well as marking the real continuity of) the events of v 9 and the events of v 10.

The sense of τέλος in v 9 is a matter of some importance for understanding v 9 and vv 10f. It is generally assumed to refer to the parousia, but would it not be more natural to refer it here to the destruction of Jerusalem/Temple? Luke's one other use of τέλος provides the sense "fulfilment" (Lk 22.37). This would be quite fitting here: the fulfilment of Jesus' prophecy of the destruction of the Temple (v 6) will not be at once. If I have been right to...

1. Godet (Luke II, 263) understands τέλος of the destruction of Jerusalem. The time references in the preceding verses (vv 6,7,8) are all to the destruction of Jerusalem. Presumably those who relate Lk 21.25-8 and/or parallels to the destruction of Jerusalem would understand τέλος of that event. (R.T. France, Jesus (1971) 227-39 and works cited there. Also works listed by G.R. Beasley-Murray (Jesus (1954) 169 n 4).)

2. The other way τέλος could be understood to relate to the destruction would be given by the sense "the end of the Temple/City": "not one stone left upon another", but this seems less likely.
find in v 8 a reference to people eager to fulfil the prophecy then nothing could be more suitable than a reference in v 9 deferring the fulfilment.

The one remaining area to be looked at before we can attempt a comprehensive outline of the material is the transition from v 24 to v 25. This occurs by means of the words, "until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled." This phrase is the focal point for our interest in the nature of the relationship between the complex provided on the one hand by the events of vv 10f and the destruction of Jerusalem, and that provided on the other hand by vv 25f and the judgement of the nations.

It is usual to locate Luke's present in the "times of the Gentiles" and it is said that Luke separates the events associated with the destruction of Jerusalem by an indefinitely long time interval from those associated with the parousia. The ἡμεραί ἐνοβίων has sometimes been taken to refer to the time for evangelization of Gentiles, but more often to the time of Gentile dominance, the latter receiving far more support from the immediate context.

...........

1. E.g. Marxsen, Mark, 190; Grundmann, Lukas, 384; Geiger, Endzeitreden, 222 cf. 170-72; Zmijewski, Eschatologiereden, 217.


4. Those who find reference to the period for Gentile conversion generally argue for a double reference. However Schmid (Lukas, 312) insists strongly on restricting the reference to Gentile dominance.
There is however the possibility that καιρός \( \epsilon \Theta ν \nu \) concerns the period for the judgement of the Gentiles: 1 after the καιρός of Jerusalem (v 20 cf. v 8) come the καιροί of the nations. 2 Mk 1.15 offers a clear example of the use of πληρώσω which would be required for such an understanding. In Mk 1.15 the καιρός now has its fulfilment, the καιροί has arrived. 3 To establish that this is the thought expressed in Lk 21.24 we do not have the help of a perfect tense, as in Mk 1.15, however only this understanding provides an adequate transition in Lk 21 from v 24b to v 25. 4

This suggestion both underlines and draws support from the close parallel, in Luke's presentation, between the judgement on Jerusalem and the judgement coming on the nations. In the

1. Cf. Wellhausen, Evangelium Lucae, 118, who compares Ezek 30.3 πέρας \( \epsilon \Theta ν \nu \) κοσμοκρατία, and apparently also Conzelmann, Luke, 130: "The times of the Gentiles (v 24) have not yet come". The plural καιροί need not count against this suggestion. It can be merely stylistic, perhaps encouraged by the plural \( \epsilon \Theta ν \nu \). Cf. Plummer, Luke, 483.

2. Without accepting this suggestion, Leaney, Luke, 262, throws the emphasis onto the judgement of the Gentiles with his quotation of IQS 4.18. Leaney translates \( \nu ηλιόν παρεπεσε \) "has appointed a period for the existence of wrongdoing". If it should rather be translated, "has ordained an end for falsehood" (Vermes, Scrolls, 77 and similarly Dupont-Sommer, Qumran, 81; Lohse, Texte, 15), then the comparison encourages even more strongly a judgement emphasis in Lk 21.24b.


4. Lk 9.51 offers a similar sense for \( \sum ν \lambda \rho \varepsilon \nu \sigma \) τής \( \epsilon θα \) της \( \alpha ν \lambda \lambda ρ η \nu \sigma \) κόσμου. The clause does not speak of the end of the days but of their arrival. Cf. also Acts 2.1.

A. Peuillet, "Discourse" (1949) 62 raises the question of whether vv 25f are events contemporary with the destruction of Jerusalem and followed by a new era; the times of the nations. Such a suggestion underlines the imprecision of the connection between vv 24 and 25 if v 24c has no reference already to events of vv 25f.
comparison of vv 10f and vv 25f I have thus far emphasized the differences which provide the sense of development and escalation. It is however just as important to note the striking parallel between the two experiences. This is even clearer when we bring into view the material from vv 20-24 and 23.28-31 about the destruction of Jerusalem. While vv 25f describe a "bigger version", in both cases we have the involvement of the nations, the natural disturbances, heavenly signs, distress and extreme apprehension. The force of the parallelism is seen more clearly when we compare vv 25f with the corresponding Markan material. If Luke had reproduced the Markan material (13.24f) there would be no parallels at all!

This parallel treatment, which is certainly important for Luke, suggests that it might be accurate to represent the force of καπνον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ by "until the Gentiles get their turn (i.e. of judgement)".

What is more there is a convenient pattern available for presenting in parallel a judgement on the Jews followed by a judgement on the Gentiles. It arises in relation to the Exile and becomes a standard prophetic pattern. I represent it in the words of Godet. "In the prophets, the drama of the last days, which


1. Zmijewski, Eschatologiereden, 122-8 has emphasized the links between vv 10f and vv 25f and asks the pointed question, "Warum hat Lukas? dabeig i.e. by the addition of "and there will be terrors and great signs from heaven" in v 11b/ einen so deutlichen Anklang an v 25a hergestellt, ...?" (122f).


closes the eschatological perspective, embraces as two events nearly following one another, the judgement whereby Israel is purified by means of the Gentiles, and the punishment of the Gentiles by Jehovah.¹ This pattern not only offers the two parallel judgement experiences (including the notion of the judgement of the instruments of judgement) but also bears within itself the idea of escalation, since it is always a greater judgement that falls on the Gentiles. It seems highly likely that Luke is consciously reproducing the pattern in Lk 21.²

If we explore further the extent of the parallel between the experience of the Jews and that of the Gentiles, the question arises: does the judgement on the Gentiles come with the Son of man,³ or is it like the judgement on Jerusalem, to be located properly in history,⁴ and therefore to be thought of as preceding

1. The pattern can accommodate delay (e.g. Hab 2.3), and is subject to certain variations (e.g. in Ezek 38 the eschatological restaging of the Gentile attack on Jerusalem will result in the immediate defeat of Gog) but the central notion of judgement of the instruments of judgement remains secure. Other examples of the pattern can be found in Isa 10; 13f; 33; 47; Jer 50f; Dan 9.26f.

The apocalyptic programme becomes a great deal more complex in some of the later literature, e.g. 2 Apoc. Bar, but even here the pattern from the Babylonian experience is evident; when Zion is desolate, Baruch's word to Babylon is, "be not greatly uplifted and boastful" is Charles' conjectural emendation from "oppress". For assuredly in its own season (Gk καιρός) shall the (divine) wrath awake against thee which now in long suffering is held in as it were by rei̇ns" (12.3f).

2. F. Flückiger ("Zerstörung" (1972) 389) sees that Luke uses an OT pattern but mistakenly identifies the chief elements as judgement and restoration.

3. Or better, does the coming of the Son of man coincide with the main part and climax of the judgement? See below.

4. The category "in history" is of course a difficult one. If it means merely as a result of human and natural forces then the fall of Jerusalem can hardly be said to be an event "in history". The decisive thing is whether the coming of the Son of man is involved in the judgement.
the coming of the Son of man? The interpretation being offered here does not depend upon, but nevertheless would gain added persuasiveness from, the conclusion that the Gentiles' judgement precedes the coming of the Son of man.¹

As we address the question it may be helpful to make the preliminary observation that it is possible in Lk 21 to be over-impressed by the distinction between sign and event. Both in vv 10f and vv 25f it seems wiser to regard the events as also part of, or the beginnings of, the judgement experience. So, for instance, in vv 10f the dependence on Isa 19.2 and especially 2 Chr 15.16 (descriptions of judgement) suggests that the warfare, etc. are already judgement experiences, as indeed the nature of the events would suggest (earthquakes, pestilences, famines, etc.). In vv 25f the situation is made a little more complex by the forward looking element in the situation (ἐκκίνησις ἀπὸ ἡμῶν γῆς κακομείου), but also there the OT background (Isa 13.10; 34.4; Ezek 32.7; Joel 2.10,13,15) suggests that in v 25 we are already into a judgement experience.

One's first tendency is to locate the judgement of the nations at the coming of the Son of man, because of what seems to be the parallel between signs for the destruction of Jerusalem (v 10 and v 20: ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ) and signs of the parousia² (v 25 cf. vv 29-31 and v 28: ὅτε ἔσται ἡ σμίκρυνσις). However it is possible that the impression is

1. Since it means that the experiences are that much more genuinely two events of a kind. If the one event were historical and the other eschatological it would be possible to argue for some kind of typological relationship between them.

2. A. Salas (Discurso Escatológico Prelucano. Estudio de Lc. XXI, 20-36, Real Monastio de El Escorial, 1967) considers that the reference is to the release of the Christians from the yoke of the Heathen and not to the parousia, (according to J. Schmid, "Rezension" (1970) 291) but this seems quite unnatural.
deceptive. It may be that there are signs connected with the destruction of Jerusalem (v 10 and v 20a) and signs connected with the judgement of the nations (v 25) and that all the events, constituting a sequence including the judgement of the nations, point to the nearness of the kingdom of God (v 31).

The issue turns on whether the ἐσπευδόμενος τῷ ἐρωτηθέντι ζυγεύειν (v 26) finds its fulfilment in "the powers of the heavens will be shaken" (v 26b) or in the coming of the Son of man (v 27).

The following points may be offered against locating the fulfilment in the coming of the Son of man.

1. In v 36 the pattern is "to escape all these things that will take place" and then "to stand before the Son of man". Standing before the Son of man is the achievement of final redemption (v 28). This makes it more likely that the coming of the Son of man in v 27 is to be separated off from the judgement events and understood more positively.

2. It is true that the nations and not the Christians are said to see the coming of the Son of man, but a comparison with 22.69 and its Markan "Vorlage" suggests that we are here in 21.27 concerned with the public nature of the manifestation of the exalted one.1

3. The interest of the following verse (v 28) in redemption suggests that the coming of the Son of man in v 27 will have a positive sense.2

1. Cf. the discussion in Zmijewski, Eschatologiereden, 244-50.

2. J. Schmid (Lukas, 313, and cf. Marxsen, Mark, 194; Conzelmann, Luke, 130) finds a contrast between the positive expectation for Christians in v 28 and the negative fears of mankind generally in vv 25f. The events are only a terror to the nations and not to the Christians. However this does not seem to be a correct reading of Luke's intention. The fear, expectation, etc. underline the terrifying nature of the experiences rather than pointing to the response of the unbeliever to them. The terrifying experiences confront the Christian equally with the non-Christian (vv 35 and 36). The Christian prays that he might make his way through them to redemption. Cf. Plender, Luke, 114; "not even the Christians are excluded".
4. The ρέτε at the beginning of v 27 already marks some kind of separation between the judgement experiences of vv 25f and the coming of the Son of man. The intermediate clause "for the powers of the heavens will be shaken" (v 26b) makes it less likely that the ρέτε separates beginnings from climax (i.e. introduces the fulfilment of the προσδοκίας), than that it marks the next event: after the experience of judgement, the whole world will see the Son of man coming in his glory - and this will mean salvation for the believers.

5. The link with Acts 1.9,11 achieved by the singular εν ρεείλαγ (contrast Mk's εν ρεείλατι) and the further comparison with Lk 9.34f suggests an emphasis on the manifestation in glory of the "hidden" Christ.

6. The Danielic imagery used in 21.27 is originally concerned not with judgement but with the receiving of a kingdom (Dan 7.14). The mention of the nearness of the kingdom in Lk 21.31 enhances the likelihood that this original imagery is in mind in v 27.

"The powers of the heavens will be shaken" (v 26b) could denote either that which provokes the fear and forboding or alternatively that about which the people are afraid. This is an obvious reference to Hag 2.6f, 21f where the earth (sea and dry land) is shaken as well as the heavens and it is all part of a judgement of destruction on the nations. Vv 25f are also reminiscent of Isa 34.4 where the context is a bloody judgement on the Gentiles. The phrase in Lk 21.26b κε ησυχα ησυχα of Isa provides a striking link with Isa 34.4 where the B text has the only use of this phrase in the

LXX. Against this background, "the powers of the heavens will be shaken" seems to provide a convenient way of denoting (without describing) a judgement of cosmic dimensions on the nations.

I conclude therefore, against first impressions, that the judgement of the nations precedes the coming of the Son of man.

This completes the parallel between the two judgements, and confirms the exegesis of \( \lambda \chi \rho \sigma \tau \gamma \theta \chi \alpha \nu \omega \nu \zeta \alpha \rho \alpha \varepsilon \omega \nu \). As a prelude to the parousia both Jews and Gentiles experience a judgement in history.

The final aspect of the parallel between the two judgements to be noted is that the two judgements considered together are regarded as the prelude to or sign of the coming of the Son of man.

1. Supported by L 0*, the clause containing it represents an MT clause omitted by \( \Lambda \) S.

The phrase also appears at Mt 24.29, the Matthean parallel to this verse, but not elsewhere in the NT, nor in the Greek Pseudepigrapha covered by the concordance in C.A. Wahl, Clavis Librorum Veteris Testamenti ..., Graz, 1972, edited by J.B. Bauer.

The link is particularly striking when we consider that such a familiar idea is expressed in this particular verbal form in only these three places.

2. A number of scholars have drawn attention to a certain Lukan reticence in describing the events of this apocalyptic judgement. E.g. G. Voss, Christologie (1965) 44, 115; Grundmann, Lukas, 384; Zmijewski, Eschatologiereden, 241.

3. We might perhaps say that the Son of man sets up his kingdom in the ruins.

4. Zmijewski (Eschatologiereden, 253) seems to me to be completely right when he comments on v 28, "Dass es sich auch bei diesen um geschichtliche und nicht um 'supranatural-apokalyptische' Geschehnisse handelt, wird durch \( \gamma \nu \epsilon \gamma \tau \varepsilon \omega \alpha \) (vgl. Vv 7.9.31.33 (sic. for 32).36) unterstrichen. Gedacht ist erster Linie natürlich an der Parusie unmittelbar vorausgehenden Geschehnisse (Vv 25f.)." Contra Geiger, Endzeitreden, 171.
In the parable Lk 21.29-31, where Mk has the "fig-tree", Lk has the "fig-tree and all the trees". In 13.6 the fig tree has been used as an image for Israel. "All the trees" are surely the Gentile nations. So the nearness of the kingdom of God (v 31) is signalled by the sequence involving the two judgements. One may suspect that this interest in both the judgements is also reflected in v 36. For while the first link will be with the judgement of vv 25f, ῥαξυπρ ... ποιελλοντι γίνεται echoes the μέλλη ῥαξυπρ γίνεται of v 7 where the concern is with the judgement on Jerusalem, and ὁκρυφειεν is reminiscent of the ἐπετεωσεν of v 21 which is enjoined at the onset of the Jerusalem judgement. Further the πάντα picks up the whole span of events so that we think naturally of the experience of both judgements. Certainly the special focus is on the Gentiles' judgement (vv 34f) as the immediate precursor of the Son of man's coming, but both judgements are part of the prelude and belong together as a connected sequence.

1. I owe this suggestion to Prof. G.W.H. Lampe. Jülicher, Gleichnisereden, 3, explains in terms of Luke's "Vorliebe für vervollständigende und verallgemeinernde Zusätze"; Jeremias, Parables, 29 explains as "embellishment"; according to E. Grässer, Parusieverzögerung (1960) 166 and n 1, Luke generalizes to eliminate any though of eschatological symbolism; Zmijewski, Eschatologiereden, 276, also sees here a generalization from the Jerusalem experience, but prefers to understand the establishment of a general principle for the interpretation of events (particularly disastrous events) in history. In this way he does not take seriously the two judgements, the one on the Jews and the other on the Gentiles.

2. Cf. Zmijewski, Eschatologiereden, 308: "Schon durch die Art der Formulierung wird also deutlich gemacht, dass V 36 vom Evangelisten bewusst als Abschlussatz der gesamten Rede Lk 21 konzipiert ist".

3. Attention may be drawn also to the ὁν πάντι καρπαὶ (cf. v 24 καρπαὶ ἐθνῶν; v 20 and v 8 together, καρποί ἐθνῶν).

4. Both Flender and Zmijewski lay stress on the parallel (continued...)
4. (continued...) between the destruction of Jerusalem and the
determination of the nations, but offer a substantially different interpretation for that phenomenon than is presented here. Zmijewski is largely following Flender and we may criticise their views together.

The first problem with the interpretation offered (esp. that of Zmijewski) is the existence of a certain tension within the view presented, Zmijewski wants to give the judgement on Jerusalem an absolute status as God's final eschatological judgement on Judaism (Eschatologiereden, 125, 200-12 etc.) and yet at the same time to make the destruction of Jerusalem merely an example of the way God brings judgement in history and thus make it into a means of setting forth a general principle for the interpretation of history leading up to the final judgement (119,121). I cannot see how it is possible to retain the absoluteness of the judgement on Jerusalem in Zmijewski's scheme which must embrace the various turns of fortune in history.

Flender does better at integrating his view. For him the fall of Jerusalem exhibits the city being reduced to having purely secular significance, for "through the guilt of the Jews Jerusalem ceases to be the bearer and guardian of the divine promises, and becomes no different from the rest of the world" (Luke, 114) and precisely because of this loss of status, "the judgement over the city becomes a typical example of what will happen to the rest of this old, transitory world" (ibid.). The "fate of the Jews" is in this way "a curtain raiser to the last judgement" (109).

Is it true, however, that Jerusalem ever becomes for Luke "no different from the rest of the world"? Flender must locate the secularization of Jerusalem at the point of its final rejection of Jesus prior to his death. Nevertheless, in Acts Jewish priority continues to be recognized (3.26; 13.46; 18.5f), and this means in the first instance the priority of Jerusalem (1.8). The location of the Apostles in Jerusalem seems to have theological significance (esp.8.2). The success of the post-Pentecost mission to the Jews (in Jerusalem) is rather emphasized by Luke (2.41,47; 4.4; 5.14; 6.1; 6.7; 21.20 etc.). Any shadow of the profaned status of Jerusalem and Temple is remarkably absent from the pages of Acts. Certainly the guilt of the Jews receives some emphasis, but this is not quite the same thing. A positive significance continues to be attached to Jerusalem and Temple (Lk 24.49,52; Acts 2.46; 3.1; 22.17 etc.). Jerusalem had been designated for judgement in times past without it being in any way God's final no to Judaism, and I think it remains to be proved that Luke thought of the judgement of 70 AD in such absolute terms. Might it not make better sense of Luke's emphases to suggest that the significance of Jerusalem has been relativized by the "to the Gentiles also" (Acts 11.18) rather than destroyed by the guilt of the Jews?

At a more fundamental level I think it remains doubtful whether Luke could have conceptualized the sharp distinction between sacred and secular history with which Flender operates.

If we have been right to see the judgement on the Gentiles as preceding the coming of the Son of man then this alone counts decisively against the view of Flender and Zmijewski. The significance we have seen in the "fig-tree and all the trees" (Lk 21.29) counts to similar effect. (continued...)
I am now in a position to offer some suggestions about how all the material fits together and functions in relation to Luke's purpose. It will be remembered that I have claimed for the chapter a background of concern about whether Christians were interested in attempting to realize their own eschatology by an attack on Jerusalem.

Luke is at pains to show that Christians entertained no such designs. Nevertheless he has traditional materials before him which express the view (a view which he shares) that historical events do have a part to play in the process that leads up to the parousia and rule of Christ. For Luke there is a developing sequence of events in history which will lead to a climax which ushers in the rule of Christ. The important thing however is where one should stand in relation to these events. What part do Christians feel they have in shaping the events?

Luke begins his description of the sequence of events at the point where it would seem most plausible that one might feel it possible to get involved to help shape the course of the future (v 9). Does the destruction of Jerusalem come in a power struggle which is designed to establish the messianic rule?

(continued...)

Against Zmijewski in particular it may be urged that we do not get the sharp contrast we might expect between a localized judgement on Judaea and a universal judgement of the whole world. We get γαὶ (v 23)/ εἶναι πάντας (v 26), not Χριστός (cf. esp. Acts 10.39)/ πάντας εἶναι (cf. Lk 2.1).

1. G. Braumann ("Zerstörung" (1963) 120-27) thinks that Luke is concerned to express the contrasting significances of the suffering of Christians and the suffering of Jerusalem at the destruction. This suggestion can be used to organize the material but gains no positive support from the text. Braumann has not offered any detailed exegetical considerations to defend the view.

2. In particular there is to be a judgement in history of the Jews, and then, in their turn, of the Gentile instruments of their judgement.
No! Wars and insurrections are not the signal for action. The rule of Christ does not come from an insurrection by his people. Wars and insurrections must come but the ἄριστος which stands over them is not the ἄριστος of Christian obedience but the ἄριστος of apocalyptic necessity.¹ Each successive portrayal of the unfolding events makes it increasingly clear that these necessary events are things that happen to one rather than things in which one actively participates. In vv 10f things are happening on such a grand scale that the prospect of one taking any initiative to affect the total shape of the events has already receded. By vv 25f any active role for humanity has disappeared altogether. Luke's portrayal belongs firmly to that kind of apocalyptic thought where the cataclysmic events which usher in the end are provided by a divinely determined necessity and in which the saints are appointed no active role.²

1. Contrast Lk 13.33 πελαγός ἄριστος συμπέραν καὶ ἀπεικόνισεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ παρεθεῖσθαι.

2. Contrast 1QM 16.1, "For the God of Israel has called out the sword against all the nations, and He will do mighty deeds by the Saints of His people."

L. Morris, Apocalyptic (1973) 40, draws attention to the bifurcation in apocalyptic circles of attitudes to rebellion. While for some "the wild visions of apocalyptic spurred them on to heroic endeavour", "some at any rate of the writers of apocalyptic must have discouraged armed intervention, for they put no trust in human endeavour". On pacifist apocalyptic views see further M. Hengel, Victory (1973) 16; O. Plöger, Daniel (1965) 164f. Hanson (Apocalyptic) argues persuasively for viewing second Isaiah and second Zechariah against the background of a split between the priestly group in control of the second Temple and the visionary (apocalyptic) group who considered that no human action could hasten the day of Yahweh.

In J.W. 5.387f, Josephus gives expression to an anti-revolutionary theology in terms of the sole agency of God in the rescue of his people. Schniewind (Markus, 121-3) finds in Mk 12. 13-17 opposition to revolution designed to establish the rule of God. J. Jeremias (Parables (1963) 151f) considers Mark 4.26-9 to have been Jesus' own answer to the Zealots.

While Luke's portrayal is "apocalyptic" in some sense it can in no sense be characterized as apocalyptic speculation: it lacks both an elaborate time-table for and detailed (continued...
In the midst of this emphatic denial of any active role for Christians in implementing their eschatology, Luke sets forward an alternative role for Christians. In v 12 attention is redirected from the wars and disturbances of the time of Jerusalem's fall, to the witness and suffering of the Christian disciples. In the events of the eschatological time-table they play no part, their role is simply to witness and suffer, and to know the protecting hand of God (vv 12-19).

The non-active role of Christians in the destruction of Jerusalem is underlined in vv 20-4. The time of destruction comes not when the disciples follow their messianic leader in an uprising (v 8) but when Jerusalem is attacked by foreigners (vv 20 and 24).

Quite passive in the whole affair, Christians neither take part in the defence of the city nor in the attack on it. They flee to safety because they know what is destined to take place (v 21).

Given this general shape a couple of particular points deserve attention. First there is the change in v 9 from Mark's \( \text{οὐπω τὸ τέλος} (13.7) \) to \( \text{οὐκ εὐθέως τὸ τέλος} \). Could it be that this alteration reflects Luke's view that there is indeed an organic connection between the beginning of wars and insurrections and the more developed situation of widespread military activity, natural disaster and cosmic portents? For him the wars and insurrections are quite definitely the beginning of the process which

…………

2. (continued...) symbolic description of end-time events. For his "apocalyptic" system Luke is content with that pattern from the OT which depicts a judgement on the Jews at the hands of the Gentiles followed by a judgement in turn on the Gentiles which ushers in the time of final blessing.

…………

1. Compare Jeremiah's encouragement of people to leave the city and surrender to the Babylonians during the siege (Jer 21.8-10).
leads to the τέλος. Mark's ἐσοπτήρ τέλος, especially without the later ἄντλησεν τέλος, separates these events too sharply from the τέλος. 1 Luke allows a real connection, but the τέλος does not flow from them immediately ( φόνον εὐθύς), but after a process of development and escalation.

μὴ προσέχει (v 9) is difficult on any understanding, 2 however it may be that the sense, against the background of the possibility of a Christian insurrection, is "do not be disturbed about the bids for ascendancy made by other groups". 3

In relation to the question in v 7, v 9 gives us the beginning of the process but does not signal the event of the destruction directly. The event is signalled by the more "apocalyptic" situation depicted in vv 10f. But the concern of the Christian is in no way to forward the apocalyptic process. Rather he is to witness and suffer (vv 12-19). While vv 10f give the general setting that indicates the time of Jerusalem's destruction (and at the same time identifies it as an apocalyptic event and not a political event) the precise signal which warns the disciples is the arrival of the foreign army (vv 20,24). When this happens they are instructed to flee. 4

At this point what may properly be termed the answer to the question is at an end, but the material continues for at least three reasons. 1. The traditional material that Luke is employing does so. 2. Since the significance of the destruction of Jerusalem is as an apocalyptic event in the prelude to the parousia, a discussion of its

1. Contra Bartsch, Wachter, 122. Cf. Goulder, Type, 113: "If anything, "not at once" is nearer than "not yet"."

2. μή προσέχει is hardly suitable for injunction to Christians faced by the eschaton!


4. Cf. W.C. Robinson Jr., Way, 78: "when the wars, calamities, and signs (21,10f) come to focus in the siege of Jerusalem (21:20) ...."
timing leads on inevitably to a consideration of its significance. In particular the judgement of the Gentiles which, for Luke, is the other side of the same coin can hardly be left unmentioned.

3. In the hidden agenda, eschatology is already in view. How is the kingdom of the Christ established? The strongly emphasized negative answer is that it is not established by Christian direct action. This answer is of course not entirely satisfactory without some balancing positive statement of how it is to be accomplished. Indeed, in part Luke establishes the negative answer by setting up the pattern of apocalyptic events, and this picture is not complete until it introduces the return of the Son of man (v 27) and the setting up of the kingdom (v 31).

It may be seen, therefore, that the distinctive features of Lk 21 are most adequately accounted for by the view that Luke was concerned in this chapter to show that Christians had had no desire to see the Temple destroyed.

This study completes the case offered in Part 2 for understanding Lk 21 as Luke's refutation of a Jewish polemic based on the logion concerning the destruction and renewal of the Temple, a polemic which is represented at Acts 6.14, and was employed to stigmatize Christianity as an insurrectionist movement violently opposed to main-stream Judaism.
Conclusion

We come finally to consider the specific conclusions which can be drawn from the preceding studies. For whom does Luke's handling of the matters studied make most sense?

The purpose of Part 1 of this work has been the essentially negative one of removing the presumption in favour of a Gentile readership which comes in the train of an understanding of Luke/Acts which finds there the story of the transfer of God's interest from the Jews to the Gentiles. That story one would write essentially for Gentiles to confirm them, as Christians, in their claim on the OT Scriptures and promises, but I have tried to show that Luke doesn't tell such a story. Luke tells rather of the unfolding of God's plan to reach in each place with the gospel the Jew and also the Gentile: "revelation to the Gentiles" and "glory to ... Israel".

By itself this doesn't tell us anything clearly about Luke's readers. It is, however, a conclusion of greatest importance since the almost unquestioned agreement of scholars that Luke portrays the transfer of God's interest from Jews to Gentiles has in my judgement, stood as the greatest single barrier to a realization that Luke/Acts is directed towards people for whom first-century Judaism provides religious norms.

Now while the content and structure of Part 1 have been determined by its negative function, along the way certain positive results have emerged which may throw some light on the identity of the readers. These can here be drawn together.
1. Luke seems to be concerned to counter any attempt to infer from the widespread Jewish rejection of Jesus and of the post-Pentecost preaching the falseness of the messianic claims of and for Jesus.

Luke carefully presents Jesus as in the tradition of the OT prophets and his death as a prophet's fate.

He has also an elaborately developed apologetic for the widespread Jewish rejection of the gospel. According to Luke it must first be reduced to proper proportions by setting it against the background of the universal scope of God's present plan which embraces Jews and Gentiles alike. Luke shows that in any case large numbers of Jews have believed both in Palestine and in the Diaspora. Further, he relates his story so as to make clear that, as is the case for the mission when other difficulties and apparent set-backs present themselves, God's missionary plans are even moved forward by rejection of the gospel by the synagogue; at times the synagogue opposition seems to provide the very momentum that keeps the mission moving; the synagogue rejection scenes are so handled as to become part of Luke's case that the Christian movement must be "of God" because, watched over by the hand of God, it makes its way unhindered and irrepressible despite every human threat and obstacle. Luke wants to stress that it is the disbelieving Jews who are the losers, not the gospel whose authenticity is put in question by this unbelief.

The extent of Jewish rejection of the gospel should not surprise since it has always been characteristic in God's dealings with his people that they have for the most part been hard-hearted and unbelieving.

The separation between the synagogue and the Christian movement is clearly the fault of the synagogue. From the Christian side, the separation is signalled as institutional rather than
absolute by the distinction made between the Jewish leaders and people, and by Paul's continuing interest in reaching Jews after the breach.

2. Luke also argues for the respectability, in Jewish terms, of the Christian interest in Gentiles: Christianity is faithful Judaism obeying God's will about offering salvation to the Gentiles also.

The Christians who make or support the outreach to the Gentiles are frequently given the best of conservative Jewish reputations and are said to have the respect of the Jewish community. 1 It is God who overcomes the solidly conservative scruples of the early Christians about acceptance of Gentiles.

The ministry of Elijah and Elisha, as an example of God's interest also in people outside Israel is offered as a biblical precedent for the offer of the Christian gospel outside the bounds of Judaism. The reader is probably offered in Acts 3.25 a biblical text to justify the Gentile mission ahead of time.

The use of the Sinai tradition in the Pentecost account may well be a subtle advance justification in Jewish terms for a Gentile mission: as the word of the gospel is taken out to the Jews in all the world, it is right that it should go to the Gentile peoples as well, just as the law did from Mt. Sinai.

The Gentile mission is shown to be no turning of the back on the Jews. For Luke, mission to both Jews and Gentiles continues

1. The Jewish leaders' opposition to Christianity is off-set by the high respect that the people have for the Christians. The converted Paul loses Jewish respect (especially the respect of the Hellenists) at his conversion but Luke can point to Ananias "a devout man according to the law, well spoken of by all the Jews who lived there" (Acts 22.12) who establishes Paul as a Christian. Stephen falls out of favour with the Jews, but only because of trumped up charges.
and all Gentile mission is conducted in the context of a continuing firm commitment to the priority of the Jews in God's plan.

Luke shows that Jews are to be saved very much as Jews and without loss to their Jewishness (while Gentiles are saved as Gentiles without first becoming Jews).

3. In the Lukan presentation, the Gentile mission is not just an embarrassing fact in need of apologetic defence (though there is certainly this apologetic aspect). In appendix 3 we see that it is for Luke an effective counter-charge to characterize the unbelieving Jews as those who violently opposed the Gentile mission because, having closed their minds to the possibility that God might be interested in uncircumcised Gentiles, they were determined to do all in their power to keep the Gentiles from being influenced by such a suggestion. The correlate to this is the characterization of the Christian missionaries (esp. Paul) as heroic defenders of the right of the Gentiles to salvation, once God had clearly shown this to be his will.

If the other results being assembled argue for a Lukan readership which will evaluate Christianity using norms provided by first century Judaism, this emphasis is surely best accounted for by a readership composed of God-fearers.

Part 2 has been concerned to show that Luke is deeply sensitive to a polemical use of the Temple logion: he has edited his material so as to make Lk 21 a refutation of the Temple accusation which is presented at Acts 6.14. Moreover, it has been possible to show that the polemic gained its force from the logion's ability, in a Jewish thought world, to characterize Christianity as an insurrectionist movement violently opposed to mainstream Judaism.
If the nature of the polemic and Luke's procedure for answering it have been rightly identified, then we have a result of considerable importance for the identification of Luke's readers.

Some of the other Jewish features of Luke's work (e.g. the emphasis on the faithfulness of the early Jewish Christians to the Temple and the law) could be accounted for by means of a concept of "Heilsgeschichte": the fidelity to Judaism of the early (Jewish) Christians establishes the "heilsgeschichtliche" continuity of the people of God through the period of transition from being a Jewish (law-keeping) people of God to being a largely Gentile (law-free) people of God, and thus justifies the Gentile church in its claim to be now the true people of God.

There are however, compelling reasons for not explaining the present piece of Lukan Jewishness along such lines. The polemic identified would not worry Gentile Christians because it would be largely unintelligible to them, and 2. because they would lack the kind of attachment to Judaism which provides the polemic with its force. The Temple logion is intelligible as a polemic only to people who are familiar with the Jewish thought world, and has persuasive force only for people who identify themselves with the fortunes of the Jerusalem Temple.

Luke responds to the polemic because he feels that it may disturb his readers and hold them back from commitment to Christianity, and this can only be true for readers who are familiar with, and receive their religious orientation from, first century Judaism. The great pains to which Luke has gone to provide an elaborate refutation of the polemic, suggest that such a readership was of considerable importance to him. They may not have been the only people for whom he wrote, but it is clear that he wrote with them very much in mind.
1. Classical and Rabbinic Parallels to "Physician, heal yourself" (Lk 4.23)¹

The sense of the proverb 'λκρέ, Θεός ε_

in Lk 4.23 is a crux for the understanding of the whole pericope in which it is embedded. Since Luke clearly puts it forward as a current secular proverb,² we may fairly look for illumination from the use in antiquity of similar traditional sayings.

While scholars frequently refer to the Rabbinic and Classical parallels to the proverb,³ I have not discerned any serious attempt to appreciate how these function in their own contexts, as a means of illuminating the way in which we might expect the Lukan proverb to function in its context. The following is an attempt to fill this gap, and thus to provide a more adequate survey of the relevant Classical and Rabbinic materials. The basis for inclusion of material is for the most part the presence of the notion of a sick doctor,⁴ and the emphasis in the perusal of each reference is on what the proverb, similitude, etc. serves to achieve in its given context.

One thing which emerges clearly from this investigation is the very different thrust and significance which even identically worded proverbs can have in different contexts. In the realm of metaphor and simile, context is decisive, and it is the contention of this

¹. This study is to appear in NovT.

². Attributed as it is to the thoughts of the Nazareth crowd it is a ἔρτοιξη in a class apart from all other Lukan uses of that word.

³. While those who cite parallels are too numerous to list, the most complete list still seems to be that of J.J. Wetstein, Novum Testamentum (1751).

⁴. Also included are a reference to a doctor whose medical skills are placed in question, and a reference to a sick drug-seller.
appendix that for purposes of comparison with the Lukan proverb, the
verbal similarities or dissimilarities have less significance than
the functioning of the compared materials in their respective contexts.

Literary reference to the incongruity of a sick doctor begins at least as early as Homer (before 700 BC),\(^1\) where in the Il.
11.833-5 we read

\[
\text{τοί μὲν ἐν κλίνησιν οὖσαι ἦλκος ἔχοντα}
\]
\[
\text{χρήσοντε καὶ ἀυτῷ ἀμώματος ηὐρίσκον·}
\]

Here the reference is quite literally to a doctor, who has sustained
injury in battle. The incongruity of a sick doctor is pointed up to
no further purpose than in the interests of more colourful expression.
Homer has no particular point to make in drawing our attention to the
incongruity.

By the time of Aeschylus (525/4 - 456 BC) we find the
incongruity of a sick doctor being used to make a comparison.

Pr. 469-75 Wretched that I am - such are the
inventions I devised for mankind, yet have
myself no cunning wherewith to rid me of my
present suffering.

(Chorus) Thou hast suffered sorrow and
humiliation. Thou art forsaken of thy wits
and art gone astray; and like an unskilled
leech,\(^2\) fallen ill, thou losest heart and
cans't not discover what remedies to minister
to thine own disease.\(^3\)

The passage begins in the first person and then abruptly changes to
the second person as Prometheus speaking about himself is replaced

1. For a discussion on the dating of Homer see C.M. Bowra, "Homer"

2. In our discussion we have consistently used "doctor" in place of
the "leech", "physician" etc. of some of the translations.

3. Lines 472-5 run πέπεσα χαὸς παρ 'απεσερλείας πρεσβύτερος
πλεκτά, καθός ἐν εἰρήνῃ ὡς τοῖς ἐν νόσῳ
πηγάθρα ζήλευε τοῖς σκέφτεν ὕψος ξείς
εὐφράτει δόσας φημήσας ἰδίσμος.
by the chorus speaking about him. Now it may be suggested that the chorus section parallels in content the earlier speech about himself, so that the suffering mentioned in the first person section is taken up and elaborated in the use of the words "suffered sorrow and humiliation", "fallen ill", "disease" etc. in the following section. The "cunning" used in the "inventions I devised for mankind" but which has now failed him is taken up in "thou art forsaken of thy wits". If this is true then the first person section also has relevance for understanding what is in mind in the mention of the "suffered" "sorrow and humiliation", "fallen ill", "disease" etc. in the following section.

1. If we were restricted to the immediate context, what comes to mind is the fake doctor who is shown up in his true colours when he himself falls ill and despairs of help from his own supposed medical skills. But such a comparison has only limited suitability for Prometheus. A much more suitable comparison is obtained if we allow the first person section of lines 469-71 to elaborate for us the content of the simile. We are given there a picture of somebody whose assistance to others is actually quite effective - and whose Achilles' heel is only revealed as he tries to deal with his own case. I suggest then the portrayal of a doctor of limited skills (see LSJ for the translation of κακος as unskilled) whose nerve fails him when he becomes his own case. When his own life hangs in the balance he panics and what skill he has deserts him and he cannot "discover what remedies to minister to /his/ own disease".

2. Had he been like the really good doctor he would have known what to do

Had he been like the really good doctor he would have known what to do

\[ \ldots \ldots \ldots \]

1. That this is so is confirmed when we reflect that the comparison with a doctor only has point in the light of the mention of Prometheus' assistance to mankind in the first person section, and further by the way Prometheus, in lines 476f expands on his role as healer of mankind.

2. This portrayal finds support in the "forsaken of thy wits", and the "gone astray" of the immediate context.
in this extreme test of becoming his own patient. Here he appears as one who has failed that test. He must be classed as a \textit{kakos iatros}.

So we have here the incongruity of the sick doctor being resolved in terms of the limitations of the doctor rather than in terms of the spurious nature of his claim to be a doctor. We might then paraphrase the force of the whole section as "You are not as good as you thought you were". Prometheus had shown up well in previous situations but is now faced with a situation that seems to be his own undoing.

With a change of language from Greek to Latin our "bad doctor" appears as "malos medicos" in a letter of a friend to Cicero in 45 BC on the occasion of the death of Cicero's daughter.

Finally, never forget that you are Cicero, one who has ever been wont to instruct and advise others; and do not imitate bad physicians who, in treating the diseases of others, profess to have mastered the whole art of healing, but themselves they cannot cure; nay rather apply to yourself and set before your own mind the precepts you so often seek to impress upon others.\(^1\)

It is not immediately clear how the comparison with bad doctors is to be applied. There appear to be two possibilities. Firstly, it could be that we are to understand the bad doctors as keen to hand out their own remedies for the illnesses of others but when they themselves fall sick, not applying these, but seeking better remedies from other doctors. Then the point would be that Cicero, having handed out so much good advice to others, should now show his own confidence in that advice by applying it to his own situation and finding a cure there.

\(^1\) Cic. Fam. 4.5.5. The Latin text in part runs "... neque imitare malos medicos, qui in alienis morbis profitentur tenere se medicinae scientiam, ipsi se curare non possunt ...."
This understanding fits neatly the immediate context, but is not so happily placed in the wider context. Cicero is hardly likely to be about to betray his own advice by following somebody else's advice as a remedy to his grief. His problem is rather the very real possibility of being so engulfed by his grief as to be beyond consolation.

Thus we should consider a second possibility. The bad doctor drums up business by the confident claims he makes for his cures, and his claims become so extravagant that he even suggests that he has mastered the whole art of healing. That he claims too much becomes very obvious when falling ill himself his own remedies are of little avail and he continues to languish on his sick bed. The point of likeness to such bad doctors which Cicero is being exhorted to avoid is that of remaining in the grip of his own grief, after having handed out to others what he offered as a remedy for theirs. The thrust of the friends letter depends on the assumption that Cicero's instruction and advice is not like that of a bad doctor. The letter is at this point a vote of confidence in Cicero's advice. It will prove totally effective for the giver (as it no doubt already had for its recipients). The risk Cicero runs of appearing to be like one of the bad doctors is not that of applying his own advice to no effect, but rather that of remaining uncured as they do, and this only because he has failed to apply his advice to his own case. The friend can thus confidently exhort Cicero to escape any likeness to the bad doctors simply by taking his own good advice.

This second explanation has the demerit of requiring a far more complex relationship between Cicero and the bad doctor, since a fundamental dissimilarity between Cicero and the bad doctor is already a presupposition of the exhortation to avoid being like
such a doctor. However the greater complexity seems justified by
the better sense given to the passage both in its immediate and
wider context.

The likeness drawn thus functions to strengthen the
exhortation to Cicero to deal adequately with his own grief by
suggesting that failure to do so would show him up in a light that
made him resemble something most unattractive.

From Cicero we turn to Ovid, again in Latin and
perhaps half a century later (born 43 BC, died AD 17). Ov. Met.
7.561 runs "... no one can control the pest but it fiercely breaks
out upon the very physicians ...".¹ Here as with Homer we are
dealing with literal doctors, and attention is drawn to the incongruity
of their illness, not to make any comment on the doctors, but to under-
line forcibly the fierce uncontrollability of this spreading plague
that has brought a whole city to its knees.

Ovid has a further reference to a sick doctor in Rem.
314.² "... I confess, I was a shamefully sick physician." Here the
reference is metaphorical. Ovid is giving good advice about how to
overcome an unfortunate infatuation. In course of his suggestions he
turns to his own experience and describes his attempts to deal with
the problem in his own life. He speaks metaphorically of himself as
a doctor treating his own illness. His confession to having been a
shamefully sick doctor draws its force from the implicit assumption
that at least ideally a doctor should enjoy perfect health, as it were

...........

1. The Latin is "... inque ipsos saeva medentes, Erumpit clades,
ob suntque auctoribus artes; ..."
2. The Latin is "... fateor, Medicus turpiter aeger eram."
curing his own illnesses before they can really take hold. Thus
while Ovid claims success for his medical treatment, he admits it is
no perfect cure being arduous and slow to take effect.

Dio Chrysostom is next to take our attention. With
him we are once again in the Greek tongue and now in a period contem-
porary with the New Testament documents. The passage is from
Discourse 49.13 and 14.

However the function of the real philosopher
is nothing else than to rule over human beings.
But if a man, alleging he is not competent, is
reluctant to administer his own city when it
wishes him to do so and calls upon him, it is
as if someone should refuse to treat his own
body, though professing to be a physician,
and yet should readily treat other men in
return for money or honours, just as if his
health were a smaller recompense than another
kind, ...

There is here no thought of the competence of the doctor being in
doubt. It is taken for granted that despite his demurs the philo-
sopher is fully competent rule and really knows he is. The comparison
of the situation of philosopher and doctor depends on the welfare of
a city standing in the same relation to a citizen as the health of a
person's body to the person. As it stands the persuasive force of the
comparison rests on it being obvious that health is of greater value
than wealth or honour. On this basis the likening of a philosopher
refusing the rule of a city to a doctor refusing to treat his own body
shows up the former as an irrational response and thus inappropriate
and to be avoided.

One cannot help but feel that the passage would have

1. The Greek text runs in part

... δικαιὸς ἐστιν ἐσπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ μὲν
ἀφιέναι πέμπει θεραπεύειν μὴ σίζοι
ἀφιέσθαι εἰπὼς εἰπέει, ἂλλως δὲ ἀνθρώπους
εἰρήσθαι πρὸς εἰς μίμοις ...
been to greater effect if the section on the value of alternative recompenses had been deleted. Its inclusion takes the focus away from the paradox of a doctor refusing to treat the illness that is closest to hand - a situation which is repulsive in its unnaturalness - and makes everything depend on the rather prosaic recognition that health is worth more than wealth, an observation which in itself has relevance to the matter in hand only at one step removed (since there is no term in the philosopher's situation corresponding to the wealth offered the doctor for his services). One might hazard a guess that Dio has borrowed the comparison of a citizen refusing to benefit his city with a doctor refusing to treat his own body, and has spoiled it with his attempt to spell it out more fully as he applied it to the case of the philosopher.

Use is made of the incongruity of a sick doctor in a proverb coined by Euripides (c 485 - c 406 BC). Unfortunately it has only been preserved as a fragment without context and we have no idea of the use to which Euripides put the proverb. However a number of later writers from the time of Plutarch (AD 46-120) onwards have made their own use of Euripides' proverb and we will examine the


2. If it could be shown that this source of Dio's was known in the milieu in which the Lukan proverb was used, it would lend great weight to the case for applying the σωμάτων of that verse to the inhabitants of Nazareth on the basis of the known similitude. However even then we would be inclined to expect τὸν σωμάτων rather than the bare pronoun. See further p 264 n 1.
function of the proverb in the contexts they have provided. The wording of the proverb runs 
\[ \ddoublespace \text{doctor of others, he running with sores}. \] 
Plutarch in *How to tell a flatterer* c32 p71,\textsuperscript{1} in a section on how to helpfully criticise a friend, makes the point that every man's frank speaking needs to be backed by his own sound character. Without this backing a man's attempt to deal in frankness results only in evoking the retort \[ \ddoublespace \text{doctor of others, he running with sores}. \] 
We could spell out the situation depicted by the proverb as one in which either the doctor has failed to medicate his own condition, in which case it is to be doubted whether even he places much store by his prescription for healing; or alternatively the medication has failed to help his own condition which makes questionable its usefulness to another. But really the use of the proverb here does not depend on any closer scrutiny of the situation, since in the first instance it is not here the advice that is being questioned, rather the right of the giver to provide it. There is an implicit appeal here to the belief that to have a right to interfere in another's affairs in any matter one needs first to have dealt effectively with that matter in one's own life.\textsuperscript{2} Here the advice has not been invited and is not wanted. Coming from a sick doctor medical advice is mere presumption. The proverb says eloquently "You're in no position to speak to me!" Thus the proverb here serves as an excuse for taking no notice of the criticism received. "Practise what you preach."

\textsuperscript{1} This and other references to Plutarch are to essays from the *Moria*.
\textsuperscript{2} Compare the line, "Persons that are frank speaking ought to be able to say of themselves that they have a good right to reprove others."
The proverb is put to a somewhat different use. Now it is not helpful criticism of a friend, but an attempt to distress the man who hates you. Plutarch advises against reviling, or at least extreme caution in doing so. If you revile a man for something of which there is any trace in you then "some vice lurking somewhere within" could "whisper ἀλλὰς ἵπτει αὐτός ἕλκειν ἡρώων". In explication Plutarch speaks of "evil speaking that recoils on its author" and "censures that by the truth are brought back upon the very persons who are responsible for them". Plutarch is warning against a situation where (to retain the medical metaphor), by declaring another person ill you are drawing attention to your own sickness.

In the use of the proverb here the spotlight has now shifted onto the failings of the doctor. The functioning of the doctor is here viewed not so much as one who offers prescription for healing but rather as one who diagnoses illness. When the doctor shares the illness with the patient, his pointing out of the patient's condition only serves the purpose of drawing more attention to his own. "People who live in glass houses shouldn't throw stones."

On brotherly love 481A has the proverb used in a manner reminiscent of that in How to tell a flatterer. In this case it is applied to a man who sets out to exhort his children.

For a man who has grown old in law-suits and quarrels and contentions with his brothers, and then exhorts his children to concord, ἀλλὰς ἵπτει αὐτός ἕλκειν ἡρώων, weakens the force of his words by his own actions.

The difference here is that the proverb is the remark of an outside observer commenting on the situation, and not the retort of the children and it gives the basis of, rather than being the expression of, the children's discounting of their father's exhortation.
Plutarch has one further use of the proverb. This time in Reply to Colotes 1110E. The use here is in line with that in How to profit from one's enemies. Colotes has levelled criticism at what he takes to be the view of Democritus. He says "people become mired in slime and confusion by such a view". Plutarch tries to show that it is in fact Colotes' views which are self contradictory and that "the slime and confusion" are what Colotes "dumps on himself and his master", and "here ... our friend turns out to be ξένος ἐλαφράς βρέχων". Colotes' criticisms are seen to be criticisms of himself as much as anybody else. He stands "condemned out of his own mouth".

This proverb from Euripides would seem to have special claim to relevance for our understanding of the Lukan proverb. It is already, as in Luke, in proverb form. Its use by Plutarch is contemporary with the New Testament. While verbally significantly different, the nature of the metaphor is identical and the range of possible applications similar. It is even quite conceivable that the NT form developed out of that of Euripides. For example, in a context like Plutarch How to tell a flatterer c32 p71F where the proverb is used as a retort, it would be quite natural to think of introducing an imperative to suit the purpose of retort better.

As it stands the proverb sets forward the incongruity of a sick doctor. In imperative form it would demand the resolution of the incongruity. This doctor of others, himself running with sores, must heal those sores, but how to express it? If there had been an adjective describing ἔλαφρας in place of the verbal form βρέχων then the "with running sores" part of the proverb could have remained intact and it may have received a form like "doctor of
others, heal your own running sores". But once it becomes necessary to tamper with the expression for running sores we notice that the doctor's being sick is now indicated by the verb which has been introduced. So that now, the designation of a specific illness for the doctor serves no greater interest than colourfulness of speech. This was justified in the original form of the proverb since there needed in any case to be some reference to the doctor's illness, but can only be kept in the new imperative form of the proverb at the expense of a double reference to the doctor being ill, and since economy of expression is almost a universal law of proverbs, there would be a strong tendency to economize at this point. Our proverb would then reduce to something like "doctor of others, heal yourself". However, with the imperative verb, doctor has become a vocative and is a bit clumsy as a vocative address. Not only that, it is also rather pleonastic. In the original form it had structural importance in pointing up a contrast: ἔλλω... ἀστήρ, and in contributing to the balance of the two halves of the proverb, but the former is now sufficiently achieved by the emphasis that falls on σεκαστήρ, and with the introduction of the verb, the proverb no longer falls into two halves needing to be balanced.

Thus the impetus to produce an imperative form of the proverb has led us straight from the Euripides' proverb to the form which occurs in Luke. Of course this falls far short of proof of dependence, but does emphasise how close they are and thus encourage us to pay close attention to the ways in which Euripides' proverb would have been used and understood, as important for our understanding of the Lukan form.

In the second century Galen, a doctor and medical writer makes use of the Euripides proverb. In Galen 6.307 the
proverb is said to have been in current use as a jeering insult against doctors who prescribe for others while not keeping themselves in constant health. The proverb serves here as a proverbial stylization of what is literally true. Its use is more for purposes of mockery than as a serious argument to deny the medical skills of the doctors. It does not come from a prospective patient as a refusal of treatment but merely from those out to find a sharp word to "bring the doctors down a peg or two".

There is an interesting reference in Galen 6.152 where Galen, if he had the Euripides proverb in hand, seems to have moved in the direction of what I have above speculated to be a possible development to an imperative form of the proverb. The sentence in question runs ἔχρην οὖν αὐτὸν ἑαυτὸν πρῶτον ἱασθαι τὸ σώματιμα καὶ οὗτος ἐπικεφαλῆς ἐτέρους ὑερακεῖσεν. The form is not self-consciously proverbial but it already has something of the style and balance of a proverb. However what is perhaps of greatest interest to us here is the way in which the force of an imperative has been introduced by the use of the verb form ἔχρην. Also a verb for "to heal" now appears (in fact both the ὑερακεῖσεν used in Luke and also ἱασθαι). Further, the specific reference to the illness has disappeared in favour of the vague general word σύμπτωμα, and this despite the context having a specific complaint in mind. The setting for the quotation is a situation in which the ailment of a doctor becomes a barrier between himself and

1. (continued...) The references to Galen are by volume and page to the text in Medicorum Graecorum Opera quae extant, ed. C.G. Kühn, Lipsiae, 1823.
the patient he sets out to treat. I give just brief attention to
later use of Euripides' proverb since we now move outside the period
for which we can claim relevance for our understanding of the Lukan
proverb. Gregory Nazianzus (AD 329-89) in his oration In defence of
his flight to Pontus expresses his concern not to be a leader whose
vice takes possession of his subjects. In particular leaders

... need to guard against being found to be
bad painters of the charms of virtue, and
still more ... poor models for the people,
or barely escaping the proverb, that we
undertake to heal others while ourselves
are full of sores. 1

Note that the proverb has been recast to apply directly to the
situation. It here functions as an indictment which Gregory wishes
to avoid.

Isidore of Pelusium from the 5th c. in one of his
letters 2 (Isidore Epp. 5.275) speaks of it being "altogether mirth-
provoking to begin to take in hand for others the things you have not
been able to begin for yourself". It is "ridiculous" and "even as if
a certain doctor running with sores attempted to heal those of his
fellow creatures". Note again the recasting of the proverb. The
incongruity of a sick doctor attempting to heal serves here as the
epitome of the ridiculous, as something to be avoided to save looking
utterly foolish. In Epp. 5.196 there is a further use of the proverb,
where the purpose seems to be to point out to the recipients their

1. Translation by C.G. Browne and J.E. Swallow in Nicene and Post-
may be found in Patrologiae Cursus Completus ..., Series Graeca,

2. Greek text in Patrologiae Cursus Completus ..., Series Graeca,
inability to help others while the present moral condition of their own lives prevails.¹

Contemporary with Galen there is a reference in Lucian to which we will refer before turning our attention to Rabbinic material. Lucian uses the drug-seller for his similitude rather than the doctor, but the situation is exactly parallel.

In short you seem just like that drug-seller who was advertising cough medicine and promising immediate relief to sufferers, while he himself was racked by a cough as he talked for all to see. (Apology for 'On salaried posts in great houses' ²)

The reference is to the embarrassing situation in which Lucian found himself in the latter part of his life. He had earlier written an essay ridiculing the supposed benefits of taking on a salaried position in a great house, and then later in his life while his essay was still enjoying acclaim and wide circulation he takes up for himself just such a position. So while per medium of his essay his voice still speaks to save people from such a course, he is at the same time doing that against which he speaks. The likeness is drawn to point up the ludicrous situation into which Lucian has stepped.

The emphasis is all on the situation as ludicrous and not at all on questions of efficacy of the cough medicine.²

1. In Isidore compare also Epp. 1.391

2. We could compare here from the 6th century AD Simplicius, Ἐγκυρίας εἰς τὸ τοῦ Ἐπικτήτου Ἐχθεριεῖαν , ch.73.

Text from J. Schweighäuser (ed), Epictetae Philosophiae Monumenta Tom 4, Lipsiae, 1800. For an English translation see (continued...)
Rabbinic references to the incongruity of a sick doctor are far more limited. The most important is probably that in Gen. Rab. 23.4 attributed to R. Jose b. R. Hanina (Palestine latter 3rd c.).¹ There is a conflict between Lamech and his wives over whether they should have children in view of the coming flood. They go to Adam for advice, who says they should do their duty and procreate. They reply

(Doctor, doctor, heal your own limp)
Have you kept apart from Eve 130 years for any reason but that you might not beget children by her!²

Adam is suitably impressed by these remarks and resumes his duty of begetting children.

It is striking at once that here for the first time we have an imperative form of the proverb as in Luke 4, something lacking in the classical material considered. When dealing with the Greek proverb I suggested that the transformation of the proverb by the introduction of the imperative of a verb "to heal" would probably cause the loss of a reference to a particular complaint. Nevertheless despite the presence of the verb "וְקָדוֹס" we still have here a precise

². (continued...) Epictetus his Morals with Simplicius his Comment translated by G. Stanhope, London, 1721⁴.

1. Dates for Rabbis are given as by Strack, Introduction.
designation of the doctor's ailment. We need look no further however, than to the difference of language structure between Greek and Hebrew to explain the יָנוֹלָן. Firstly the Hebrew pronominal suffixes allow the retention without the expenditure of a second word. Secondly Hebrew lacks the more specialized reflexive form available in Greek, and to express the reflexive here would need to use some form as רַעְשָׁנ 2 which is structurally no simpler than יָנוֹלָן, and in fact exactly the same. As to the actual choice of ailment, while I am not aware of the use of this root in reference to it, I find attractive the suggestion that it is the place of the limping of Jacob in the Hebrew imagination which is behind the choice. 3 It can be seen that it would not be impossible to suggest a line of dependence back to the Euripides proverb.

If we turn now to the actual function of the proverb we see that the proverb serves as a retort by someone who has received a moral directive from a person who has not applied the same directive to himself. We may avoid repetition by saying that the proverb functions similarly to that of Euripides in the context provided for it in Plutarch's work How to tell a flatterer, and by then pointing out the differences. There is difference in that Adam's advice has been sought, while the friend gives his unsolicited. However in both

...........

1. In יָנוֹלָן a Semitic tendency to repetition overrules the normal preference in proverbs for economy of expression.

2. This is in fact used in modern Hebrew translation of Lk 4.23.

3. It is just possible that the "limp" here connects with the "gout" of Midr. Rab. Lev 5.6.
cases it is the right to give the advice which is questioned. A further significant difference is that in Genesis Rabbah we may presume that the wives of Lamech complied with the directive of Adam, while protesting the right of Adam to give it, so that the proverb does not actually give expression to an intention to disregard the advice given, as is the case in Plutarch. Further an extra dimension is provided in Genesis Rabbah by the repentance of Adam. This gives our proverb something of the nature of positive exhortation. "Doctor take your own medicine."

Midr. Rab. Lam 1.16 § 51 in an obscure section attributed to R. Levi (late 3rd c. Palestine) implies the incongruity of a sick doctor. It speaks of

a physician one of whose eyes was weak (and watered) and he said, My eye weeps for my other eye.

The context would be well suited if the sense were that the one eye is said to weep because shamed by the conduct of the other eye. However whatever the sense the passage depends on the assumption that in a doctor such a failing demands explanation.

R. Levi is again responsible for a comment in Midr. Rab. Lev 5.6 on the verse "If the anointed priest shall sin so as to bring guilt on the people." The text runs

Is it conceivable that an anointed Priest should sin? Said R. Levi, Shame on the province whose physician is gouty, whose governor has only one eye, and whose defending advocate in capital cases plays the part of a prosecutor.

The doctor ill with gout is thus, with the other items in the list, conceivable, but a perversion - an unnatural monstrosity. A doctor with gout is presented as an extreme of inappropriateness and to have gout is probably understood to be most blameworthy for a doctor.

The final Rabbinic reference is not to a sick doctor
but rather to one whose healing powers are placed in doubt. In Midr. Rab. Num 20.14 we read of a doctor who offered to cure with his tongue a person bitten by a snake. On the way he saw a lizard and began searching for a stick with which to kill it. People said to him, "If you are unable to remove this creature, how can you offer to heal one bitten by a snake with your tongue?" If the lesser act requires the help of a stick how can he achieve the greater with nothing more than his tongue (his word of command?)?

We are now in a position to look back over the range of material considered and make some observations.

One cannot but be struck by the variation in thrust and significance in the different references to a sick doctor. In Aeschylus reference to a sick doctor serves to paint a portrait of a broken man, in the letter to Cicero it draws attention to a humiliation to be avoided, in Ovid it functions as an admission of limitation. Plutarch can use it on the one hand as a way of denying another's right to give advice, and on the other hand as a way of turning criticism back on its giver. In Galen reference to the proverbial sick doctor becomes a jeering insult, while for Gregory Nazianzus it

1. Dio Chrysostom's reference has been deliberately omitted from our summary list - not because it is not sufficiently distinctive - but because it is very definitely an "odd man out" in the list. The significance of Dio's reference pivots not on a comparison of a philosopher with a (sick) doctor, but rather on a likening of the body politic to one's own physical body. "A man's city is as himself." The notions of illness and of being a doctor are present but are peripheral to the main comparison.

Since the comparison with the sick doctor is here reached only secondarily via a more fundamental comparison, this reference cannot fairly be used in a list of references designed to determine the range of function and significance which we might expect for a comparison with a sick doctor.

2. How to tell a flatterer c32 p71f.

3. How to profit from one's enemies 88D.

is an indictment to be avoided by moral effort. With Isidore it epitomizes the laughable and ridiculous.¹ In the context provided by R. Jose b. R. Hanina the reference to a sick doctor becomes a call to repentence, and for R. Levi² the sick doctor is a wicked perversion.

When we observe how the wide variation in meaning is achieved, two points of importance stand out. Firstly that the widest diversity of significance is compatible with verbally identical references to the sick doctor. So in Plutarch the same proverb ἀλλὰς ἵππος ἐλκεσθαι βρῶν is in one context a retort denying the right of another to give the advice that has been proffered - and thus an excuse for disregarding the advice,³ and in a different context a way of exposing a critic to his own criticism so that he stands self-condemned.⁴ Secondly, that a very different form of wording for a reference to a sick doctor can, depending on context, have a very similar meaning. For this we may compare Plutarch's use of ἀλλὰς ἵππος ἐλκεσθαι βρῶν in How to tell a flatterer with R. Jose b. R. Hanina's use of the rather different proverb יְרָעָתָהוּ אִם אָמְרוּ אִם אִם אָמְרוּ. In both cases the right of a person to offer advice which has been given is being questioned, so that the central thrust of the two proverbs is here the same. Together these two points show clearly the dominance of context over verbal form, for the understanding of our references to sick doctors.

1. Isidore Epp. 5.275.
3. As p 264 n 2.
4. Reply to Colotes 1110E. Cf. also How to profit from one's enemies 88D.
I have now assembled a range of functions and significances for which references to sick doctors have been used in antiquity, and we have observed the decisive role of context in understanding each individual reference. What help have we here for our understanding of the Lukan proverb? We have not been able to find in Classical or Rabbinic sources another occurrence of the same proverb. Nor have we discovered that references to sick doctors always make some point to which our Lukan proverb must conform.

I have been able to show a natural line of development from Euripides' proverb to that in Lk 4.23. Therefore it is likely that Lk 4.23 is not an independently coined proverb but that it developed out of a tradition of proverbial references to sick doctors. This likelihood enhances the value for the study of Lk 4.23 of seeing the literary function of other surviving examples of such proverbs.

The relative unimportance for meaning of the particular verbal forms taken by the different mentions of a sick doctor has implications for our endeavour to understand Lk 4.23. The very obvious need to analyse the development of thought and functioning in context of our reference to sick doctors in Rabbinic and Classical sources points us to exactly the same need in the Lukan context. An atomistic approach simply will not yield a meaning.

Finally, since the exact verbal form of the reference to a sick doctor seems not to be of prime importance in the sources considered, we may claim that the whole range of references looked at, maps out for us something like the range in which we ought to operate as we seek to understand the point of Lk 4.23.
2. A fresh look at Acts 15.10

\[ \text{\underline{\underline{\text{διαχειρίσεως ἐπαναλήψεως}}} \] (Acts 15.10) is an important statement for the discussion of Luke's theology of the law, and it is the impression of the present writer that too often this verse has been understood in isolation from the whole statement on the lips of Peter (vv 7-11) in which we find it embedded. In particular it seems that the attempt is not made to define the contours of the statement by following closely the logical sequence and thought connections of the material. We here offer an attempt to reach an understanding of Acts 15.10 in this way.

For an understanding of Acts 15.10 the nature of the relationship between v 10 and vv 7-9 seems to be of supreme importance. At one level the relationship between v 10 and vv 7-9 is clearly expressed by \( \text{μείσας} \) "in the light of the Cornelius experience you make trial of God by demanding commitment to the law". However at another level the whole piece (vv 7-11) is a justification of the use of this strong term, and the relationship between the argument of vv 7-9 and that of v 10 still needs to be determined.

In vv 7-9 Peter has argued from the Cornelius experience, that Mosaic observances are not necessary for Gentile salvation.

1. This study is to appear in NTS. It stands here as an appendix because of the support it provides for the translation of Acts 15.11 adopted in chapter 1.

2. Is it right to see protruding here Luke's own attitude to the law, so carefully kept out of sight elsewhere? (Cf. Haenchen, \textit{Acts}, 446 and n 3). Or is Jervell closer to the mark in pointing to the history of Israel as the story of the failure of the Jews to keep the law ("Law", 151 n 55)? A systematic consideration of Luke's theology of the law is beyond the scope of this treatment. Nevertheless our results will have a significant bearing on this debate.
Is v 10 a new argument addressed to the disputed matter or does it lack independent status and depend on what has already been established in the preceding verses?

If the point in v 10 is self-contained then the argument could be from the impossibility of keeping the law. "It is our experience and that of our fathers that the law is an oppressive, impossible burden. How can we make the fulfilment of the impossible a condition for salvation?" The argument is a kind of logical deduction from the nature of the law, the nature of which is said to have been revealed by the Jewish experience. Haenchen adopts a view rather like this and feels that here "we have the law seen through Hellenistic Gentile Christian eyes, as a mass of commandments and prohibitions which no man can fulfil."¹

If this is the argument it proves rather more than is strictly required by the context. It may not be too strong to say that it becomes an argument for the uselessness of the law - an oppressive burden laid on men to no good end. As an argument it must apply as well to Jews as to Gentiles. In fact since the nature of the law is said to have been discerned from the Jewish experience, the application to Jews should come immediately to hand,² even before its relevance to Gentiles is seen.³ This proves too much for Luke who portrays Jewish Christians as not questioning the continuing validity of the law (cf. Acts 21.21). At best we can say that when Luke or

1. Haenchen, Acts, 446 n 3. See also 459.

2. More so in the light of the obvious interest of the passage in how Jewish Christians are saved, which is present clearly in v 11 on any reading.

his source thought up the argument the situation of early Jewish Christians had slipped from view.¹

The argument is, further, very curiously situated. It is strange enough to have this alien sentiment set on the lips of Peter, to whose Jewishness attention is drawn by the Semitic sounding Σύμεων of v 14, it is far more incongruous to have this argument set up as an answer to Pharisaic Jewish Christians. How can this argument, depending as it does on a hellenistic view of the Mosaic law, be offered to convince those who show, by the very demand which they are making, that they do not share this view of the law? Luke no doubt does have a tendency to address the reader rather than the situation of his narrative,² but he does this for literary advantage, and not with total disregard for the demands of the narrative situation.³

As well as this difficulty, it seems to me that the very nature of the argument is inappropriate from Luke. The argument depends on a view of the law as a mass of commandments and prohibitions which no man can fulfil - an intolerable burden. Now it is one thing to say that this is how the law would be experienced by a Hellenistic Gentile Christian, and by Luke himself if he is such a one. It is quite another thing to have Luke propose an argument which presupposes that this negative experience of the law is the only possible one. Yet the force of the argument depends on Luke's


3. We may compare the recasting of the account of Paul's conversion in Acts 22. So that a relatively full account can be given in the setting - an address to a hostile Jewish audience - the most explosively controversial point is relegated to the end where it can be allowed to precipitate a commotion without disturbing Luke's intention of once more recounting the conversion episode.
regarding the law as by necessity an impossible burden. Can this be true of Luke, who is not only aware that Jewish Christians kept the Mosaic law, but is able to portray with considerable perceptiveness a positive Jewish experience of the law (cf. especially the infancy narratives)? As a Hellenistic Christian his own feelings about the Jewish law may well be negative, but he is too aware of a different experience of the law to consider it a priori inconceivable that the keeping of the Mosaic law could be required of anybody. The awareness of this other experience of the law is too pervasive in his work to argue that for the moment he forgot that it was possible.

So I conclude that although the words ζυγόν ... ὄν ... [ού] Ἰσχύσαμεν ἀπόστισαν would suit well a Hellenistic Gentile Christian argument from the impossibility of the law, this is not in fact their function at the hands of Luke.

It would be possible to suggest that the form of argument in v 10 is "you've no right to ask of others what you haven't been able to do yourselves". This could be a pointed remark in relation to a Jewish Christian demand for Gentile observance of the law. It does however have the disadvantage of placing all the emphasis on the inappropriateness of the Jewish demand, where the real issue in the incident is the necessity or otherwise of such observances, and more particularly their necessity for salvation. One also wonders whether the Pharisees addressed would have much sympathy with an assumption that they hadn't made much of a success of keeping the law. Further περὶ ... κέτε links v 9 and 10 better if v 10 emphasises setting

1. These portray a very positive Jewish piety according to the law. See esp. ch.1.6, 8-11, 22; 2.21-27, 36-38, 39, 41-42. The Jewish piety of the Benedictus is reflected in J. Gnilka's conclusion: "Das Benedictus steht an der Schwelle von Judentum zum Christentum. Sein Verfasser ... schätzt die religiöse Literatur des Judentums seiner Zeit", "Hymnus" (1962) 238.

2. Some suggestion of this pervasiveness is given by the list in Cadbury, Making, 306-8.
up a contrary opinion to God's, rather than the making of a demand for which one lacks moral authority: ἐπιθέτους can hardly be epexegetical of ἐπιθέτους on such a view and one wonders what to make of the infinitive.

If we press the link with vv 7-9 and regard the point of v 10 as being dependent on vv 7-9 then the argument could be, "Back there in the case of Cornelius God didn't regard the law as necessary - why do you want to add it now since it is only an oppressive burden."

The attractiveness of this view is that it need not carry in its train the implications of Jewish freedom from the law. We are not now arguing from the impossibility of the law to its non-necessity. The argument starts from the premise based on vv 7-9 that for Gentiles God has shown that he doesn't regard the law as necessary. The point is then that we should not ask of the Gentiles what is both unnecessary (vv 7-9) and oppressively burdensome (v 10). The law is of course also oppressively burdensome for the Jews, but, burdensome as the law is, the argument does not exclude the possibility of its remaining as an obligation for the Jews.¹

This view also has better claim to be representing a possible Jewish view of the law - the view of the common people to whom the maze of intricacy was rather overwhelming, the view of those of whom it is curtly said in Jn 7.49 "this crowd, who do not know the law, are accursed."²

¹. Though not if its necessity for salvation is seen in such strict terms as Jas 2.10, "For whoever keeps the whole law but fails in one point has become guilty of all of it."

². See Rabbinic references cited at C.K. Barrett, John (1955) 274. It is however, still difficult to have this Jewish view emerge here and yet be represented nowhere else in Luke/Acts, when we consider how frequently Jewish observances come into view.
There are however several decisive objections to this view. Note firstly that this understanding of the point of v 10 has relevance in discussing a general demand for Mosaic observances by Gentiles, but none at all to the suggestion of the salvific necessity of these observances. Now the question has been set up in terms of the salvific importance of the law (15.1), the concern of vv 7-9 is with the circumstances of Cornelius' receiving salvation and v 11 is clearly concerned with how one may be saved. This would make v 10 half-way an irrelevance, or at best an aside. The however, at the beginning of v 11 seems to require that v 10 be in the mainstream of the argument. That is to say, the only really satisfactory reference point for the is the failure to fulfil the demands of the law; noted in v 10, but since salvation is the sole concern of v 11, it must also be the real concern at the place where the other pole of the contrast is expressed.

Secondly, this view leaves entirely unanticipated the interest of v 11 in how Jewish Christians are saved. With no explanatory introduction such an interest is quite out of place.

Thirdly, running through Peter's speech there is an obvious interest in bringing Jews and Gentiles together as the same in God's eyes. (καθὼς καὶ ἡμῖν (v 8); οὐδὲν διέκρινεν μεταξὺ ἡμῶν ἐκαὶ αὐτῶν (v 9); καθ' ὑπὸ τρίτων κακελῶν (v 11).) It would be desirable to have an understanding of v 10 more in line with this thrust, that so far as salvation is concerned, God treats Jewish attachment to the law or Gentile disregard of it as an irrelevant difference between Jews and Gentiles.1

1. Note already in the Cornelius episode, Acts 10.34, οὐκ εἶνα ἄρα προσωπολημπήγης ἐν θεῷ.
I should point out that in the form of argument being considered, we have really only kept the possibility of Jewish Christian allegiance to the law by taking up the point of vv 7-9 with a rather different emphasis than that provided by the text. We have required the emphasis "God has shown that he doesn't require the law of Gentiles", but it would be closer to the text to say that law keeping is treated as a trivial difference between Jews and Gentiles so far as the receiving of salvation. If we conform the above suggestion for the argument at v 10 to this emphasis then the question arises: "Why then should the Jews continue to try to bear the oppressive and impossible load that turns out to be of such trivial importance?"

With an eye to the points made in our criticisms above we turn to v 10 again to attempt an alternative understanding. The ζυγόν ... ὑπὸ οὐκ ἔχοντας ἑαυτοῦ ὑπὸ οὐκ ἔχοντας ἔχοντας παράτασις is variously taken above as

1. an oppressive burden of impossible demands;
2. pointing to the compromised situation of those who would make demands of the Gentiles;
3. an oppressive burden which the Jews have not in fact successfully carried.

In light of the difficulties encountered above, I ask whether the words necessarily convey a sense of oppressiveness, and in the course of presenting an alternative understanding of v 10 I will attempt to show that oppressiveness is not in view here.

First some preliminary observations. 1. Luke views the members of the early church as those who have experienced salvation. In Israel it is the (Jewish) Christians who are the saved (Acts 2.47).
They are those for whom the hopes of Israel have become realities. Further their possession of salvation is a palpable reality. (It is because the notion has this strong experiential element, that Cornelius' possession of salvation cannot be questioned. There can be no doubt that he had entered into these eschatological realities just like the Jewish Christians.)

2. I have already pointed to the passage's interest in how Jews are saved. V 11 clearly relates the question of how Jews are saved to the question of whether law-keeping should be demanded of Gentiles. An interest in Jewish salvation already has its roots in the ἀ δόκιμος καὶ ἡμίν of v 8 and the σκότος διέκμεν μετὰ ἡμῶν τε καὶ ἀ δόκιμον of v 9 which link the Jewish Christians to Cornelius' experience of salvation. This interest is thus quite pervasive and the slant of it all is that Jews and Gentiles are saved in just the same way.

In the light of these emphases I suggest that the background question at v 10 is, "What relevance had the law to your salvation?" and the concern is to show that their possession of the law was as irrelevant to their salvation as was Cornelius' lack of it.

It has already been noted that this sharp focus on salvation in v 10 is encouraged by the ἔλλειψα that begins on v 11.

Further, there is in v 10 a certain bringing together of Jews and Gentiles in so far as the Jewish experience of the law is related to Gentiles. If v 10 has the concern which I suggest it has, then the bringing together of Jews and Gentiles here will have the

1. They have the end-time experience of the Spirit (2.17, contra Haenchen, Acts, 179). God's promise through Joel is now redeemed (2.39). They live in days of fulfilment of what all the prophets pointed forward to (3.24). Even the hope of resurrection is in a sense fulfilled (26.6-8 cf. v 23).
same function as the bringing together of vv 8, 9 and 11, which serve the interests of showing that both Jews and Gentiles are saved in the same way.

The οὔτε καὶ παρόντες Ἰμίως οὔτε Ἰμεῖς links the Jewish Christians with the national solidarity of Israel.¹ The Jewish national history demonstrated that there was a characteristic human inability to come up to the law's expectations, since their history embodied the ambivalence of commitment to the law but failure to keep it (Acts 7.53) - no criticism of the law (cf. Stephen's λόγως ζυγίας (7.38)), but a decisive indication that it is not the way of salvation. Viewed as a prospective way of salvation it turns out to be accusing rather than salvific.² Generation upon generation of Jews had had the law but had failed to experience salvation. This is not unlike the sentiment attributed to Paul at Acts 13.38 πάντων ἦν οὐκ ἦν νόμος δικαίωσις.) In both places the law is considered with respect to its candidature as a means of salvation.³

The law which the Jewish Christians shared in common with the rest of Israel obviously had not the slightest connection with their salvation, and so it is to their Christian distinctive that one

1. Cf. Acts 13.32f γίγαν πρὸς τοὺς παρόντας ἐπιμέλησιν ἐγενομένην ἐκ τοῦ ἤτοι ἐπικεφαλήσιμον τοις τέκνοις Ἰμιών. Ἰμίων is however textually insecure. Haenchen's "neither the Jews of old nor the Jewish Christians themselves" seems to separate without good reason.

2. This contrast is seen to express Luke's point even more effectively when we call to mind the close connection for Luke between salvation and forgiveness of sins (Luke 1.77 χάριτων σωτηρίας ... ἐν ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτίων κατὼν). For Luke man's greatest need is forgiveness (cf. Lk 14.37; Acts 13.38f etc.).

3. Elsewhere throughout Acts the law seen as the Jewish way of relating to God remains unquestioned. Here also it is not called in question as a way of expressing piety. It is merely pointed out that the law can make no claim to be salvific.
must look for the cause of their salvation. On my reading, \(^1\) v 11 then points out that it is their Christian distinctive to have believed. Through the grace of the Lord Jesus, this believing is salvific for Jews and Gentiles alike. \(^2\)

We could then outline vv 7-11 as follows. The overall thesis is that the Jewish law is not salvific. Peter argues firstly that its absence did not preclude Cornelius from salvation. He argues secondly that its presence did not bring the experience of salvation to the Jews. He asserts finally that Jew and Gentile alike attain to the experience of salvation through believing.

Now where does all this leave us with regard to the precise sense of ζυγόν \(\ldots\) έν οὖτε οἱ πατέρες ημῶν οὐτε ήμείς ίσχύσαν \(\ldots\) \(\text{κατά}\)?

We find ourselves able to take seriously the verse’s own claim that we are dealing with an experience of the law that worked itself out in the history of Israel, which means firstly that the words need not bear the sense that falls to them most naturally if they express an outsider’s experience of the law. \(^3\) When a Jewish writer spoke of the law as "the yoke of the kingdom of heaven", \(^4\) he spoke of an obligation to which one gladly committed oneself. No

\[\ldots\ldots\ldots\]

1. In an appended note I offer reasons for translating v 11: "through the grace of the Lord Jesus, we believe (in order) to be saved, and so do they."

2. Compare Acts 13.38f where the salvific ineffectiveness of the law is contrasted with the salvific effectiveness of believing. διά τούτου ημῶν έδέσιν έμπιστούσα κατάγειλεν \(\ldots\) \(\text{κατά}\) πάντων \(\ldots\) ημείς έλέγχον \(\ldots\) εν νόμῳ Μωυσίου δικαιολογοῦμεν εν τούτῳ πάς \(\alpha\) πιστεύων διακαθότατοι.

3. See appended note on \(\betaιστρέφειν\).

4. See the references gathered under Mt 11.29 in Str-B I, 608ff.
sense of oppressiveness adhered to the term 

Yet the Rabbinic sense of the national failure to come up to the standards of the law is reflected clearly in the views of some Rabbis that Israel's failure to repent, even for one day, or to keep even one sabbath exactly as it was meant to be, was delaying the beginning of the messianic age. We can then speak of "failure to carry the yoke", without speaking of "oppressive burdens". Indeed the function which we have argued for v 10 in the development of thought is far better served by a reference here to failure than by a reference to oppression.

1. As in the appended note on , here too it is necessary to distinguish between being required to make an effort and feeling badly about the demands that are being laid upon one ("oppressive", "unfair", "impossible", etc.). The imagery of the cannot be used without suggesting that there is constraint imposed, hard work required, obligation undertaken etc., but it frequently escapes any sense that the is an undesirable thing. (Cf. the English "in harness").

As early as Jer 5.5 "yoke" is being used as a synonym for obedience to "the way of the LORD and the law of their God". Sir 51.26f commends the yoke of wisdom in the following words: "Put your neck under the yoke, and let your souls receive instruction; it is to be found close by. See with your eyes that I have laboured little and found for myself much rest." Mt 11.29f invites the taking of a yoke that is easy.

Did. 6.2 presents the ideal of Christian perfection as "to carry the whole yoke of the Lord." 2 Apoc. Bar. 41.3 speaks of those who have withdrawn from the covenant and cast from them 'the yoke of the law'. Rabbinic texts which speak of the "yoke of the law", "yoke of the kingdom" etc. are conveniently gathered at Str-B I, 608ff and 176f. "Yoke" is used in these in the same way as in Jer 5.5.

There can be no thought that in this well established use of "yoke" with regard to religious obligation ("of the law", "wisdom", "kingdom", "Lord", etc.), we are to see any kind of criticism of the religious duties. The word is used to denote "constraining religious obligation" without any negative colouring at all.

2. Ibid., 163ff.

3. Obligations are not shown to be oppressive simply because they happen to fail to be met. The resistance of our human failings to our own highest aspirations seems to be a universal experience.

4. We can make a better case at Acts 15.28 for the law as burdensome where elements of the Mosaic law are spoken of as a . This is however in relation to Gentile Christians to whom the whole Mosaic system was culturally alien. While the two are obviously linked it is not necessary to allow the sense of 15.10 to be controlled by this reference at 15.28 as do K. Lake and H.J. Cadbury, Beginnings IV, 174.
Secondly, once we have cleared away the negative overtones from "yoke", it is clear that at least one thread of the whole Old Testament history of Israel is the story of a people whose law was an obligation which they never really managed to fulfil - a yoke which they had not had the strength to carry. We suggest that it is really this biblical history of Israel which is in view, and the contemporary Jewish experience only as seen as a contribution of the biblical pattern.¹

Appended note on the translation of Acts 15.11

This words constitute the climax and conclusion to Peter's speech to the Council at Jerusalem over the question about the need to circumcise Gentiles. It is usual to translate v 11, "We believe that we shall be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus, just as they will".² I wish to dispute this translation.

The background against which Peter is depicted as speaking, is an assertion that Gentiles need to have themselves circumcised according to the custom of Moses, if they are to be saved (15.1) and to keep the law of Moses (15.5). Thus the question he is setting himself to answer is a generalization of the Philippian gaoler's rather personal ρέκε με ἅπαντα· σωθήσονται σωθω (16.30).

If we translate 15.11 as above then the verse does not relate directly to the question.³ To be sure it is the grace of the...

¹ In other contexts Luke is fond of representing the present (unbelieving) attitude of Jews as a continuation of the Biblical pattern (Acts 7.51, 28.25ff and elsewhere).

² RSV translation, supported by e.g. Haenchen, Acts, 446 and Conzelmann, Japhet, 392 n 160, who both refer to EDF § 397(2).

³ If Luke had like Paul an established law/grace antithesis then this would provide the necessary transition from v 10 to v 11, but none of Luke's other uses of χρίσις betray the slightest interest in such an antithesis.
Lord Jesus that makes the demands of v 1 and v 5 unnecessary of fulfilment, but that is just what Peter has yet to prove. Since the dispute is presented as internal within Christendom we can say that all parties to the dispute would be prepared to echo the sentiment "we believe that we shall be saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus". What is under debate is the meaning of this with regard to the evangelisation of Gentiles.

Another problem with the given translation is that it requires us to take πιστεύω in the sense of δοκεῖ or at least in the line of the use of πιστεύω meaning "to regard as credible, as true". This is not at all Luke's normal way of using πιστεύω. Of 45 uses, only in the two negative statements Acts 9.26 and 13.41 does this sense appear, and there the negative contributes its own particular nuance.

Further, where "believing" and "being saved" come together elsewhere in Luke's writing, he is intent on showing that faith leads to salvation. In Acts there is 14.9 where Paul ἐστήκει πίστευσέν τοῦ σωθηναί commanded the Lystra cripple to get up. Then at Acts 16.31 Paul answers the Philippian gaoler's question with πιστεύον ἐν τῷ κύριῳ Ἰησοῦ καὶ σωθήτητα.

In the gospel at 8.12 the Devil is said to remove the word from people's hearts ἐν μυ̊ πιστεύοντες σωθηναί. Jairus is told at 8.50, on hearing of the death of his daughter ὅτεν πιστεύσων καὶ σωθήτητα. Finally at 17.19 the

1. R. Bultmann, Πιστεύω (1968) 203.
2. Here physical healing is prominent in the content of σωθήναι but not to the exclusion of a bigger concept. So also Lk 8.12; 17.19.
Samaritan leper who returns to give thanks is told ἐπὶ τὸν σέ θαμβὸν
στειριμένον μετὰ τεταρτήμην ἑτέρου κατακλυσμοῦ.

These three objections to the given translation would all be met if we are able to read θεραπεύειν as an infinitive of result, and translate 15.11, "But through the grace of the Lord Jesus, we believe (in order) to be saved, and so do they." Since we have shown above that this translation contributes also to a coherent understanding of the whole passage, we suggest that it should be preferred to the normal rendering.

Appended note on βαστάζοντας

The translation of βαστάζοντας as "to bear" in Acts 15.10 is unfortunate as it is apt to be misleading in modern English. As the use of "bear" with the neutral sense "carry" has dropped away, the word is more and more restricted to use in fixed expressions and contexts where a strongly negative connotation is present. Thus to translate βαστάζοντας as "to bear" suggests that

1. These references are also noted by Lake and Cadbury, Beginnings IV, 174.

2. BDF § 391(4). Cf. Lake and Cadbury, Beginnings IV, 174 who provide this as "an alternative view" and suggest that "this interpretation may explain the variant in Κατὰ τοὺς Ἰωάννην συμφώνα itero;" Bruce, Acts (1952) 295, prefers this understanding of the infinitive.

3. With κατέρχομαι τρέποντας καθολικῶς the stress must fall in such a way as to make clear that the case of the Gentile Christians is being proved from the case of the Jewish Christians.

It is interesting to note that although Haenchen, Acts, 446, regards θεραπεύειν as expressing the content of the belief and not the result of the belief as here, in a later section (459) where he is more interested in the thought content he paraphrases the verse, "Belief in Jesus is the only thing which saves - Jews and Gentiles alike."
we are dealing with a word which has automatically a negative colouring, which is just not true of the use of the Greek word.

There are instances where some kind of negative reaction is connoted by $\beta\xi\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\zeta$ (so English: tolerate; endure; put up with; not be overwhelmed by; etc.).

In the NT there are Rev 2.2 $\omega\upsilon\delta\upsilon\nu\eta\eta\nu\zeta\tau\acute{\iota}\zeta\zeta\omicron\upsilon\zeta\omicron$; Jn 16.12 $\omega\upsilon\delta\upsilon\nu\nu\sigma\theta\epsilon\upsilon\beta\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\zeta\zeta\upsilon\nu\upsilon$; Gal 5.10 $\delta\epsilon\tau\rho\rho\iota\omicron\sigma\sigma\nu\nu\zeta\upsilon\zeta\omega\upsilon\zeta\zeta\tau\acute{\iota}\zeta$ $\tau\omicron\omicron\upsilon\varphi\tau\alpha\omicron\omicron\upsilon$, but these three are the only sure cases in 27 occurrences. (It may be argued that Mt 20.12 and Rom 15.1 should be included.)

Further, none of Josephus' 32 or 33 uses of the word have negative connotation, nor any of the six occurrences in Philo. (Philo Quod Det 9 is a good example of the use of the word where we are dealing with a heavy burden gladly taken up: "'Sychem' means 'shoulder', a symbol of patient toil; for lovers of virtue carry a very great burden ($\beta\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\zeta\zeta\nu\nu\upsilon\gamma\lambda\nu\upsilon\zeta\chi\theta\upsilon\zeta\zeta\upsilon\nu\zeta\zeta\upsilon\zeta\omicron\upsilon\zeta\nu\upsilon\upsilon\nu\zeta\upsilon\nu\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon\zeta\upsilon\upsilon$), namely resistance to the body and bodily pleasure ...." (cf. § 10) "The words in which thy father urges thee to go put no compulsion on thee, in order that thou mayest follow the better course at thine own prompting and by thy own spontaneous action." It is clear that $\beta\xi\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\zeta$ here indicates virtuous effort rather than negative toleration.)

Of 11 occurrences in the Pseudepigrapha covered by J.B. Bauer only in an uncertain reading at Apoc. Mos. 11 and in

the B text of Test. Ab. 13 is any negative connotation present.

H. Kraft lists 24 uses of $\beta \gamma \tau \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$ in the Apostolic Fathers. Herm. Vis. 1,3,3 is the sole instance where the colouring of the word is negative. In Did. 6.2 the ideal is to $\beta \gamma \tau \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu \tau \kappa \nu \iota \omega - \nu$ we might translate "to take on". If you can't manage that you are to reach whatever level you can ($\epsilon' \delta' \omega' \delta' \nu \nu \nu$, $\nu \nu \nu$, $\tau \sigma \tau \nu \nu$).

Seven uses in LXX offer one with negative connotation (4 Kgdms 18.14). The sense of Sir 6.25 depends on the word there being free of negative overtones. We can catch the sense by paraphrasing, "wisdom is a load to carry, but you ought not to regard it as irksome to do so."

The negative connotation appears more frequently in the translation of Symmachus who has three cases in 14 extra uses of the word. Theodotion has two cases in seven uses. From other Greek translations of the OT, E. Hatch and H.A. Redpath list six further uses of $\beta \gamma \tau \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$ none of which has negative colouring.

So of the 129 uses of $\beta \gamma \tau \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$ scrutinized, in only 12 cases is the word to be understood in a negative sense.

We conclude then, that except for the weakened sense, where the idea of a burden has disappeared completely (Gal 6.17; Acts 9.15; Herm. Sim. 8, 10, 3; 9, 28, 5), that the focus of the word is for the most part firmly on the effort required to carry the

load, rather than on the load being something hard to put up with. (There is also a usage where emphasis falls on what one's carrying achieves, where we may translate "to support", e.g. Philo Migr 114).

It can be noted further that the cases in which the negative connotation does appear are almost exclusively cases where the carrying imagery is as much as possible out of sight. So e.g. Apoc. Mos. 11: finding reproof intolerable; Test. Ab. B 13: glory unbearable; Jn 16.12: what Jesus has to say too much to take; Rev 2.2: not being able to endure evil (men); etc. 4 Kgdms 18.4 is an exception to this pattern, but it is the example with the weakest negative colouring. Here βαστάζειν approximates to "accept" with perhaps some suggestion that acceptance will not be palatable - any stronger sense of feeling badly about being called upon to accept the demand is lacking. Gal 5.10 is difficult to categorize.

In Acts 15.10 the carrying imagery is very much in sight, the whole expression picking up as it does the image of the animal carrying a heavy yoke (cf. Jos. Ant. 8.213, βαστάσας ἄγα λύτος ὑπενέγκατον; Did. 6.2, εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἔσκαμοι βαστάσας ἐλθών τούς Ἀγάλλου τοῦ Κυρίου τέλειος ἐτης). It would seem therefore that we should be quite surprised if βαστάζειν here in Acts 15.10 were to have negative overtones, and ought to carefully guard ourselves against being influenced by the connotations of the English word "bear".
3. Jewish Opposition to the Gentile Mission

The concern of this appendix is to sketch briefly Luke's portrayal of the unbelieving Jews as those who would expend every effort to keep the Gentiles from Christianity (salvation) because they (the Jews) were not prepared to allow that God might have a place in his purposes for Gentiles as well.

We begin with the presentation of the unbelieving Jews as those who made every effort to stop the Gentiles embracing Christianity. This motif first occurs with and is given dramatic embodiment by the Jewish false prophet Bar-Jesus who seeks to keep the Gentile proconsul Sergius Paulus from becoming a Christian (Acts 13.6-12). Bar-Jesus is presented, in his role as adversary to the Christian faith, as a kind of antitype to John the Baptist.1 The position,2 the dramatic presentation and the literary formulation3 of this incident of Jewish opposition to evangelization of the Gentiles suggest that Luke uses the account to focus attention on the motif as it surfaces from time to time in his subsequent narration.

Elsewhere, in 13.44f it is in the light of the Gentile influx into the synagogue to hear Paul that the Jews contradict his

1. John is a prophet (Lk 1.76; 7.26) whose concern is to turn people to God (1.16f) and "make [the Lord's] paths straight" (3.4 and cf. 1.17,76 and 7.27).

Bar-Jesus is a false prophet (Acts 13.6) who sets out to turn away the proconsul from the faith (v 8) and "make crooked the straight paths of the Lord" (v 10).

2. This incident enjoys prominence as the front-piece to Paul's first missionary campaign.

3. I.e. the presentation of Bar-Jesus as an antitype to John the Baptist.
message and revile Paul (or Christ); in v 50f it is Paul's Gentile mission in Antioch that occasions the persecution stirred up by the Jews; in 14.2 we are told how the unbelieving Jews stirred up the Gentiles and poisoned their minds against the brethren; Jews from Antioch and Iconium (14.19) turn the misguided but enthusiastic reception of the Christian missionaries in Lystra (v 18) into murderous rage (v 19). Other indications of Jewish hostility to Paul should perhaps be understood as directed against Paul the missionary to Gentiles (cf. 21.21f). ¹

We now turn our attention to the basis, as Luke understands it, for Jewish interference with the Gentile mission. Luke does not present the basis for, as overtly as the fact of interference, nevertheless I think it is clear enough that he understands the opposition to stem from a refusal to allow that God might have a place in his purposes for Gentiles: the opposition is a jealous guarding of Jewish exclusiveness. Having closed their minds to the possibility that God might be interested in uncircumcised Gentiles, they did all in their power to keep the Gentiles from being influenced by such a suggestion.

Luke portrays Jewish exclusiveness as the initial attitude of the Jewish Christians. They needed clear direction from God to

¹. We would need to except 9.23 and 29 from this judgement.
see that he wished to reach for salvation in Christ not only the Jews but also the Gentiles of the world. In the Cornelius incident "the believers from among the circumcised (= the Jewish Christians) ... were amazed, because the gift of the Holy Spirit had been poured out even on the Gentiles" (10.45). Similarly when the incident is recounted in Jerusalem the light which dawns on the Jerusalem Christians is that "to the Gentiles also God has granted repentance unto Life" (11.18).\footnote{1}

Now there can be little doubt that Luke has the Jewish Christians starting out from the normal or at least the most "authentically Jewish" attitude in Judaism. We are to understand that it is Judaism's view that salvation is not for Gentiles. It should not be lost on us that it is God's interest in a highly respected pious God-fearer which comes as such a revelation to the Jewish Christians.\footnote{2} The "normal" Jewish attitude as reflected by Luke is that proselytes are on the inside (2.10) but God-fearers are on the outside along with all other Gentiles. The God-fearer may receive certain fringe benefits (e.g. "enlightenment", cf. Rom 2.19) from his attachment to the synagogue and even attract a measure of respect from the Jews (Acts 10.22; Lk 7.4f) but in the final analysis he remains outside the sphere of salvation

\footnote{1. Cf. also 10.28 and 10.34 cf. 15.9 "no partiality". J. Jervell ("Paul", 165) is quite misleading when he speaks of the Jews in Acts as "not unwilling to allow /the Gentiles/ a share in salvation". He can mean only that Gentiles could join the Jewish nation by circumcision as proselytes.  

2. Luke's interest in stressing the Jewish piety of the man is suggested by the repeated mentions of his piety (10.2f cf. v 7, v 22, v 30, v 35).}
unless he takes the final steps and joins the Jewish nation as a proselyte.¹

Now it seems intrinsically likely that Luke would have us see this "normal" Jewish attitude behind the Jewish interference with the Gentile mission and he has actually provided us with some specific pointers in this direction. In Acts 13.44f it is the streaming of the Gentiles into the synagogue which triggers the negative Jewish reaction (v 45 contrast v 42).² In 22.21f it is

1. There is some (but scant) evidence for a more generous stream of thought in Judaism (See e.g. F. Siegert, "Gottesfürchtige" (1973) 114-20), and it has frequently been noted that the presence of God-fearers in the synagogue would generate a pressure towards a more liberal attitude. However, what has not been demonstrated is that this pressure had much headway in the face of the forces of Jewish exclusivism (despite some confident assertions especially in relation to the diaspora situation, e.g. G.E. Moore, Judaism I (1927) 325; Siegert, "Gottesfürchtige", 120 - for a contrary view see E. Lerle, Proselytenwesen (1960) 28-35; also E.P. Sanders, "Salvation" (1976) 42: "What is remarkable is that there is no clear evidence at all from Hellenistic Judaism that the salvation of Gentiles who did not convert was seen as possible. ... Hellenistic Judaism was more consistently exclusivist than Palestinian Judaism"; M. Simon, Israel (1949) 323 (and cf. 332): "les metuentes, n'ont jamais été considérés comme membres de la communauté sainte ... ils restent sur le parvis comme des catechumènes permanents.")

Eph 2 seems to reflect a radical Jewish "no" to Gentiles, with circumcision marking the line of division (v 11 and cf. Rom 2.25-29). See my article "Uncircumcised Proselytes?", forthcoming in JSJ, for a refutation of N.J. McLennan's claim ("Circumcision" (1973) 328-33) that circumcision was not such a strictly demanded requirement in first-century Judaism.

If the claim of this dissertation is correct, that Luke writes to people who have first-hand familiarity with practicing Judaism, then it would be an unforgivable failure of verisimilitude for him to misrepresent what was the known Jewish attitude to God-fearers.

2. Cf. 17.4 where however it is not unambiguously clear that it is the conversion of the devout Greeks and leading women which provokes Jewish jealousy.

Haenchen (Acts, 414 n 3) is wrong to dismiss the suggestion of Wendt (Apg., 217) and Loisy (Apges, 540) that here the Jews begrudged the Gentiles salvation. Cf. also Schlatter, Apg., 168.
the mention of the mission to the Gentiles that converts a willingness on the part of the Jewish crowd to listen into a frenzied mob reaction.¹

I conclude therefore that Luke is concerned to characterize the unbelieving Jews as those who violently opposed the Gentile mission because, having closed their minds to the possibility that God might be interested in uncircumcised Gentiles, they were determined to do all in their power to keep the Gentiles from being influenced by such a suggestion.²

Now the conclusion which can reasonably be drawn from the main body of the dissertation is that Luke writes for a reader who will evaluate Christianity using norms provided by first-century Judaism. But if we have rightly understood this motif of Jewish opposition to the Gentile mission, we may be able to identify the readership more exactly.

As an apologetic, this motif seems to be tailor-made for God-fearers:³ people who assess Christianity in categories provided by their Jewish mentors, people who nevertheless find

1. The same attitude may lie behind the reaction to the suspicion that Paul had brought Gentiles into the Temple (20.27-36). However, we cannot be sure since, in Luke's presentation, Paul himself would never have dreamed of taking Gentiles into the Temple.


3. Studies with a special interest in God-fearers include J. Bernays, "Gottesfürchtigen" (1977); J. Levi, "Prosélytisme" (1905); Str-B II, 716-21; Lake, "Proselytes and God-fearers", Beginnings V, 74-96; L.H. Feldman, 'Sympathizers' (1950); R. Marcus, "Sebomenoi" (1952); K. Romaníuk, "Gottesfürchtigen" (1964); E. Benamozegh, "Noachism" (1964); H. Bellen, "Gottesfürchtigen" (1965-6); B. Lifshitz, "Sympathisants" (1970); J. Newman, "The 'Righteous'" (1971); E. Every, "God-fearers" (1975); Siegert, "Gottesfürchtige"; H. Hommel, "Theaterinschrift" (1975). See also the studies on proselytism for which an extensive bibliography of the material to the end of 1974 may be consulted in W.P. Bowers, Mission (1977) 201-4.
themselves in the uncomfortably ambivalent position of being welcomed in the synagogue, yet kept at arms length by the Jews and pronounced to be outside the sphere of God's salvation so long as they feel unable to take the final step and join the Jewish nation as proselytes, people who are being told by Luke that their Jewish mentors would purposely keep them blind to the truth of Christianity precisely because they (the unbelieving Jews) were not open to the possibility revealed in Christianity that God was also interested in Gentiles. ¹

¹. Luke does not however think in terms of Jewish malevolence towards God-fearers. On the contrary, part of the groundwork in Luke's case for the acceptability of what Christianity is doing in extending salvation to Cornelius and his like is provided by precisely the degree of Jewish approval of the pious God-fearer (Lk 7.4f; Acts 10.22). Cf. H.J. Cadbury, Making (1927) 308. (A similar appeal to Jewish values occurs at Acts 22.12.)
The attitude of the Qumran Covenanters to the Jerusalem Temple has been variously understood. It has been suggested that they offered sacrifices in their own community in a cult set up in opposition to that in Jerusalem. It has been suggested that there were special arrangements within the precincts of the Jerusalem Temple for them to sacrifice separately. It has been suggested that they frowned on all sacrifice, adopting a wholly spiritual understanding of the cult.

1. This study is to appear in RevQ number 36 under the title, "JOSEPHUS Antiquities XVIII, i, 5, 19 - a misleading statement of the Essene attitude to the Temple".

2. Literature with particular relevance to the question of sacrifice at Qumran includes J. Baumgarten, "Sacrifices" (1953) 141-59; J.L. Teicher, "Priests" (1954) 93-9; J. Carmignac, "Sacrifices" (1956) 525-32; Gartner, Temple, 1-46; Klinzing, Umdeutung, 20-49.

Important texts with disputed significance include CD 4.2; 9.14; 11.17-22; 12.1f; 16.13; 1QS 9.3-5; 8.6-10; 4QFlor 1.6f. The literature contains many contributions to their understanding and we cannot list them here.

On the significance of the partly burned bones found in jars at Qumran and/or the "altar" found by S.H. Steckoll see F. Zeuner, "Notes" (1960) 28-30; R. de Vaux, Archéologie (1961) 11f; H. Bardtke, "Tierknochenfunde" (1963) 328-49 and the literature there cited; Steckoll, "Temple" (1967) 55-69; M. Delcor, "Temple" (1968) 196-9 (and the post-script thereto by de Vaux, 204f ); Steckoll, "Notes" (1969) 33-44; R.T. Beckwith, "Calendar" (1971) 587-91. The literature on the cultic meals of the Essenes also has a certain relevance to the question.

The fact that the Qumran community hoped once again to sacrifice in Jerusalem and their obvious enthusiasm for cultic matters, suggests to me that their emphasis on atonement by means other than sacrifice is not enlightened spirituality so much as a way of dealing with a sense of loss. This seems inconsistent with a developed alternative sacrificial cult.


4. See n 2.
My own estimation of the situation reflected by the Qumran documents themselves is briefly as follows. There was probably a time in the early history of the movement when the Jerusalem Temple was still used by the Covenanters and certain cultic regulations still survive in the Qumran literature as relics from this period. There was no disillusionment with sacrifice as such but rather sacrifice ceased when an irreparable rift with the Jerusalem leaders led to a situation where what the Covenanters considered the only proper place for sacrifice came to be thought of as defiled and unfit for use. Thus deprived of sacrifice in the present, on the one hand the Covenanters looked forward intensely to the time when they would "liberate" Jerusalem and restore a pure cult, and on the other hand they consoled themselves by developing for the interim a spiritualized understanding of sacrifice and Temple which assured them that their present worship of God was not left defective.

Now it is not my intention here to defend such a view. This note has the more limited concern of proposing an understanding of Jos. Ant. 18.19 which, if correct, shows that this text provides no evidence for an Essene attitude to the Temple which is more positive than that which I suggest prevailed in the Qumran community.

1. These "relics" may also reflect a consciousness of the need for cultic regulations for the future.

2. I regard G. Klinzing's study (Umdeutung, 20-49) to be a particularly valuable contribution to this debate.

3. It is of course quite possible that there were Essene views which differed considerably from those at Qumran. The Essene movement was considerably wider than its manifestation at Qumran. Beckwith ("Calendar", 590f) speculates that the hard Qumran attitude to the Temple belongs to the marrying Essenes, while that in Ant. 18.19 is characteristic of the better known celibate Essenes.
Josephus tells us of the Essenes εἰς δὲ τὸ ἱερὸν ἄναβηκαν στέλλετες, but this does not sound like the Qumran Covenanters at all and I offer the following account of the Josephus text Ant. 18.19.

Josephus is embarrassed by the strict separation from the Temple practised by his religious heroes, the Essenes. He can hardly ignore this glaring distinctive of the movement, so he attempts to portray it in a way which minimises the impact of this unfortunate defect. He knows (or assumes) that they paid the Temple-tax - all Jews did that! This offers him a possibility of providing the Essenes with one positive link to the Temple. Furthermore payments of Temple-tax are ἄναβηκαν (cf. Ant. 18.312) so Josephus can honestly (but deceptively) say that the Essenes send ἄναβηκαν into the Temple. So far so good, but what can he do about their refusal to have

1. Dupont-Sommer's linking of CD 11.18-21 with the practice mentioned by Josephus (Qumran, 154 n 1) is not convincing, since whatever we are to make of the CD passage it certainly includes the offering of just those burnt offerings at the Temple which are excluded by Josephus. Cf. J. Strugnell, "Essenes" (1958) 114 n 36.

2. The full text under discussion reads

εἰς δὲ τὸ ἱερὸν ἄναβηκαν στέλλετες ἔλθας ἐντελεσθεὶς ἐπιθεσθαι ἀγρευν, ἵπτοντες καὶ ἄντων εὐφόρους τοῦ κοινοῦ τελευταῖος ἐὰν αὐτῶν τοῖς ἐπιτελεσθεῖσιν, βεβαίως ἐν ἱλλος ἀνδρεῖς....

3. The Essenes may well have considered it expedient to do so. However Vermes (Scrolls, 249) is probably right to see in the stipulation of 4QOrd 2.6-9 that the payment to the Temple be made only once in a man's life-time, a way of "refusing regular support to the Temple at Jerusalem".

4. The text speaks of τὸ ... ἐκπροχθὸν ... καὶ ... ἄλλο ἀναβηκαν. The text in Exod 30.11-16 on which (with 2 Chron 24.9) the Temple tax is based, speaks of ἱλλος ἀνδρεῖς. In Rabbinic discussion, e.g. Ṣeqal. 1.5 the Temple tax is discussed in parallel with (other) Temple offerings.
anything to do with the sacrificial cultus? Well, he can give the impression that this was at least half-way the fault of the Temple authorities: the Essenes would have gladly sacrificed in the Temple but the authorities wouldn't let them sacrifice using the ritual purification rites they thought necessary, and even went so far as to banish them from the common precincts of the Temple!\(^1\) The Essenes were left with no option but to make alternative private arrangements for making sacrifice to the deity. (This last statement would appear to be a factual error, at least so far as the Qumran community is concerned.\(^2\) Perhaps with Klinzing we should think here of a misunderstanding of a source,\(^3\) or alternatively of a false deduction by Josephus, that such pious people must have made sacrifices to God.)

By the time Josephus is finished we no longer have a movement whose attitude to the Temple is scandalous. Their proper pious regard for the Temple is signalled by the \(\text{of }\ \text{or }\), while their obvious failure to take part in the sacrifices is to be explained as the unfortunate by-product of one of those disputes over purifications which continued to be part of Rabbinic debate and can be well contained within respectable Judaism. The Essenes only failed to sacrifice because the Temple authorities

\begin{itemize}
  \item 1. "Banished" not "withdrew themselves": \(\text{of }\ \text{or }\) is always passive, never middle voice in Josephus (R. Marcus, "Pharisees" (1954) 158).
  \item 2. See the literature p 290 note 2 .
  \item 3. Umdeutung, 48f.
\end{itemize}
wouldn't let them. For this reconstruction I have assumed that \(\text{οὐκ} \text{ εἰσερχόμενος} \) should follow \(\text{σεῖλλοντες}\). This is the reading of the Epitome and is supported by the old Latin. Apart from the Epitome, the Greek texts all lack the \(\text{οὐκ}\). Since the old Latin is at least five centuries older than the existing Greek manuscripts it is an important textual witness, and it is generally agreed that the textual evidence is sufficiently indecisive to require the decision about the correct reading to be made on

1. Josephus' primary audience is Gentile for whom lack of reverence for the Jerusalem Temple would appear problematical, but sacrificing at another place would not.

   It may be however that Josephus also has canons of acceptability to Jews in mind as he writes. It is hard to give a confident assessment of how "out of line", sacrificing somewhere else than at the Jerusalem Temple would have appeared to first century Jews. The Leontopolis Temple is not roundly condemned in the way we might expect (Delcor, "Temple", 202f).

2. The textual evidence is conveniently summarized by J. Thomas (Mouvement (1935) 12 n 3).

3. It is also the situation that either reading may be accounted for as a derivative of the other.

   M.J. Lagrange (Judaïsme (1931) 316 n 5) postulates a Latin insertion of the negative because the existing phrase seemed unintelligible. He does not work the suggestion out in any detail.

   Thomas' suggestion (Mouvement, 15) that a scribe perceived a contradiction between \(\text{ὅσις} \text{ ὁσιός} \) and \(\text{ὅσις} \text{ ὁσιός} \) is particularly attractive to me. It is interesting to note that W. Bauer acts the part of just such a scribe when he argues that the \(\text{οὐκ}\) cannot be original because of just this contradiction ("Essener" (1924) col. 398 lines 61-66).
M. Black has disputed the appeal to the old Latin for support for the negative reading, apparently on the basis that the Latin glosses cum populo into the text, which means that only a sacrificing "with the people" is negated, and not sacrificing per se. However it is hard to see the force of Black's argument, since the Greek οὐκ ἐν τῷ θυσίαν no more excludes sacrifice per se than does the Latin.

Black has drawn attention to the strange use of prohibent to render στελέλοντος. It seems possible that what has happened here is that the translators, feeling the Essenes' attitude to Temple άνθρωπος and θυσία c.

2. Scrolls, 40 n 1.
3. The old Latin text is not to be found at "ed. Migne P.L.IXX, col.1133c" as Black (ibid.) suggests. As far as I have been able to determine it has not been edited since the edition at Basileae, 1524, by Johannes Frobensius, Flavii Josephi patria Hierosoly .... F. Blatt, The Latin Josephus I. Introduction and Text. The Antiquities: Book I-V, København, 1958, projected a further volume completing the critical text begun here, but no further volume has appeared.
4. Unless Black wants to have the negative totally separated off from the verb and thus to translate, "They sacrificed, not with the people ...", but this is hardly a natural reading of the Latin.
5. In the Greek the implication is "not in the Temple". The Latin with its "not with the people", leaves open the possibility of the kind of arrangements for separate sacrifice at the Temple for which Black argues (ibid., 40).
6. Ibid., 40 n 1. The Frobensius text reads propenda prohibent, which if it is correct reinforces this suggestion further, since in that case prohibent corresponds to nothing in the Greek text and represents an addition which the translators must have felt forced upon them.
will parallel each other, have been misled precisely by the
which confronted them in their Greek text.

It would appear therefore that reason is lacking for
doubting the witness of the old Latin to the presence of the
negative in an earlier Greek manuscript tradition.

Thomas has offered the most detailed case on internal
grounds for accepting the \( \sigma \cup \kappa \) \(^1\), while Strugnell seems to provide the most carefully worked out case against the negative reading.\(^2\)

I do not intend to repeat here any of Thomas' arguments but I would suggest that they deserve more careful attention than Strugnell's "do not convince".\(^3\) The approach here will be to work from the frame which Strugnell has provided and to consider in turn his three reservations about including the \( \sigma \cup \kappa \) \(^4\).

Strugnell's first objection (114) is that reading \( \sigma \cup \kappa \)
"necessitates a contrast between \( \sigma \tau \varepsilon \lambda \lambda \omicron \omicron \upsilon \omicron \varsigma \) and \( \sigma \cup \kappa \) \( \varepsilon \rho \alpha \omicron \omicron \varepsilon \omicron \delta \omicron \upsilon \) which the text does not indicate".

There is however an indication that a contrast is intended somewhere in the text, viz. the \( \chi \lambda \lambda \omicron \varsigma \) at the beginning of the following sentence: "Otherwise they are of

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{1. Mouvement, 13-18.}
  \item \textbf{2. "Essenes", 113-115.}
  \item \textbf{3. Ibid., 113.} In particular Thomas' argument that the initial clause must be understood as a case of adversative subordination (Mouvement, 14) while it does not require the acceptance of \( \sigma \cup \kappa \) as Thomas suggests, does seem to call in question Strugnell's translation of the text without the \( \sigma \cup \kappa \). D.H. Wallace, "Sacrifice" (1957) 335-8 has offered Thomas' arguments in an English dress, but does rather less than justice to them.
  \item \textbf{4.} Or rather his reservations about following the translation he offers based on this reading, \textit{viz.}:
    "Although the Essenes send \( \chi \nu \omicron \upsilon \omicron \upsilon \upsilon \omicron \varsigma \) to the Temple, they do not sacrifice (sc. 'there', rather than sc. 'at all') because of a difference about the \( \chi \gamma \nu \upsilon \omicron \upsilon \omicron \varsigma \) that should be used. It is because of the existence of this difference that they are excluded from the 'common court' of the Temple and perform their sacrifices separately" ("Essenes", 114).
\end{itemize}
the highest character". This surely indicates that it has been preceded by something for which the Essenes may attract criticism. Now the sending of votive offerings to the Temple is not open to criticism, nor what precedes it in 18.18, so the sensitive matter must begin somewhere in what follows στελλοντες. But since what follows belongs together as the explanation of a single matter (whether we read οὐκ or not), we must conclude that the implied contrast begins after στελλοντες.

Strugnell's third difficulty (115) is one of sequence of thought. On his reading the inclusion of the οὐκ leads to a situation where "the fact that they have abstained from the sacrificial cult of the Temple because of a dispute over the appropriate άγνεον" is being offered as the "ground for their being excluded", which is clearly a nonsense.

It is however quite possible to understand the text in a way that provides a far better thought sequence: "They do not perform sacrifices because of a dispute over the purification rites which should be used" remains imprecise until elucidated by the following remarks. Indeed the same imprecision remains even with the addition of οἵ αὖτί καὶ εἴποι οὔτω τὰς οὐνίσκε καταλελουθ. We only know that a dispute has led to a situation where the Essenes find it necessary to sacrifice by themselves rather than in the Temple. The parenthetic clause εἰρήμενοι γοῦν κοινοτικά τιμενάμενεις supplies us with the information needed to rightly construe the whole. The clause makes clear the way in which the dispute has led to a situation where the Essenes no longer sacrifice in the Temple: the dispute led to the authorities refusing them permission to do so. They have not withdrawn, they have been thrown out! So we are to understand that the Essenes do not make
sacrifices in the Temple because a dispute over the right purifications to be used has led to their ejection, as a result they have arranged an alternative sacrificial system among themselves.

Strugnell's second problem (114f - that to be required to understand "in the Temple" as an implied condition on "they do not sacrifice" is "rather an important scilicet") is at least part way met when we reflect that the localizing force of εἰς τὸ ἱερόν is carried into the principal clause by the fact that a Temple context is implied for the dispute over purifications: it is purifications for Temple sacrificing which had been in dispute.

If we have been able to deal adequately with Strugnell's objections, are there things which positively recommend the reconstruction I have offered? There seem to be two.

In the opinion of Strugnell "a really satisfactory explanation of the optative νομιζομενον "has not yet been provided (115). Can I suggest that this lack has been met by the above reconstruction. Unlike Strugnell's rendering of the text containing the οὐκ, my own understanding requires no implication of the practice of the Essene rituals in the context of the difference. The dispute is over what should be done in relation to Temple sacrifices and at that point remains theoretical.¹ This clears the way for the "oratio obliqua after the notion of controversy" which Strugnell had considered to be, strictly speaking, excluded.²

¹. The Essene practices which should be adopted for Temple sacrifices are only put into effect by the Essenes in the alternative sacrificial arrangements which they make after their exclusion from the Temple.

². Ibid., 115 n 41.
The second advantage is that already recognized by Strugnell.\textsuperscript{1} \linebreak1 έξιφορείς ἀγνείς is better understood as a causal phrase as above,\textsuperscript{2} than as a modal adverbial phrase (as required by the text which lacks \textit{οὐκ}) which strains its sense until it is equivalent to \textit{δισφορείς ἀγνείς}.

It would seem therefore that there is every reason for accepting the \textit{οὐκ} into the text of \textit{Ant.}	extit{18.19}.

I conclude by offering a translation of the text which embodies the main suggestions offered above and on the basis of which I have put forward the view that Josephus is deliberately giving a misleading portrayal of the Essenes at this point.

While sending offerings to the Temple, they do not offer sacrifices because of a dispute over the purifications which should be used, and for this reason\textsuperscript{3} (having been excluded from the common court of the Temple) they perform their sacrifices among themselves.

\textit{.........}

1. \textit{Ibid.}, 115.

2. I cannot offer a certain example of \textit{δισφορείς} with the sense "difference of opinion", however it seems reasonable to consider that the word would be used in this way. \textit{δισφορά} is certainly used with this sense.

3. I.e. because of the situation which has arisen as a result of the dispute. The parenthetic clause defines more carefully the sense of the rather vaguely conceived \textit{αὐτό}. 

---

\textsuperscript{1} Ibid., 115.

\textsuperscript{2} I cannot offer a certain example of \textit{δισφορείς} with the sense "difference of opinion", however it seems reasonable to consider that the word would be used in this way. \textit{δισφορά} is certainly used with this sense.

\textsuperscript{3} I.e. because of the situation which has arisen as a result of the dispute. The parenthetic clause defines more carefully the sense of the rather vaguely conceived \textit{αὐτό}. 

---

---
5. Sib. Or. 3.265-94, an early Maccabean Messianic Oracle

Sib. Or. 3.218-94 provides a sketch of the history of Israel from the call of Abraham from Ur to the restoration after the Babylonian captivity, at which point the oracle is marked as complete and transition to new material achieved by the words: "Then indeed my spirit ceased its God given strain, and I besought the Great Father to ease me from my spell. And again the word of the Great God fluttered in my breast and bade me prophesy of ..." (lines 295-8).¹

Our particular interest here is restricted to lines 265-94 which compass the period from the Babylonian deportation to the restoration of the Temple to "as it was before" (line 294).

A number of earlier scholars² found a messianic reference in "the God of heaven will send a king, and shall judge each man with blood and flame of fire" (lines 286f).³ This view has, however, fallen into disrepute and N. Nikiprowetsky⁴

1. Cf. the similar formulae in lines 1-7 and 62f.


3. For "of heaven" (εὐρυγνῶσ) some texts have "from heaven" (εὐρυγνωσία) and this latter reading is adopted by Hilgenfeld.

4. N. Nikiprowetsky, Sibylle (1970) 133. Earlier critics of the messianic interpretation are listed by E. Fehr, Studia (1893) 49. To these we may add J. Geffcken, Komposition (1902) 7; A. Kurfess, Weissagungen (1951) 293; J.J. Collins, Oracles (1972) 38f; and Nikiprowetsky himself.
can confidently claim that all modern critics reject the messianic interpretation. The different messianic interpretations shared in common the flaw of leaving lines 286f as a messianic fragment poorly integrated into what is otherwise understood to be a straightforward historical outline. The modern critic is surely right to find such interpretations inadequate.

However there is one messianic interpretation which seems to have been overlooked in modern studies. Proposed by

1. H. Ewald (Entstehung, 35f) makes lines 288-294 almost parenthetical - that Temple is "vorräufige" only - and suggests that the eschatological judgement motif of lines 286f is resumed in lines 300ff which extends "das Unheil und die Strafe" - despite Zerubbabel - "noch immerfort". While lines 300ff certainly take up themes from the section in question (e.g. lines 301f) it is very difficult to deny continuity of sense from line 287 to lines 288ff, and to require the thread of continuity to be picked up again in lines 300f. Doubly so when we note that in the literary structure a deliberate break is marked by the intervening lines 295-299.

In the hands of H.F. Delaunay (Moines, 259) lines 288-294 acquire a thorough sense of anti-climax when he suggests that, "Après cette promesse, (of a king sent from heaven to judge all men ) à la réalisation de laquelle il n'assigne pas de date précise, la sibylliste, reprenant la suite des événements, nous montre Esdras relevant le temple et les rois des Perses y envoyant des présents".

A. Hilgenfeld does not really make clear how he sees the relationship between lines 286f and 288-294 (Apokalyptik, 64; "Apokalyptik", 318; "Sibyllen", 36 n 2). Perhaps we do him most justice if we understand his position to be similar to Ewald's, except that he tries to draw lines 288-294 more into the sequence of thought with his comment, "So hab nur bei den Juden das göttliche Strafgericht eine vorübergehende Bedeutung" (Apokalyptik, 64). In reply to criticism of his messianic interpretation of lines 286f he admits that the king in 286f is "allerdings zunächst Cyrus, aber nur inwiefern er schon Jes.45,1 der Messias Gottes genannt wird" ("Sibyllen", 36 n 2). E. Fehr took this to be a reversal of his previous view (Studia, 49 n 2). However this is not so. He was rather moving in the direction of a double identity for the king, but failed to develop this idea. (Cf. also C. Alexandre, Oracula (1869) 97 cfd. with idem , Excursus (1856) 315.)
E. Fehr in 1893, it involves understanding eschatologically not just lines 286f but the whole section from line 282 to line 294. Fehr’s suggestion is interesting, not only because it opens again the possibility of a messianic understanding of lines 286f, but also because it uncovers in lines 288-90 an expectation of a restoration of the Temple by a messianic figure. Now while it is generally assumed that the building of the eschatological Temple is occasionally attributed in Jewish tradition to the Messiah, the evidence for this is either late or of uncertain date or doubtful interpretation, and L. Gaston has argued strongly that there is in fact no early tradition of a messianic building of the Temple. If Fehr’s line of interpretation is correct, and if lines 265-94 share the

1. Fehr, Studia, 49-51. M. Vernes (Histoire (1874) 57 n 1) in a single sentence almost seems to anticipate Fehr and then abandons the line of thought in favour of a non-messianic interpretation of the passage.

2. My own investigations had led me independently to Fehr’s conclusions before I became aware of his suggestions.

3. "There is a royal tribe, whose family shall never stumble: and this in the circuit of times shall have dominion and shall begin to raise up a new shrine of God."

4. The texts involved are Tg. Zech 6.12f; Tg. Isa 53.5; Lev. Rab. 9.6 and parallels; Sib. Or. 5.41ff and perhaps Tg. 2 Sam 7.13f; Tg. 1 Chron 17.12f; the midrash on 2 Sam 7.10-14 in 4QFlor. Cf. Mk 14.58 and parallels.

second century BC date of other material in *Sib. Or.* 3, we have here in *Sib. Or.* 3 an important early expression of hope for a messianic building of the Temple.

This appendix sets out then, to develop Fehr's suggestion, to defend it with additional supporting arguments and to discuss the dating of the text.

We can begin by noting that the eschatological pointers which led the older critics to find a messianic reference in lines 286f are not restricted to those lines, but colour the whole section lines 282-94.

Thus, it is already striking that the historical outline should terminate with the restoration, and this must be accounted for in any reconstruction. J.J. Collins concedes that the restoration "constitutes a parallel to the final messianic deliverance", and is impressed by "the parallelism between this account of the historical restoration and the description of the eschatological age later in the book" (p 45).

There are a number of eschatological touches in the description of the restoration which confirm this impression:

"A king (who) shall judge each man with blood and flame of fire"

1. For an outline of the history of the investigation of the date of *Sib. Or.* 3 see Nikiprowetsky, *Sibylle*, 195-226. This may be supplemented by Collins, *Oracles*, 21-33.

2. *Oracles*, 39. For Collins this is a major concession since he is firmly set against Nikiprowetsky's attempt to read eschatology out of the passage.
(lines 286f) does not seem entirely fitting for Cyrus\(^1\) but it is reminiscent of the "blood and fire and columns of smoke" which are portents of the eschatological judgement in Joel 3.3 and cf. 4.2 (ET 2.30 and 3.2);\(^2\) "the exceeding great glory" (\(\xi\gamma\iota\varsigma\gamma\iota\varepsilon\\) \(\mu\varepsilon\gamma\iota\varsigma\pi\gamma\eta\) ) of the restoration (line 282) is rather different from the actual event (cf. Hag 2.3), while in the same line "at the end" (\(\tau\epsilon\lambda\omicron\omicron\) ) suggests an eschatological glorification; finally, "the Temple shall be again as it was before" (line 294) fits ill with the restoration of the Temple which "will not be like the former one" (Tob 14.5).

The use of the sixth century destruction and restoration as a pattern for understanding, and establishing hope after, the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 AD is something we are familiar with from the books 1 Baruch, 2 Baruch and 4 Esdras.\(^3\) In these books the authors speak to the situation of the men of their own time in terms of their being, as it were, the exiles of the sixth century. The particular impetus to this procedure is the

\begin{itemize}
    \item \textbf{1.} Noted by Fehr, Studia, 50, et.al.. More recently A. Peretti, La Sibilla Babilonese nella Propaganda Ellenista (Firenze, 1943), 392ff, who finds here the influence of the Oracle of Hystaspes (according to Collins, Oracles, 38).

    It makes little difference whether the judging is syntactically linked to the king, or to God as maintained by Collins, Oracles, 38. If God is thought to be judging then the king will be the instrument of judgement.

    \item \textbf{2.} Further, Fehr, Studia, 50, et.al. compare Sib. Or.3.652, "Then from the sunrise (or from the sun: \(\Delta\pi\iota\iota\varepsilon\lambda\iota\omicron\omicron\) ) God shall send a king." The comparison depends somewhat on reading \(\omega\rho\nu\sigma\tau\omicron\nu\) in line 286 (cf. p 300 n 3).

    \item \textbf{3.} Fehr, Studia, 51 n 1, also compares 2 Baruch and 4 Esdras. Not all are convinced of a post-70 AD date for 1 Baruch. It is supported by E. Schurer, History, 2nd Div., vol. 3 (1896) 191f; O.C. Whitehouse in Charles: Apocrypha, 574ff; W.O.E. Oesterly, Introduction (1935) 258-65; L. Rost, Einleitung (1971) 93f. An earlier date is favoured by W. Rothstein in E. Kautsch (ed.), Apokryphen (1900) 215f; Eissfeldt, Introduction 593f; et. al.
\end{itemize}
obvious parallel between the devastation of 587/6 BC and that of 70 AD. Is it possible that precisely the same procedure is being adopted here?

I draw attention to the casting of lines 266-85 in the second person, where lines 218-65 and again 286-94 are in the third person. In Sib. Or. 3 this casting in the second person can be merely a rhetorical flourish (e.g. lines 414, 444, etc., where events described are evidently past). However it is more typically an address to the present time by the Sybil, and exclusively so where there is definite exhortation to those addressed (8f?), 545ff, 624ff, 732ff, 762ff). Now in the passage under consideration lines 283-5 are hortatory in form and would seem, therefore, to be best understood as addressed to the contemporary scene in the time of composition. There is some corruption in the text of line 285 but we can at least be sure of the exhortation in lines 283f to patient "trusting in the holy laws of the Mighty God".¹

Thus the author can be seen to be challenging and offering encouragement and hope to his own generation under the guise of speaking to the sixth century exiles.

By identifying the situations of the sixth century exiles and of the people of his own day, the author can record the sixth century restoration and sequel in a way that makes it at the same time an expression of a prophetic expectation of an .........

1. Fehr, Studia, 51 says of this exhortation, "Et quae deinde poëta populo suo monet, vv 283 sqq. ... eum etiam ad aequales suos respexisse videntur probare."
eschatological renewal. So there is no either/or between Cyrus and Messiah in lines 286ff, and the clear reference of lines 288ff to the Zerubbabel restoration says nothing against these verses expressing eschatological hopes. Once having established the identity between the sixth century situation and his own day, the author achieves his purpose by simply adding eschatological colouring to his outline of the work of Cyrus and Zerubbabel.

Now without doubt the historical situation which best suits such a procedure is that after 70 AD which we know produced 1 & 2 Baruch and 4 Esdras. However, since most of the material in Sib. Or. 3 is generally taken to be second century BC it will be important to consider the possibilities of a second century dating for the section under consideration also.

Certainly the second century situation offers in some measure a destruction of the city (1 Mac 1.29ff), a desolation of the Temple (1.20-23, cf. v39) and the carrying off of women and children into captivity (1.32), all of which must have evoked historical memories of the sixth century destruction. The second century relevance of the narrative in Daniel is based on some kind of parallel between the two situations.

1. Fehr, Studia, 51, says, "Si igitur coniicere licet, Sibyllistam duas aetates calamistosas hoc loco confudisse, credibile est, eum liberatorem illum et restitutorem Iudaeorum, cladibus eorum finem impositurum ad imaginem Cyri sibi repraesentasse."

2. Possibly not 1 Baruch (see above).
A more precise use of the parallel between the sixth and second centuries is offered by the reinterpretation as 70 weeks of years in Dan 9.24 of the 70 years which "according to the word of the Lord to Jeremiah, must pass before the end of the desolation of Jerusalem" (v 2). We have here an appropriation to the second century situation of an "eschatologized" form of the restoration hope of the Jeremiah prophecy. CD 1.5-8 speaks of the beginning of restoration "390 years after he had given them into the hand of King Nebuchadnezzar of Babylon". This seems to reflect an idea shared with Daniel that the "real" restoration did not in fact occur in the sixth century, but is still outstanding, and now - in the case of Daniel - imminent, and in the case of the Damascus Document in process. The equating of the sixth century exile situation with the second century situation is however, quite different from that in Sib. Or. 3. In CD and Daniel the equation is based on the sixth century situation having prevailed right through to the present. In

1. Dupont-Sommer, Qumran, 121 n 2, has suggested that the 390 years of CD 1.5f are Daniel's 490 years, with the time span of the present generation (40 years), the period of activity of the Teacher of Righteousness (40 years), and the period of groping mentioned in CD 1.9 (20 years) all subtracted. The 390 years would then indicate that the present generation is the end-time generation.

2. This same notion finds expression in the Apocalypse of Weeks 1 Enoch 93.1-14 and 91.12-17 which fails to include any sixth century restoration in its outline of the "weeks" of history. Whether or not the poem presupposes the political tension in the early second century, before the Maccabean revolt (cf. J.G. Snaith, Ecclesiasticus (1974) 174), Sir 36 also seems to express the idea that the fulfilment of the restoration prophecies of Jeremiah and Haggai is still outstanding (See Sir 36.15b, and v 14 cf. Hag 2.3).

The description of the current situation in Neh 9.32-7 accords well with this view: v 36, "We are slaves this day; in the land ... (37) its rich yield goes to the kings which thou has set over us because of our sins ..." Compare Ezra 9.6-9 which sees in the Cyrus restoration the action of God only to "grant us a little reviving in our bondage (v 8)".
Sib. Or. the basis is a repetition at a later time of the sixth century pattern.

Thus far our passage in the Sibyllines would still seem to be closer in literary type and general concept to 1 & 2 Baruch and 4 Esdras, than to Daniel or the Damascus Document. However there is in Dan 9.26 a possible instance of a literary device which brings us much closer to what is going on in our oracle. The mention in Dan 9.26 of the destruction of the Temple has been something of a puzzle. Could it be that what we have here in the mention of the destruction of the city and the sanctuary is a deliberate describing of the assaults of Antiochus Epiphanes IV on Jerusalem and Temple in terms which more accurately fit the Babylonian destruction, in order to parallel the two situations and thus to stress the certainty of ultimate divine deliverance? The suggestion is conjectural, but if it should be correct then it offers a parallel literary phenomenon to that which we have encountered in the Sibylline Oracles. While in the Sibyllines we have the modification of the description of the sixth century experience in the direction of the contemporary situation, here we would have the modification of the description of the contemporary situation in the direction of the sixth century situation. The aim in both cases would be to tie the two together.

The other work that needs to be considered here is the Book of Jubilees. In ch.1 there is an outline of Israelite history purported to have been revealed to Moses on Mt. Sinai. Of interest to us is the description of the restoration which follows the reference to the sixth century exile.

1. J.A. Montgomery, Daniel (1927) 283, understands נ"הו" of moral corruption but this seems difficult in the context and has not been generally followed.
"And after this they will turn to Me from amongst the Gentiles with all their heart and with all their soul and with all their strength, and I will gather them from amongst all the Gentiles, and they will seek me, so that I shall be found of them, when they seek me with all their heart and with all their soul. (16) And I will disclose to them abounding peace with righteousness, and I remove them the plant of uprightness with all My heart and with all My soul, and they shall be for a blessing and not for a curse, and they shall be the head and not the tail. (17) And I will build my Sanctuary in their midst, and I will dwell with them, and I will be their God and they shall be My people in truth and righteousness. (18) And I will not forsake them or fail them; for I am the Lord their God."

Following this the construction is somewhat interrupted by an intercession of Moses (vv 19-21). However, the thought of the exile seems to be picked up again in v 22 and is followed by a rather grand description of religious restoration in verses 23-25 (and cf. vv 26b & 27) which has strong echoes of the restoration description of vv 15-18. The restoration in vv 23-25 is certainly viewed as an ultimate event, allowing of no later apostasy and even that in vv 15-18 seems rather too good for the sixth century restoration.

G.L. Davenport has noted on the description in verse 10 of the apostasy that led to the exile that "The description of the violations of Torah in 1,10 indicate his desire to relate the passage to his own day", and on v 22 when the exile situation is taken up again, "This indictment includes a call to confession, a call hardly intended for any generation other than the author's own". 2

1. The section enclosed is marked as corrupt by Charles (Pseudepigrapha, 12).

Davenport takes this relating of the exile to the contemporary situation along the lines of the view in Daniel and the Damascus Document noted above and paraphrases, "The exile is at last ending. Let us confess our guilt as a people and thus welcome this new day" (p 29). However it seems more likely to me that vv 15-18 are a heightened description of what did happen in the sixth century restoration. In particular it seems difficult not to see v 17 in relation to the Zerubbabel Temple. Now if the chapter does presume in the first instance a sixth century restoration, we have a case precisely parallel to our passage from Sib. Or. 3, that is to say, here we have a second century situation being addressed under the guise of a sixth century situation.

The other main eschatological passage in Jubilees, ch. 23.14-31, which Davenport recognizes (p 46) as coming from the same redactor as 1.4b-26, offers us support for this view. For here we have a description of apostasy and exile which does not attempt to be anything other than a description of the second century BC situation, but which nevertheless describes God's judgement in history in terms obviously borrowed from the Babylonian conquest. ¹ There is no question here of thinking in terms of an experience of exile and judgement which has continued fundamentally unchanged into the second century BC. Rather there is a new and distinct judgement of God at the hands of a Gentile nation,² and moreover one that leads into the beginnings of the eschatological renewal (23.26ff.). It seems

1. In particular 23.23 uses the language of Jer 6.23.

2. This is not to say that there has not been sin and judgement previously. For the writer the entire period after the flood is covered by the rubric "manifold tribulations and the wickedness of their ways" (23.9). The words probably belong to an earlier pen than do vv 14-31 (Davenport, Eschatology, 46), but are nevertheless endorsed by the writer of vv 14-31.
therefore unlikely that the same writer is, in ch.1, thinking of the second century situation in terms of continuity with the sixth century situation. He thinks rather of a replay of that history in a heightened form leading on into eschatological renewal.¹

I conclude therefore that Jubilees offers us a clear second century BC parallel to the literary/theological approach which has been discerned in Sib. Or. 3.265-294.² Thus despite the obvious attractions of positing a situation after 70 AD for this device, there is a real possibility that this section belongs with the other material of Sib. Or. 3 to the second century BC.

There are some other features of the part of the Oracle which may have relevance to its dating. The emphasis on idolatry in lines 277ff as the cause of the exile would have a closer literal applicability to the second century (cf. 1 Mac 1.43,47, etc.) than to the post-70 AD situation. On the other hand the $\phi\nu\lambda\gamma$

$\beta\sigma\lambda\eta\iota\omicron\omicron\varsigma$ whose $\gamma\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$ will be $\kappa\pi\tau\alpha\omicron\sigma\omicron\nu$

(lines 288ff), which seems to echo Gen 49.10 and the whole notion of the inviolability of the Davidic kingship (2 Sam 7, etc.), fits well a post-70 AD situation. It certainly is inconsistent with any view that regards the Maccabean uprising as the starting point for its hopes. However on a second century dating the exhortation

1. The mention in 1.22 of the need to confess "their own sin and the sin of their fathers" may be a point at which the author allows us to glimpse the close parallel and internal relationship he sees between the apostasy and restoration of the sixth century and that which he conceives for the second.

2. The song of Azariah - ostensibly a lament, confession and prayer for restoration in the sixth century situation - probably depends upon this same sense that the second century was witnessing a replay of the events of the sixth century. (W.H. Bennett, in Charles: Apocrypha, 629; L.H. Brockington, Introduction (1961) 96f; and Rost, Einleitung, 67, all confidently date to the second century on the basis of v 15. Eissfeldt, Introduction, 590, considers that the work lacks dating indications). The song of Azariah does however lack the eschatological emphasis of Jubilees and Sib. Or. 3.
to waiting and prayer in lines 282-5 would suggest a period prior to significant Maccabean success, and a Davidic hope would be quite in keeping with an early Maccabean date, before the rise of popular hopes in the Maccabees. The mention in lines 271f of every land and sea being full of the Jews was taken by Bousset to exclude an early Maccabean date. There was however significant dispersion by that period, and in any case the reference to the extent of the scattering is at least as much controlled by the sentiment of Deut 28.64 as it is by historical realities.

We are left, then, with two distinct time slots into which Sib. Or. 3.265-94 can be fitted: a post-70 AD situation or the early Maccabean period. I suggest the emphasis on idolatry as the cause of punishment, and the second century BC date of the other material in Sib. Or. 3 should incline us to the earlier date. So that in all probability we have in lines 286-94 an expression of the hope, thrown up by the dark days of the early Maccabean period, that a messianic figure of the royal tribe would soon come as the eschatological Temple restorer.

1. W. Bousset, "Sibyllen" (1906) 271.
2. See V. Tcherikover, Civilization (1966) 269-95. New information from papyri and inscriptions has changed the picture since the time of Bousset.
3. One is tempted to link lines 271f with the quotation of Strabo in Jos. Ant. 14.115 to the effect that the Jewish "people has already made its way into every city, and it is not easy to find any place in the habitable world which has not received this nation and in which it has not made its power felt". However the Strabo quotation is part of their success story, while Sib. Or. 3 is speaking of their oppression.

It would be good to be able to show that the traditional understanding "claiming my office" adopted in ch.5 for Lk 21.8 does not involve quite such an alien sense for the words ἐν τῷ ὄνομα του τοῦ προφήτου as is sometimes supposed. It may thus be helpful at this point to see how Luke uses ἐν τῷ ὄνομα του τοῦ προφήτου elsewhere. We are fortunately placed for considering the Lukan sense: he has 8 of the 13 NT uses (Mt 2; Mk 3; Lk 4; Acts 4). These are Lk 1.59; 9.48; 21.8; 24.47; Acts 4.17,18; 5.28,40.1

The Acts passages may be treated together since in each case the reference is to the Council's attempt to silence the teaching or preaching of the apostles ἐν τῷ ὄνομα του τοῦ προφήτου. It may seem initially attractive to understand the phrase here in the light of that LXX usage where the expression means "as alleged spokesmen (of)" (e.g. Ex 5.23; Deut 10.8,18.19f; Jer 11.21; 14.14ff; Zech 13.3 etc.). However there seem to be at least three reasons for not following this course.

The first problem is that the emphasis is all wrong if the Council's prohibition is made in this way to focus on the basis of the Apostle's preaching rather than its content. This point received classical expression by Heitmüller: "wenn die Behörde den Jüngern befiehlt μὴ λαλέσθω ἐν τῷ ὄνομα του τοῦ προφήτου, so kümmert sie sich schwerlich um Grund oder Grundlage der Predigt, sondern um den Inhalt: sie will verhüten, dass dieser verhasste Name immer wieder genannt und bekannt werde."2

1. In Luke/Acts the phrase may also occur at Lk 9.49 (cf. W. Heitmüller, Namen (1903) 11) and Acts 1.38, but as the attestation is doubtful we will not consider these texts.

This judgement can be made even more emphatically when we recall that the Council hearing had arisen out of Peter and John's healing of a man "in (ἐν) the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth" (3.6). The name of Jesus is established as a power to be reckoned with and the Council's prohibition is their reaction to this state of affairs (4.16f).

The third consideration is of a more general kind. The early chapters of Acts are controlled by an understanding of the Apostle's preaching as witness to what they have seen and heard (1.8; 4.20; 5.32 etc.), not by an understanding of them as authorized spokesmen (1.8; 4.19 cf. ν 20; 5.29 cf. ν 32). By comparing 5.40 and 5.42 we can see that the Apostles' defiance towards the charge not to speak in the name of Jesus took the form of "preaching Jesus as the Christ", not saying "thus says Jesus Christ".

Positively, it emerges from the above considerations that in Acts we should understand "speaking εἰς τὸ ἐνώματη, " as "speaking about", "making mention of" or the like, where taking on one's lips the name of Jesus Christ is involved. Clearly this is not the same as the traditional understanding which we are claiming for the phrase in Lk 21.8, but it should not escape our attention that this usage stands at some considerable distance also from each of the alternative senses for the phrase at Lk 21.8 which have been rejected above.

If we turn our attention now to Lk 24.47, ἐπὶ παρακαλῶν ἐν τῷ ἐνώματι κατὰ μετάνοιαν καὶ ἐφορέω ἐνημερίζων, a comparison with Acts 2.38, "Repent and be baptized ... in (ἐν) the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins", and 5.31 "Jesus who is to give repentance to Israel and forgiveness of sins" makes it
clear that in Lk 24.47 we are dealing with forgiveness through Jesus Christ, not with preaching authorized by Jesus.¹

Once again we have a sense which is different from that which I am concerned to establish, but also to each of the alternative suggestions. If I am right against Heitmüller, it is also different from the sense of the phrase in Acts.

The sense of ἐν τῷ ὄντως in Lk 9.48 is very difficult to pin down. No less than four possibilities present themselves and even some of these seem capable of further subdivision. Some attempt will be made here to assess each in terms of its ability to contribute to a coherent sense for the whole pericope (vv 46-48).

Firstly, then, does ἐν τῷ ὄντως designate the child as a Christian? If it does this would suggest that ὄντως (v 48) means in the circle of disciples. On this understanding the discipleship of the child becomes pivotal, rather than his being a child: "although he is a child, because he is a disciple ...." We would then understand the point to be that, in the circle of disciples, everybody is great beyond measure - even the humblest child - as the bearer of the hidden presence of Jesus (and his Father). Since each believer carries the superlative mark of greatness, any attempt to rank Christians is foolishness.

¹. The other possibility is that of Heitmüller (Namen, 61-3) who suggests that the idea involved is that of preaching repentance and forgiveness by preaching about Jesus, which conforms this use of the phrase to that seen in Acts. However, to my mind, the passive form ἐκ τοῦ ὄντως makes such a sense rather awkward.
Such an understanding by-passes completely the concept of "receiving". It comes in verbally if we express the thought in the form "if you receive a child who is a Christian, you receive a 'great one'", but it remains peripheral to the main structure of thought. This seems to be a damning criticism when Luke uses ἐν τῷ ὑπάρχοντι μου no less than four times in the account. It also seems to be a problem that Jesus' action with the child can be given no real significance on this understanding. That Jesus ἐπικατάθηκε αὐτῷ παῖς ἔστω seems even to detract from one's seeing the child as bearer of his hidden presence. Since "receiving" has no structural significance for the thought development, it is not even possible to think of Jesus "receiving" the child (v 47).

A second possibility is to understand ἐν τῷ ὑπάρχοντι μου as "for my sake". If we start from this sense, the action of Jesus with the child seems to force the sense in the direction of "following my example" or better, since it does more justice to the words ἐν τῷ ὑπάρχοντι μου: "as my representative", "doing what I myself would do". This possible sense will be dealt with separately below. Keeping strictly to the sense "for my sake" we would probably need to read between the lines "for such caring for children is dear to my heart" (on the basis of the action of Jesus towards the child), which would stand as a separate and distinct motivation for receiving children from that provided by the promise

1. His being physically with Jesus belongs to an entirely different circle of thought than does his secret bearing of the presence of Jesus.

2. Heitmüller, Namen, 113 cf. 64f. "For my sake" = "to serve me" = "because this action is something I desire".
that in doing so one will receive Christ himself. A certain lack of integration can be perceived in the juxtaposition of these two motivations which are not brought into any kind of relationship with each other.

Another problem emerges when we consider that, beyond seeing that Jesus is concerned to encourage humble caring, it is not at all clear how the reaction of Jesus (act and word) is meant to relate to the argument over who was greatest. This is particularly a difficulty because v 48 finishes with what seems to be Jesus' answer to the question implied by the dispute. According to Jesus the μάκροτερος is the great one. If the child is the μάκροτερος we may be tempted to create a link to what proceeds by locating the greatness in the bearing of the hidden presence of Jesus, but this is not possible without the thought becoming over complex, since the receiving of Jesus (and his Father) is the divine response to the obedience of the disciple who receives the child, and not at all something inherent in the child. We would need to read into οὗτος εστιν μεγαλός the idea "this is where you can find something great."

The last problem can be overcome at least in part if we may take the μάκροτερος as he who receives children. In this case he is great, because although he seems to be dealing only with humble concerns he is in fact playing host to God himself.

The third sense for ἐὰς τὸν ἐνέμασα μου which comes up for consideration is "as my representative", "doing what I myself

would do", "acting on my behalf". This sense accommodates well
the activity of Jesus with the child. Jesus exhibits what he
himself would do so that they might do the same on his behalf. If
we may take the as above to be him who receives
children then the question of who is greatest has its answer. The
great one is he who receives children (as Jesus does), because in
doing so he receives Jesus himself. There is however a certain
tension between the acting for Jesus and the receiving of Jesus.
In the example of Jesus himself there can be no thought of receiving
Jesus in the child, and there seems a certain inappropriateness of
imagery in being required to think of one, who acts, as it were, as
an extension of Jesus in receiving the child, and yet who receives
Jesus himself in this act: Jesus receiving Jesus!

We consider finally the possibility that means here "as if he (the child) were me", "as you would receive me". The idea would then be to receive the child with the respect
and honour one would show if he were receiving Christ himself.
This suggestion allows the sense: "If you give the child the
reception you would have given me, you will turn out to have received
me." (Cf. Heb 13.2, "Do not neglect to show hospitality to strangers,
for thereby some have entertained angels unawares.")

On this understanding, what holds the whole pericope
together is the background idea that one's greatness may be measured
according to whom one has dealings with and the matters to which one
gives one's attention. The disciples considered themselves great

1. Cf. Cranfield, Mark, 309, "because he is my representative",
but this is not quite the same.
ones (Lk 9.46), and just as they considered Jesus too important to receive children (18.15), so we can understand that they considered themselves above such a role. To give attention to children would detract from their exalted status. A woman or one of the servant classes (the μικρόερος) deals with children. The "great" deal with important matters and receive and entertain the great.

Within this framework of thought the pericope sets out to show that receiving and honouring the lowly does not mark one as inferior but rather exalts a person, because in doing so one receives Jesus and his Father: one plays host to God himself! This concept turns the pursuit of greatness on its head and shatters any thoughts of preserving one's own self-importance. Greatness is not the possession of those who act out the part but comes as a gift to those who humbly serve the lowly.

Now if we are correctly following the line of thought, then Jesus taking of the child is no longer an example (contrary to Mk 9.36, "He placed him ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐναρκτηθείς ἐν αὐτῷ"), rather it is done by Jesus to provide, with himself, the two contrasting extremes (Lk 9.46 "He placed him παρ' ἐμνῦτῳ "). The Lord and the child represent the most exalted and the most humble of the persons whom it might be possible to receive. The challenge is to give the child Jesus' reception.

This "giving the child Jesus' reception" needs some further definition. We should not construe the sense as "you ought

1. I.e. the gift of the presence of the Exalted Lord and God himself.
not to treat me any better than you would this child". Such
egalitarianism is certainly not in mind. The sentiment is addressed
not to the period of Jesus' earthly life - when it would naturally
have this egalitarian force - but to the period of Jesus' absence.
What is being offered is a "substitute" way of duly honouring Jesus
(of properly receiving him). 1 Respect shown for the humblest child
is respect shown for Jesus. The high status, that came to the
disciples during Jesus' lifetime from their association with him
(and which we see them abusing in their quest for glory), is now
to be found, paradoxically, in the company of the lowly - whom to
honour is to honour Jesus and his Father (a path to glory not open
to the same abuse). 2

In preferring this final sense on the grounds of internal
coherence I do so with a certain sense of vulnerability, on the one
hand because we are not dealing with a simple thought sequence with
an easily observed consistency of thought, and on the other hand,
because of the way Luke is combining units of traditional material
whose tendency to fixedness could very easily leave a certain lack

1. In the NT a number of statements are formulated against the
background of the question: what corresponds in the life of the
later disciple to the receiving of the earthly Jesus? (E.g. Mt 10.4.)
This concern to bridge the gap is especially evident in John (e.g.

Wellhausen, Evangelium Marci, 81 seems conscious of this
preoccupation when he remarks on Mk 9.37 that Jesus "nur vertret-
ungsweise Beweise der Liebe empfangen kann".

2. Another interpretation is offered by Grundmann, Lukas, 196f, who
takes seriously the redactional unity of the text in Lk, but his
exegesis does not successfully bring together the various ideas he
finds present: it is not at all clear why the "smallest" is the
"greatest"; the way to greatness seems to be different for the child
than for the disciples.
of integration in Luke's account even after careful editorial work. δὲ ἐὰν ἐδίδον ἐν τούτῳ ... παραδείσονται με
would seem to be a rather fixed form. However, the other main unit ὁ γὰρ μικρότερος ... ἐστὶν μέγας does not have a nicely polished form and is sufficiently different from its nearest parallels (Mt 20.26f; Mk 10.43f; Lk 22.26) to give some confidence that it is formulated here with a good measure of independence from traditional forms and thus may be taken to express precisely Luke's thought.

If Lk 9.46-8 has been rightly understood then the use of ἐν τῷ ἴδιω ὄνομα there comes closer in sense to the traditional understanding in Lk 21.8. In both cases we have an identification of the person with Christ, though of course the nature of the identification is quite different. This sense in Lk 9.48 is also somewhat related to the sense "pretending to be me" in so far as that also involves an identification of another with Jesus. It distances itself from each of the other suggestions considered for Lk 21.8.

The final Lukan use of our phrase is in Lk 1.59 where the people ἐκ λαοῦν John the Baptist ἐν τῷ ἴδιῳ ὄνομα ἦν καὶ ἰσχύς Ἠσυχαστος Zachariah. We may translate "using the name of his Father". While the particular force here has no relevance for Lk 21.8 it may be seen that "using the name of" could acquire, in a suitable context, the sense "pretending to be".

Now while our survey of Luke's use of ἐν τῷ ἴδιῳ cannot be said to have offered any strong positive evidence for the sense adopted in ch.5 for Lk 21.8, it has at least shown that Luke's other uses of the phrase offer no encouragement for the alternative


2. Cf. the use in 3 Kgs 20(21).8 where Jezebel wrote letters ἐν τῷ ἴδιῳ ὄνομαν Ahab with the pretence that the letters were coming from Ahab.
understandings offered for Lk 21.8. From this judgement is to be excepted the sense "pretending to be me", which already comes closest in meaning to "claiming my office".

We conclude the appendix by exploring the possibility that Luke may say "pretending to be me" when he means "pretending to occupy my office".

A strong encouragement to our consideration of this possibility comes from the way "Christ" begins to function as a name for Jesus so early in the Christian tradition. In Paul this is clearly so. In Luke we adduce the use of "the name of Jesus Christ" in Acts 3.6; 4.10; 8.12; 10.48; 16.18. Further Lk 24.47 (and cf. v 46) suggests that Luke would have been happy to use "in the name of (the)Christ".¹ Very early a situation arises where the conviction that Jesus is the Christ becomes so much a matter of presupposition in Christian speech that one says "Christ" and means "Jesus" without any particular consciousness that thereby any extra claim is being made for Jesus. The concept "the Christ" has been reshaped in the likeness of Jesus and the early church's understanding of him. As a word it still denotes the status of Jesus (or his office), but it has lost its independence as an office of known shape which Jesus can be judged to have failed or succeeded in filling.²

1. In v 46 the definite article is necessitated by the statement being presented as speech by Jesus about himself in the third person. We cannot be sure whether Luke would otherwise have dispensed with the article.

2. This is not to say that the use of "Christ" as a name is to be explained in terms of the unintelligibility of messianic categories outside the original Jewish framework. Even among the Jewish Christians, the Christian reality so transcended the accustomed messianic categories that it must have transformed the Christ category for them.

The identification of Jesus as Messiah remains important for the conviction that Jesus is the fulfilment of the Scriptures. However beyond this basic claim, Old Testament messianic categories play only a very limited role in Christian reflection about Jesus.
In such a situation a claim to be the Christ is seen as a claim to be what Jesus is, indeed a claim to be what for Christians has its shape as a concept from their experience of Jesus. "Christ" is so inseparable from Jesus that "pretending to be Christ" (i.e. "using the name Christ"), can be represented on the lips of Jesus as "pretending to be me" (i.e. "using my name"), when only official identity and not personal identity is in question.
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