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Abstract

This thesis examines possible allusions to the cult in Luke and indicates their potential impact on his soteriology. Various Jewish concepts of ‘salvation’ current in Luke’s day are discussed. This is followed by a critical examination of the Nazareth pericope (Lk 4.16-30) and the Emmaus encounter (Lk 24.13-35), as possible allusions to the Jubilee, and that Jesus might be presented as the fulfilment of the prophetic redemption contained therein. The sabbath-day healings are considered as possible indications that Luke’s Jesus deliberately healed on the sabbath in order that the sick might, being healed, receive shalom. Indications that Luke and his contemporaries may have understood the consecration of the sabbath in Genesis to be, at least partly, a celebration of shalom as the work of creation, is presented as possible evidence that the healing ministry of Jesus in Luke was fulfilling the purpose of the Temple cult (the ritual re-creation of Edenic shalom), and that Jesus applied to himself the exemption from sabbath-day rest granted to the Temple priests. Finally the prayer of the parabolic tax collector (Lk 18.13) is treated as a possible allusion to the prayer of the High Priest on the Day of Atonement and an indication that the righteousness attributed to those who observe the Day is now available to the penitent sinner.
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Introduction

0.1 The Question

Since Hans Conzelmann (1969, p.201) declared that in Luke:

‘there is no trace of any Passion mysticism, nor is any direct soteriological significance
drawn from Jesus’ suffering or death. There is no suggestion of a connection with the
forgiveness of sins [in the Passion of Jesus].’

many redaction and other historical Biblical critics have continued to deny any sense of
read a more holistic sense of salvation to incorporate physical, social, economic and political
dimensions alongside the spiritual, and agree that Luke does not clarify the means of
atonement, but rather obscures it by omitting Mk 10.45 καὶ γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἄνθρωπος οὐκ
ἠλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.¹ For
Glöckner (1975) salvation in Luke is not achieved by Jesus’ death or resurrection but rather by
the repeated pattern of reversal: in his death and exaltation, Jesus identifies with the lowly
who shall be exalted. For Dibelius (1966) the crucifixion was a model of innocent martyrdom
rather than a means of expiation. Against this Karris (in Sylva ed. 1990) argues that translating
dίκαιος in Luke 23.47 as ‘innocent’ misses Luke’s theology of Jesus as the ‘righteous one’ (cf
Ps 22; 31; 69; Wis 2) who, having suffered, was vindicated by God. Some (du Plessis 1994,

¹ For the Son of Man did not come to be served but to serve and to give his life as a ransom for many.
Mittman-Richert 2008) see the Last Supper as an allusion to the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus on the cross which becomes a major theme in Luke-Acts. Finally, others (Doble 1996, Hagene 2003) have looked for a specifically Lucan model of salvation different from the traditional expiation/atonement models. For Doble the imitation of Christ is salvific, for Hagene Lucan history imparts saving knowledge to conquer human ignorance. (All cited in Reardon, 2013, pp. 77-95.)

However Conzelmann limits his vision in addressing salvation simply to terms of substitutionary atonement, thus he opposes Lohmeyer (1937, p.181 cited in Conzelmann, 1969, p.201) who looks to the citation of Is 53.7-8 in Acts 8.32-33 (‘As a sheep led to the slaughter or a lamb before its shearer is dumb, so he opens not his mouth. In his humiliation justice was denied him. Who can describe his generation? For his life is taken up from the earth’) and Acts 20.28, where Paul speaks of the church as having been purchased by Christ’s own blood. Conzelmann rejects any thought of atonement or substitution on Luke’s part in the former case, and the latter Conzelmann rejects as just a probable fashionable turn of phrase. Conzelmann focuses on the absence of ideas of atonement in the Passion, and the omission in Luke of Mark 10.45 (‘the son of man came to give his life as a ransom (λύτρον) for many’).

This thesis challenges Conzelmann by identifying possible allusions to the cult in Luke which provide an interpretative key to understanding the death of Jesus. Three aspects of the cult will be considered: the Year of Jubilee; the Sabbath; and the Day of Atonement.

---

2 Unless stated otherwise, all biblical citations in English are taken from Revised Standard Version (1952). Hebrew MT quotations are from the Codex Leningradensis, Greek LXX from Rahlfs (1935), and Greek NT from Nestle-Aland 27 (1993).
0.2 Aspects of the cult relevant to this research

0.2.1 The Year of Jubilee

This research accepts Sloan’s (1977) thesis on the allusion to the Jubilee in Luke 4.18-19. Sloan concluded that ‘… the notion of jubilee as presented in Luke is … crucial for perceiving certain functional aspects of Jesus’ Messianic self-understanding, and hence for understanding the nature of Jesus’ Messiahship itself’ (p.174). Sloan (1977, pp.166f) argues convincingly that the Jubilee was not just a socio-economic restoration, but also had a cultic and eschatological dimension. Its cultic dimension was manifest in its being announced by a ram’s horn (יוֹבֵל) blown by priests on Yom Kippur (Lev 25.10, 11, 12) which would be followed by the Feast of Tabernacles. It was accompanied by other cultic acts: the burnt offering; the fast and rest from work (Lev 23.23-44); and the Jubilee laws were entrusted to the priests who carried the Ark of the Covenant (Deut 31.9-13). The socio-ecomomic restoration (of prisoners and the poor, Lev 25.25, 39; Is 61.1) was accompanied by ‘cultic release,’ proclaimed (a priestly function in Mosaic legislation) by an ‘anointed one’: the people were called to repentance from sin (Is 58.1); and the fast was not to be accompanied by the oppression of hired workers (Is 58.3) or fighting (Is 58.4). The acceptable day of the Lord desired by him included the ‘fast’ of loosing the bonds of wickedness and letting the oppressed go free, of sharing bread with the hungry, housing the homeless poor and clothing the naked (Is 58.6.7). Thus in its broader contexts of Isaiah 61 and 58 the Jubilee was linked with cultic and social demands.

3 Bergsma (2007, p. 81) argues ‘there is something inherently “eschatological” about the jubilee, long before it was seen as a symbol of the eschaton by later writers. Since it recurred usually only once in a lifetime, the impoverished Israelite—or at least the one projected by the text—would spend most of his life in anticipation of this event.’
Sloan (1977, pp.166f) develops his analysis of allusion to the Jubilee in Luke including the following texts. Luke alludes to the Jubilee in his version of the Beatitudes where the blessings of the poor are contrasted with Levitical-style curses (Lev 26.1-46) of the wealthy (Lk 6.20-26). John the Baptist’s question of whether Jesus was the coming one is answered in terms of the fulfilment of the Jubilee (Lk 7.22), and the restoration of the humble in the parable of the marriage feast also reflects the Jubilee (Lk 14.7-24). In Acts 1.6 and 3.21 restitution (ἀποκατάστασις) calls to mind what, according to Philo (De Decalogo 1:164), was the most important part of the Jubilee:

‘There are also other laws about the fiftieth year, in which what has been enumerated above is performed in the most complete manner; and, what is the most important thing of all, the restitution is made of the different portions of land to those families which originally received them, a transaction full of humanity and equity.’

According to Sloan (1977, p.174) Jesus’ ministry is characterised by the preaching of the kingdom of God and its righteousness. In this sense he argues the ‘poor’ and the ‘kingdom’ are understood within the context of the Jubilee announcement.

This research will extend Sloan’s valuable contribution, examining the impact of Luke’s allusions to the cultic aspects Jubilee in his soteriology.

0.2.2 The Sabbath

In the Mosaic Law, every seventh year was to be held as a solemn Sabbath for the land (Lev 25.4), and at the end of seven weeks of years, the Jubilee was to be consecrated and held holy

---

4 The word recalls also the Stoic concept of the completion of the Golden Year, though of course this does not contradict the notion of the Jubilee, indeed Philo appears connect the sense of completion with restitution.
Chapter Two of this thesis argues that in Second Temple thought the weekly Sabbath was consecrated in Genesis 2.1-2, not just as a rest to participate in God’s anthropomorphic rest, but also as a celebration of the state of shalom that God had created. The chapter goes on to argue that Jesus’ Sabbath day miracles were a sign of the restoration of Edenic shalom foreshadowed in the Temple cult. Just as the priests were exempt the proscription of working on the Sabbath in their Temple ministry of re-establishing Edenic shalom, so Jesus applied the same exemption to himself as he brought shalom to those who did not have it.

0.2.3 The Day of Atonement

The annual solemn fast and cultic ritual for the purification from sin was held on the Day of Atonement. On this day alone the High Priest entered the Holy of Holies with the blood of the bull and goat victims, and pleaded before the presence of God for the forgiveness of all his sins, those of his household and of the people (Lev 16). In Chapter Three of this dissertation I shall argue that the Day of Atonement is alluded to in the prayer of the parabolic tax collector (18.13) who begs for forgiveness in the words of the high priest on the Day:

‘O Lord, forgive the iniquities, transgressions, and sins, which I and my house have done’ (Mishnah Yoma 3.8, trans. Neusner, 1988, p.269).

Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra (2003) in his doctoral thesis ‘The impact of Yom Kippur on early Christianity’ examined various allusions to the Day (Mt 27.15-23; Galatians 3; John 1.29; 1Peter 2.24; Romans 3.25-26; 1John 2.2; Colossians 1.13-20 and Philippians 2.6-11). Whilst

---

5 The widely used term ‘Second Temple’ will be employed in this thesis despite (a.) the lack of homogeneity in Judaism of that period, and (b.) the fact that many aspects of ‘Second Temple’ Judaism pre-date and/or post-date the second Temple.
he notes Luke’s reverence for the Day in Acts 27.9 (where he refers to the ‘fast’ which had endangered the sea voyage of Paul to Rome), he, like Conzelmann, believes ‘Luke does not include interpretations of Jesus’ death as atonement and even eliminates them from his source, Mark’ (p.215). Chapter Three argues, pace Stökl Ben Ezra, that the Day of Atonement is alluded to in the parable of the Pharisee and the tax-collector where the latter’s prayer for forgiveness alludes to that of the high priest on the Day.

0.2.4 Salvation, Cultic Sacrifice and Atonement

Perhaps one of the most important concepts that emerges to unite the diverse literature of the OT, and appears to have been apparent to Luke, is that the Lord saves. This is expressed in several word groups. חָיָה, ‘to be alive’ (qal), ‘to preserve, keep alive or give a full and prosperous life’ (piel and hiphil). It can have a secular sense (to spare a life e.g. Joshua 6.25), but in the variety of meanings of salvation חָיָה expresses the principle that it is God who freely

---

6 I am aware of the semantic complexities posed by the differences between Hebrew and Greek thought and the discussion on this subject by Barr (1978) and Hill (1967), and the inherent difficulty of invoking the entire semantic range of a given word at every occurrence. I hope to be afforded the opportunity of making a more thorough examination of pansemanticism.

7 The conventional term ‘Old Testament’ will be employed in this thesis, although it may be said to impose a Christianizing interpretation on Jewish scripture and does not necessarily denote the text known to the early Christian writers. So too notions of the canon of the OT and even the name itself are anachronistic. However, all but the first point could be said of ‘Hebrew Scriptures,’ ‘Jewish Scriptures’ or the MT which would also exclude the LXX.

8 e.g. σωτηρία: Lk 1.69 (‘he has raised up a horn of salvation for us’); 1.71 (‘that we should be saved from our enemies’); 1.77 (John the Baptist will ‘give knowledge of salvation to [God’s] people in the forgiveness of their sins’); 19.9 (‘salvation has come to this house’ of Zacchaeus) σῴζω: Lk 6.9 (‘I ask you, is it lawful on the sabbath to do good or to do harm, to save life or to destroy it?’); 7.50 (‘Your faith has saved you’); 8.12 (the parabolic seeds from which the devil takes away the word so they may not believe and be saved); 8.36 (the healing of the Gerasene demoniac); 8.48, 50 (Mk 5.34; Mt 9.22) (the woman is made well); 8.50 (the girl is made well–Mk 5.36 does not have σῴζω); 9.24 (‘For whoever would save his life will lose it; and whoever loses his life for my sake, he will save it’—note the absence of σῴζω in Mt 10.39); 13.23 (‘Lord, will those who are saved be few?’); 17.19 (the leper is made well); 18.26 (‘who can be saved?’); 18.42 (the blind beggar is made well); 19.10 (‘For the Son of man came to seek and to save the lost.’); 23.35, 37, 39 (why does Jesus not save himself from the cross?)
saves. For example: Ezekiel (3.18) is called to preach repentance to the wicked person that they may live לְחַיֹּתּוֹ, saving his life תַּחֲיוֹת עֲתוֹנָו (Gen 19.19); and despite the evil designs of his brothers, Joseph and his family were preserved because God worked through their evil to bring a greater good (Gen 50.20). The most significant act of salvation, expressed as ישׁע (hiphil) or ρύομαι, is the collective deliverance of Israel from slavery: מִצְרָיִם מִיַּד אֶת־יִשְׂרָאֵל בָּיְמֵהוּ בַּיּוֹם יְהוָה יּוֹשַׁע καὶ ἐρρύσατο κύριος τὸν Ισραηλ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἐκ χειρὸς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων (Ex 14.30) which became the historic paradigm of salvation. Despite the undeserving and rebellious people, God displayed his chesed and established a covenant with them, to which he was always faithful, but they were repeatedly unfaithful. Their identity lay in being the people God saves. This was even reflected in some significant Hebrew names: Joshua, Jesuah (Jesus)—‘God saves’, and the Divine Name itself יהוה appears to be connected with the gift of life היה which is an object of salvation. In Genesis God created order from the chaos of the waters (1.6-9; cf. Ex 14.21-30), then in Exodus God manifested his salvation by mastering that primordial representation of chaos. With the adapted dragon mythology of the Near East, the salvific event of the Exodus became remodelled as the divine vanquishing of the watery chaos monster Leviathan (Ps 74.12-14 ‘Yet God my King is from of old, working salvation (σωτηρία) in the midst of the earth. Thou didst divide the sea by thy might; thou didst break the heads of the dragons on the

---

9 And that day the Lord saved Israel from the hand of the Egyptians.

10 I have yet to find any commentators from antiquity who made such a connection.

11 Throughout this paper the MT numeration of the Psalms is cited for clarity even if the LXX is quoted.
waters. Thou didst crush the heads of Leviathan, thou didst give him as food for the creatures of the wilderness.’ Is 27.1 ‘In that day [when the LORD will come to punish the iniquitous (26.21)] the LORD with his hard and great and strong sword will punish Leviathan the fleeing serpent, Leviathan the twisting serpent, and he will slay the dragon that is in the sea.’ As the Hebrew cult developed the three major feasts when all the men were obliged to ‘appear before the Lord’ became identified with the Exodus: Passover (Ex 34.18), Weeks or Pentecost (Deut 16.12), and Tabernacles (Lev 23.43), and thus became celebrations of God’s salvation.

ישׁע can express ‘bringing into a spacious environment’, ‘being at one’s ease, free to develop without hindrance’ (Green, 1965, p.15; North, 1964, p.120) but also includes the sense of ‘be helped’, ‘be victorious’ (niphil), ‘help’, ‘save’, ‘rescue’ or ‘come to the aid’ (hiphil). God is almost invariably its origin, he alone can save: ישׁע אלVES יְהוָה מִבַּלְעָדַי וְאֵין יְהוָה אָנֹכִי אָנֹכִי מֹשִׁיעַ (Is 43.11).12

As Luke appears to quote the LXX it would seem probable that he accessed the OT in that version. However, whether Luke and his readers were conversant with the Hebrew OT or not, it is useful to understand the Hebrew concepts related to salvation with the LXX interprets. So those familiar with λυτρόω were introduced to the ideas behind ישׁע, ‘to redeem’, ‘ransom’ or ‘deliver’, and its participle ישׁע (Numbers 5.8) ‘the deliverer’ (though primarily ‘the kinsman who vindicates his relative’ (Numbers 35.19) (Green, 1965, p.29)) as expressions of God’s salvation. Thus God, delivering his people from Egyptian slavery, became their great kinsman-deliverer (Ex 6.6 ישׁע אלVES יְהוָה בִּזְרוֹעַ אֶתְכֶם וְגָאַלְתִּי וְלְשׁוֹב µא µא µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µα µa

12 I, I am the Lord and there is not a saviour except me.
Whilst with people deliverance came at a price (Ruth 4.4, 6; Lev 25.26, 32), with God the Redeemer no ransom price is paid, yet Green (1965, p.30) argues that does not mean deliverance is not costly. God ‘exerts’ himself, by his mighty power, his love and חֶסֶד to redeem. The notion of the redeemer God גֹּאֵל is closely connected with the creator God בּוֹרֵא in Isaiah. He gives strength to the weary (40.28); he holds his people by their hand, making them a covenant to the people and a light to the nations, gives sight to the blind and rescues prisoners (42.5-7); he is the creator and king who leads his people out of Egypt (43.15-17). With him there is no chaos (תֹּהוּ κֵנָנוֹן) (45.18). Unlike other gods he is righteous and a saviour who brings everlasting salvation (45.17). He brings peace and heals (57.19). He creates a new heaven and a new earth (65.17, 18). Above all, God redeems because of his חֶסֶד (Ex 15.13) a concept Luke expressed in Zechariah’s prophecy: the horn of salvation God raised was the performance of his mercy (Lk 1.69, 72).

The Exodus also formed the background for the root פָּדָה which can be interpreted ‘to acquire by giving something in exchange’ (Green, 1965, p.31) and so involves the concept of substitutionary sacrifice:

‘Every firstling of an ass you shall redeem (נֶפֶד) with a lamb, or if you will not redeem (נֶפֶד) it you shall break its neck. Every first-born of man among your sons you shall redeem (נֶפֶד)’ (Ex 13.13)

Here פָּדָה recalls the tenth plague, the death of the first born (Ex 12.29-32), and the God-given escape from the plague–the passover lamb (Ex 13.14). However, whilst when people and animals are the subject of פָּדָה there is the sense of substitution, when God is the subject, 

13 I shall save you with an outstretched arm.
14 often translated ἔλεος but here as δικαιοσύνη
redemption is without any sense of substitution; he redeems freely even if there is still a sense of costliness. The Lord redeemed (πᾶς λυτρῶν) his people because he loved them, but it was with a mighty hand (חֲזָקָה יָד) that he delivered them (Deut 7.8; Neh 1.10; Psalm 78.42), and the people would stand in awe of the God of Israel because he redeemed (πᾶς ἀφορίζω) Abraham (Is 29.22-23). In anthropomorphic terms God is described as going (out of his way) to redeem his people:

‘What other nation on earth is like thy people Israel, whom God went (χυτῶν ὁδηγέω) to redeem (πᾶς λυτρῶν) to be his people, making himself a name, and doing for them great and terrible things, by driving out before his people a nation and its gods?’ (2Sam 7.23)

He performed signs and marvels, turned rivers into blood, sent flies and frogs, gave the crops to the locusts, destroyed vines and sycamores, gave their cattle to the hailstones, sent his burning anger upon the Egyptians, smote the first-born, led and guided his own people like sheep and brought them to the holy land out of which he had driven out its inhabitants and settled his people there even though they would rebel against him (Ps 78.42-58).

Finally כופר, usually a ransom price that is paid (Ex 21. 30 λύτρον), can be applied to God. As Isaiah (43.1-4) proclaims an oracle of salvation for the Hebrews in exile, כופר is the price of exchange (ἄλλακτομα): God, the one who saves (ὁ σῴζων), offers Cyrus Egypt as a כופר ἄλλακτομα, and Ethiopia and Seba instead of (ὑπὲρ) his people (v.3) who were precious in his eyes (v.4). Although the words of ransoming by paying a price are employed, Westermann (1969, p.118) insists that the emphasis is on the Lord’s ‘power to intervene in sovereign fashion in the affairs of the nations … [he] is at work in the great political changes afoot in the world of the day, changes which revolved round the liberation of Israel.’ North

---

15 Perhaps here we have separate ideas which are referred to by the same word.
(1964, p.120) says ‘this text is generally taken to mean that Yahweh will give the African territories to Cyrus in return for the liberation of exiles.’ Watts (1987, p.132) agrees, even though it was Cyrus’ son Cambyses who conquered Egypt, as he puts it: ‘God summoned Cyrus to facilitate Israel’s access to her homeland.’ Simon (1953, p.100) had disagreed with this theory on the grounds of the lack of convincing evidence from Herodotus that Cyrus did conquer the known parts of Africa, and even if he had, it would hardly constitute an exchange for the Israelites. Instead he argues that the ransom was in fact not the defeat, but the conversion, of the heathens who shall come to the Israelites and say: ‘God is with you only, and there is no other, no god besides him’ (Is 45.14), this is the God who saves because he loves:

‘For I am the LORD your God, the Holy One of Israel, your Saviour. I give Egypt as your ransom, Ethiopia and Seba in exchange for you. Because you are precious in my eyes, and honoured, and I love you, I give men in return for you, peoples in exchange for your life.’ (Is 43.4).

Although the concept of salvation in the OT is not primarily concerned with the forgiveness of sin (though often concerns addressing the events seen as the consequence of sin such as Elijah’s prayer for the resurrection of the widow’s son–she thought her sins caused his death, 1Kg 17.17-24) the forgiveness of transgression is present in places, thus Isaiah (61.10) rejoices greatly in the Lord ‘for he has clothed me with the garments of salvation, he has covered me with the robe of righteousness.’ Ezekiel speaks of salvation as God gathering his people together in their own land, but they must be purified from (cultic) uncleanness (טֻמְאָה ἁκαθαρσία) and idols, and given a heart of flesh that they may keep the commandments of God (36.24-29). The Lord will cleanse them from their iniquities (ἁνοµία ἑαυτοῦ) and their
salvation shall be as the restoration of the Garden of Eden (36.35). As always salvation is God’s work, since without his presence no one can avoid falling into sin (Is 64.6) and after sin only he can restore the joy of his salvation (σωτηρία ἀνετής) (Psalm 51.14).

The analysis above indicates that in the OT (and for Luke and his contemporaries via the LXX) it is God alone who is the author of salvation. He saves freely because he loves. However, although the cult did not cause God’s salvation, it played a significant role in God’s saving activity. Of the Hebrew roots discussed above only כפר (ἐξιλάσκομαι) is connected with the cult, and salvation is never attributed to the sacrifice itself. The evolution of the Hebrew cult and its understanding of sacrifice, and particularly sacrificial atonement, is beyond the scope of this thesis. However certain points are relevant and need to be clarified. As the prophets of the eighth and seventh century BCE came to a better understanding of God they appreciated more that sacrifice was useless without repentance from sin:

“‘Come to Bethel, and transgress; to Gilgal, and multiply transgression; bring your sacrifices every morning, your tithes every three days; offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving of that which is leavened, and proclaim freewill offerings, publish them; for so you love to do, O people of Israel!’ says the Lord GOD. ‘I gave you cleanness of teeth in all your cities, and lack of bread in all your places, yet you did not return to me,’” says the LORD’ (Amos 4.4-6)

‘I [God] did not speak to your fathers or command them concerning burnt offerings and sacrifices. But this command I gave them, “Obey my voice, and I will be your God, and you shall be my people; and walk in all the way that I command you, that it may be well with you.”’ (Jeremiah 7.22-23),

The prophets lead the people away from the idea that God needed to be placated by sacrifice, or that they could change his attitude towards his worshippers. Such an attitude might be seen in the example of Jephthah who vowed to sacrifice the first person he should see coming from his house who happened to be his own daughter, if he should route the
Ammonites (Judges 11.12-40). Though even here there is no sense that God demanded such a sacrifice, nor that he was pleased with it or that Jephthah was successful in battle because of his vow. Indeed according to Josephus (Antiquities 5.266) the sacrifice was not according to the Law and God was not pleased with it. And the Mishnah (Nedarim 9.4) states that vows are not binding if they would result in transgressing the Torah, although Jephthah is not cited as a negative example displeasing to God, any first century CE Jew familiar with this law might well have thought of Jephthah. Pseudo-Philo (Biblical Antiquities 39.11) goes further in retelling the story. Jephthah’s vow is no longer a prayer directed to God but a declaration to the people, but God reacts at such a rash decision which might have resulted in the sacrifice of a dog. God in retribution causes the death of his first-born and the victory is not attributed to Jephthah’s sacrifice but God’s response to the prayers of the people.

Sacrifices rather than affecting God made the people mindful of God’s mercy, and needed to be accompanied by appropriate morality:

‘Has the LORD as great delight in sacrifices and burnt offerings as in obeying the voice of the LORD?’ (1Sam 15.22)

‘Will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my first-born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He has showed you, O man, what is good; and what does the LORD require of you but to do justice, and to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God?’ (Micah 6.6-8)

“‘What to me is the multitude of your sacrifices?’ says the LORD ... ‘Wash yourselves; make yourselves clean; remove the evil of your doings from before my eyes; cease to do evil, learn to do good; seek justice, correct oppression; defend the fatherless, plead for the widow’” (Isaiah 1.10-17)

‘For thou hast no delight in sacrifice; were I to give a burnt offering, thou wouldst not be pleased. The sacrifice acceptable to God is a broken spirit; a broken and contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise’ (Psalm 51.16-19).
However by the first century CE, cultic sacrifice for sin was seen, at least by some Jews,\textsuperscript{16} to be efficacious in pleading for atonement through the shedding, offering and sprinkling of blood which represented the life of the animal (Lev 17.11) as long as it was offered with a pure and contrite heart (Philo \textit{Quod deus sit immutabilis} 1:8). Even if an animal was not going to be sacrificed but eaten, its blood was, in theory, still reserved exclusively for the cult, and so could not be consumed (Deut 12.23-27). Thus it was not the death of the victim that made the sacrifice but the offering of blood. ‘The life-principle \textit{nephesh} was released in sacrifice in order to effect, in primitive quasi-magical thought, the production of more abundant life, that is, to make the crops grow and the flocks increase’ (Young, 1979, pp.55-56). Thus Josephus (\textit{Antiquities} 1.58) says Cain’s life was spared by God whose anger was appeased by sacrifice. Likewise Noah sacrificed to appease God’s wrath (\textit{Antiquities} 1.98). Abraham explained to Isaac that his sacrifice was so that he could be taken to God’s presence and, spared of disease and old age, could there be a help and supporter to Abraham in his old age (\textit{Antiquities} 1.231). However, Jospehus also thought sacrifice is worthless before God without obedience, and from the obedient he does not require sacrifice, but if they do sacrifice, even if it should be a lowly offering it is acceptable to God (\textit{Antiquities} 6.148-149).

Frances Young (1975, p.11) introduced her work on ‘Sacrifice and the Death of Christ’ as addressing ‘the most common misconception when sacrifice [sic] language is applied to the death of Christ runs something like this: “God was angry with sinners. The Jews had tried to placate God’s anger by symbolically offering the lives of animals to him in place of their

\textsuperscript{16} The thoughts of the Qumran community and the diaspora, for instance, may have been quite different, so too the idea of offering a sacrifice to placate an angry God is not foreign to the OT.
guilty selves. But this was inadequate and so Jesus offered a perfect sacrifice. He died as our substitute to appease God’s anger.” Here Young may be over-simplifying, or perhaps even parodying the case. Her argument may represent one understanding of atonement present in the OT, but it may not be the only understanding we find there or in first century CE Judaism. For instance the laws concerning the validity of sacrifices in the Mishnah imply atonement is effected simply by correctly sprinkling the blood of the victim:

‘The House of Shammai say, “Any [offering, the tossing of the blood of which] are to be placed on the outer altar, in one [properly] tossed one tossing [of blood], has effected atonement.’ (Zebahim 4.1A) (trans. Neusner 1988, p.705)

And Philo (de vita Mosis 2.147) explains that God should be propitiated (ἐξευμενίζω) by sacrifice for sin lest he chastise the sinner.

Against Young’s argument we might place the Suffering Servant of Isaiah 53:

4 ‘Surely he has borne our griefs and carried our sorrows; yet we esteemed him stricken, smitten by God, and afflicted.
5 But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; upon him was the chastisement that made us whole, and with his stripes we are healed.
6 All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the LORD has laid on him the iniquity of us all.
7 He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he opened not his mouth; like a lamb that is led to the slaughter, and like a sheep that before its shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth.
8 By oppression and judgment he was taken away; and as for his generation, who considered that he was cut off out of the land of the living, stricken for the transgression of my people?
9 And they made his grave with the wicked and with a rich man in his death, although he had done no violence, and there was no deceit in his mouth.
10 Yet it was the will of the LORD to bruise him; he has put him to grief; when he makes himself an offering for sin, he shall see his offspring, he shall prolong his days; the will of the LORD shall prosper in his hand;
11 he shall see the fruit of the travail of his soul and be satisfied; by his knowledge shall the righteous one, my servant, make many to be accounted righteous; and he shall bear their iniquities.
Therefore I will divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he poured out his soul to death, and was numbered with the transgressors; yet he bore the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors.’ (Is 53:4-12)

Pre-Christian interpretation of this text is by no means unified, however there is some evidence for the development of the theme of a vicarious atoning death that may have been known to Jesus and his contemporaries such as we find in Maccabees, and (arguably) Paul used in his theology of the cross. (‘Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures’ (1Cor 15.3); ‘Christ died for the ungodly…God shows his love for us in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for (ὑπὲρ) us.’ (Rom 5.6, 8); For Christ, our paschal lamb, has been sacrificed (1Cor 5.7). Williams (2010) argues for the influence of 2 and 4 Maccabees on Paul’s theology of the cross.) Some Second Temple rabbinic sources interpret Isaiah 53 as a reference to a Messiah figure rather than a corporate reference to Israel, however their interpretation of the redemptive value of his suffering is not apparent.

Whether anyone of the extensive OT period, and later of Jesus’ time, acted as if God was compelled to forgive because a sacrifice is offered to him might be argued from the evidence of those who sought to correct such an idea. There is evidence, especially from the prophets, of an attempt to counter any idea that a legalistic debt is paid in the sacrifice thus obliging God to forgive, indeed ‘the sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination; how much more when he brings it with evil intent.’ (Proverbs 21.27) (also cf.: Psalm 40.6; 51.16-17; 1Sam 15.22; Isaiah 1.11). Rather the sin-offering is the God-given means for wiping away the

---

17 Targum Jonathan, Ruth Rabbah, Midrash Tanchuma et al. cited in Brown 2012, pp. 62-63. Brown incorrectly includes ‘the Talmud’ without specifying whether it was the Palestinian (400CE) or Babylonian (500CE); neither can be counted as Second Temple.
sins of his people thus enabling them to fulfil their side of the covenant relationship with him who declares himself to be their God and the one who abides with them (Ex 29.1-46).

Whether Luke had any knowledge of the letter to the Hebrews is not directly significant for this study. What is significant though, is the assumption in Hebrews (9.22) that ‘without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness of sins.’ If this were axiomatic in Second Temple Judaism then significant allusions to the cult might provide an interpretative key for understanding the death of Jesus in Luke which in turn is alluded to as the covenant in his blood which will be shed (22.19) for (ὑπὲρ) his disciples and, shockingly for them, they were to drink.

On the Day of Atonement the high priest enters the holy of holies and as representative of the people he walks with God in the cultic representation of the Garden of Eden, the origin of life, into which he brings new life in the blood of the bull and goat. Thus the original free gift of creation is restored to man in the cultic act of recreation.

As this research evolves it shall be argued that Luke’s allusions to the cult suggest the salvation accomplished through the death of Jesus is not the legal payment of the compound debt due to the composite sins of the human race, but rather the fulfilment of the Hebrew cult which was the modus operandi of restoring the original state of creation. The blood of the covenant signified new life with God. The new life that Jesus brought though his fulfilment of the cult, was definitive in that it need not be repeated.
0.3  Methodology

This thesis adopts some historical critical methods such as a concern for the *Sitz im Leben* of Scriptural passages (and also their interpretation by the time of Jesus) and the theological redaction of sources, and accepts the theory of Marcan priority, but also uses some narrative critical approaches and so looks at Luke-Acts as a narrative story including such literary devices as the implied author and reader, narrator, plot, point of view, irony and allusions. The analysis also incorporates semantic research: words do not exist in a vacuum; they are interrelated within the particular text within which they exist, and they depend on their complexity of meaning derived from their accepted use within the literary corpus from which they emanate. The LXX is of particular value in that it might be considered an interpretation of the traditional Hebrew Scriptures, which may or may not be accurately represented in the MT in any particular instance. However as Barr (1978, pp. 8-20 and passim) has pointed out the considerable differences between Hebrew and Greek thought introduce semantic complexities to the point that LXX is not just a translation of the Hebrew Scriptures but it influenced Second Temple Jewish thought. Intertestamental literature provides valuable insights into the often complex state of beliefs and their expression in the first century CE.

0.3.1  A taxonomy of allusions

Borgen (1996, p.195) has noted how difficult it is to develop a satisfactory method for examining the varied phenomena of quotations, allusions and representations of biblical stories. Hays (1989) suggested an approach developed from literary criticism including the device called *metalepsis* which requires the reader to understand the original context inferred
by, but not explicit in, the allusion. By way of example of thematic allusions where there is no
textual corollary, we might consider Yitzhak Berger’s (2009) analysis of Ruth 3 showing its
allusion to the story of David’s lack of empathy ordering the death of Uriah (2 Sam 11) by
employing the theme of ironic reversal of a pre-determined plan (the messenger does not
report back to David the outcome of the fighting exactly as he should; Ruth does not seduce
Boaz as Naomi instructed her). Here the thematic allusions highlight the reversal in the
Davidic line: from the flawed and sinful character of David, to the integrity of Boaz and Ruth
who continue the line.

Individually it might be hard to convince a stern-faced jury of the intentionality of the
author in the employment of thematic allusions, but multiple attestations following a pattern
might illicit a more favourable verdict (cf. Moyise 2001, p.60). Hays’ (1989, p.29-32) seven,
mostly subjective, tests for ‘hearing’ echoes (coined by Hollander) are:

• availability–‘was the proposed source of the echo available to the author and/or
  original readers?’

• volume–the degree of explicit repetition of vocabulary and syntax, but also its
  strategic rhetorical location

• recurrence–how often does the author make the same allusion?

• thematic coherence–does the proposed echo fit with the overall flow of the text?

• historical plausibility–is it possible the actual author could have intended this reading
  of the supposed allusion?

• history of interpretation–‘one of the least reliable guides’–have others suggested the
  same interpretation?
• satisfaction—does the proposed meaning make sense and shed light on the text?

Hays’ favouritism for ‘echoes’—a faint allusion sounding different from its original context but amplified in its NT situation—has lead him to criticism and could hardly be called a taxonomy of allusions. He offers a criteria for determining one class of allusion (echo) not a classification of the whole gamut of allusions. If it is acceptable to apply the lexicology of the science of acoustics to the taxonomy of linguistics, I suggest resonance would be a better choice than echo. An echo is passive, merely the reflection of a sound off another object such as a wall. The reflecting object merely deflects the original sound.

Resonance is the name given to the phenomenon where the vibrations (e.g. sound) transferred to another object will vibrate with considerably greater magnitude at a frequency determined by the resonating object. It is therefore the particular characteristics of the resonating object that determine the frequency at which it will vibrate in unison with the original source. Thus while an echo diminishes the further away the reflecting object is from the source of the sound, a resonating object considerably augments the volume of the original sound, even if it is distant, when the frequency matches the resonant frequency determined by the object’s physical characteristics.

If the analogy is applied to linguistics an echo merely suggests a faint reflection of an idea, whereas resonance suggests a particular word or phrase will have a greatly increased significance when it is read in the context of another concept. For instance λυτρόω (Lk 24.21) might simply mean redeem or set free, but when read in the context of the expectation of the fulfilment of the Jubilee (where λύτρωσις/λυτρόω occurs nine times in the Jubilee legislation of Leviticus 25) it resonates with the same concept.
Longenecker (1999, p.xvii), critical of Hays, focuses primarily on the explicit references to the OT in the New: potential allusions should be judged with great care according to their ‘multiple attestation,’ ‘manifestly redundant and disruptive features,’ ‘multiple and sustained lexical linkages,’ or the ‘density of their occurrence.’

‘Intertextuality’ in the realm of secular literature was coined by Julia Kristeva (1969) (cited in Moyise 2000, p.14) who claimed texts existed in dialogue with each other, not so much by agency and influence, than by ‘an intersection of textual surfaces’. Thus the interpretation was open to a gamut of possibilities. Moyise (2000, p.14) and Beal (1992, p.28) suggest what determines a legitimate identification of intertextuality is ideology. Vorster (1989), who introduced intertextuality into Biblical exegesis, stated the principle differed from redaction criticism as follows:

‘First of all it is clear that the phenomenon text has been redefined. It has become a network of references to other texts (intertexts). Secondly it appears that more attention is to be given to texts as a process of production and not to the sources and their influences. And thirdly it is apparent that the role of the reader is not to be neglected in this approach to the phenomenon of text’ (cited in Moyise 2000, p.15).

Moyise (2000, p.17), like Hays, commends the subtlety of ‘intertextual echoes’, where an apparently insignificant word or phrase, by alluding to something significant, may contribute to the meaning of its parent text: ‘Sometimes, subtle allusions or echoes, especially if they are frequent and pervasive, can be more influential than explicit quotations.’ ‘Dialogical intertextuality’ is an attempt to describe the two-way influence between text. One does not make the other redundant but clarifies its meaning. This is particularly true of fulfilment statements. ‘Postmodern intertextuality’ looks at the meaning of a text derived by suppressing its other meanings (Moyise (2000, p.17-18). Fundamentally intertextual theory
suggests no text exists in a vacuum. Somehow it relates to a group of interrelated texts. (Fewell 1992, p.17)

Beale (1988) interpreted biblical intertextuality as analogy, where there is a basic correspondence between an OT idea and something in the NT (in this case in Revelation). Although there may be a mutation of contexts, the principle idea is taken into the new reading. His criteria for assessing allusions is that the wording should be substantially the same as its source, not change its original meaning nor have a competing source (Beale 1986, p.543). According to Borgen (1996, p.202): ‘this kind of exegesis [is better characterised] as transference of ideas, functions and perspectives into the context of early Christianity’.

The following allusions are examined in this thesis:

The Jubilee is explicitly recalled by the quotation from Isaiah 61.1-2; 58.6, and confirmed as the programme of Jesus’ ministry by repeated mention of the release of those held captive (by Satan 13.16) and the blind receiving their sight (7.21). After Jesus achieves his end in Jerusalem and, having risen, meets the two disciples on the road who say they had hoped he would be the one who would redeem (λυτρόω) Israel. Thus the Jubilee theology continues to resonate. If one followed Hays’ penchant for echoes his first five criteria would be satisfied: the Jubilee theology was known through Leviticus and Isaiah; The Jubilee is placed strategically as the programme for Jesus’ ministry, and at the beginning of his ministry, and key vocabulary is repeated; the theme recurs though the Gospel including its conclusion; it logically follows that the overall low of the text would reflect the programme of Jesus’
ministry; it is possible the actual author could have intended this reading of the supposed allusion.

The Sabbath is explicitly mentioned as a day on which Jesus healed, that this healing alludes to recreating the state of shalom is argued on the basis of the concurrence of concepts in the healing ministry of Jesus and those of creation. Sabbath day healing then leads to the allusion to the Temple cult which, in its mythology, also recreated the state of shalom. This also fits Hays’ first five criteria: I have argued that both the concept of shalom as the state of created order, and the mythical interpretation of the Temple cult could have been known to the author and original readers; he concepts associated with shalom and Jesus’ healings are repated though the Gospel, and at strategic locations (e.g. 13.16); I have argued that the theme is coherent and historically plausible.

The Taxonomy of the prayer of the parabolic tax-collector is discussed with reference to Kimball’s distinction between citations and allusions in section 3.1. The prayer is frequently said to be an allusion to the penitential psalms, although the vocabulary is different the theme of repentance does match. However I have argued that the vocabulary matches that of OT priestly sources and, with those sources in mind, more accurately matches the Hebrew prayer of the high priest on the Day of Atonement and so may allude to that. As the LXX shows a sensitivity to the differences in vocabulary in the MT it is plausible that a reader of Luke may have been aware of these differences, likewise the importance of the Day and its prayers are likely to have been known to those with some knowledge of the Hebrew cult; I have argued that the parabolic prayer is an explicit repetition of the vocabulary and syntax of the Day; there is no repetition of the allusion to the Day however I have argued throughout the thesis
that Luke alludes to the cult; the historical plausibility of early Christian texts alluding to the Day is attested by the Letter to the Hebrews 9.
Chapter One

Part One

The Year of Jubilee announced in Nazareth: the programme for salvation in Luke

1a.1 Introduction

The sequence of biblical allusions found in the ‘Nazareth pericope’ (4.16-30), has been described as ‘programmatic’ for Luke-Acts (Roth, 1997, p.153), or ‘the Messianic programme’ (Conzelmann, 1969, p.180). Like the other six quotations from Isaiah in Luke-Acts it marks a turning point in the story. At this critical juncture Luke chooses to present Jesus’ mission as a fulfilment of the prophecies of Isaiah. Slightly later on, Jesus’ confirmation of his purpose being to fulfil Is 61 would seem to be indicated in his response to John’s disciples who ask if he is the Coming One: πορευθέντες ἀπαγγέλατε Ἰωάννῃ ἃ εἶδετε καὶ ἠκούσατε· τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν, χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν, νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται, πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται (7.22). This verbal witness is backed up by the various accounts of the blind receiving their sight (7.21; 18.35-42), the lame walking (5.18-25; 13.11-13), lepers being cleansed (5.12-14; 17.12-19), the dead being raised (7.12-15; 8.49-58) and the good news is preached (though in the narrative those who hear the

---

18 for an extensive bibliography cf. Nolland (1989a, pp.188-190)

19 Lk 3.4-6 / Is 40.3-5 (John the Baptist); Lk 4.18-19 / Is 61.1-2 & 58.6 (the beginning of the ministry of Jesus); Lk 22.37 / Is 53.12 (the beginning of the passion); Acts 7.49-50 / Is 66.1-2 (the end of Stephen’s speech); Acts 8.32-33 / Is 53.7-8 (the mission to the gentiles); Acts 13.47 / Is 49.6 (the end of Paul’s mission in Antioch); Acts 28.26-27 / Is 6.9-10 (the end of Acts)

20 Going announce to John that which you see and hear: the blind see; the lame walk; lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear; the dead are raised the poor are preached the Good News.
gospel are not described as poor (8.1)). The deaf hearing is not mentioned specifically but might be included in the summary healing statements (4.40; 5.15; 6.17-19). Furthermore the twice repeated aim of the year of the Lord, ἀφεσις (here ‘remission’ ‘release’; for the Jubilee ‘general debt release’) (Lev 25.10, 11, 12, 13, 28, 30, 31, 33, 40, 41, 50, 52, 54), is announced as the purpose of salvation (Lk 1.77) and the object of preaching (ἀφεσις ἁµαρτιῶν - ‘forgiveness of sins’) in the name of the crucified and risen Christ (Lk 24.47).

1a.1.1 Jesus replaces John: the field of scholarship

Smit (2013, pp.45-55) argues that Luke’s quotation of Isaiah in 4.18-19 forms a parallel with that concerning John the Baptist in 3.4-6 and follows the John-Jesus diptychs21 in the infancy narratives (annunciations of birth Lk 1.5-56; births, circumcision and naming, manifestation, growing up Lk 1.57-2.52). Following the pattern of the preceding diptychs Jesus surpasses John: Jesus is the fulfilment of the prophecies, whereas John the prophet announces him; Jesus the messiah proclaims deliverance, whereas John preaches preparation for salvation (John ‘preaches a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins’ (Lk 3.3), his preaching fulfils the prophecy of Isaiah (40.3,4; 52.10) that ‘all flesh might see the salvation of God’ (Lk 3.6); however, he denies that he was the Christ (Lk 3.15-17), and, having heard that God was ‘visiting his people’ through the ministry of Jesus, sends his envoys to confirm whether Jesus was the Coming One (Lk 7.19-23)). Brown (1977, pp. 239-241) argues against linking Luke 3-4 in this way with chapters 1-2, whereas Talbert (1980, pp.129-130) moving from source

criticism to a narrative approach, argues for the integrity of Lk 1.5-4.15 as a coherent unit (Smit, 2013, p.47).

Smit’s diptychs work well for the birth narratives but might be somewhat too simple later on, not taking into account the possibility that Luke may have been attempting to establish the position of John as the precursor of the Coming One (Lk 3.16), which may not have been accepted by the disciples of John. Thus John retains his disciples even after Jesus has begun his ministry (Lk 5.33). Following Mark, John’s imprisonment (Lk 3.20) removes him from the narrative and complements Zachariah’s prophecy that John’s role was to prepare the way. Whilst Luke appears to stress that John too was preaching the good news (Lk 3.18), and adds his own Sondergut teaching to a widening audience; the crowds - tax collectors - soldiers, with a content comparable to Jesus: almsgiving (Lk 3.11; 16.19-31); integrity/honesty (Lk 3.12-14; 6.27-36; 19.8), he also reports that some of John’s followers were not aware of Jesus and had to be informed: Ἰωάννης ἐβάπτισεν βάπτισμα μετανοίας τῷ λαῷ λέγων εἰς τὸν ἐρχόμενον μετ’ αὐτόν ἵνα πιστεύσωσιν, τοῦτ’ ἐστιν εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν (Acts 19.4).

Thus while Luke presents Jesus as superseding John, he does so in a way to show a generous deference to John and his followers who had not appreciated this (Josephus (Antiquities 18.5.2) for instance does not link John and Jesus).

---

22 John baptised with a baptism of repentance for the people saying it was in preparation for the one coming after him that they might believe: this is Jesus.
1a.2 The Isaian citation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Luke 4.18-19</th>
<th>Isaiah 61.1-2; 58.6</th>
<th>Matthew 11.5/Luke 7.22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 ιδεῖμα κυρίου ἐπ᾽ ἐμὲ οὖν εἶνεκεν ἐξηρισάντες μὲν εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς, ἀπέσταλκέν μὲν, κηρύζαν αἱμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἄναβλεψιν, ἀποστέλλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει,</td>
<td>ιδεῖμα κυρίου ἐπ᾽ ἐμὲ οὖν εἶνεκεν ἐξηρισάντες μὲν εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς ἀπέσταλκέν μὲν, κηρύζαν αἱμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἄναβλεψιν, ἀποστέλλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει,</td>
<td>τυφλοῖς ἄναβλεψιν καὶ χωλοῖς περιπατοῦντις, λεπροῖς καθαρίζονται καὶ κωφοῖς ἀκούονται, καὶ νεκροῖς ἐγείρονται καὶ πτωχοῖς εὐαγγελίζονται.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 κηρύζαν ἑνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτόν.</td>
<td>2 καλέσαι ἑνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτόν καὶ ῥῆμαν ἀνταποδόσεως (reward (ἡ ἁμαρτίας (MT, 1QIsaa)) παρακαλέσαι πάντας τοὺς πενθοῦντας</td>
<td>58.6b ἀπόστελλε (πῆς to free (MT, 1QIsaa)) τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared with Q’s (Matthew 11.5; Luke 7.22) apparent allusion to the same passage in Isaiah, Luke quotes the LXX of Is 61.1,2a almost verbatim but omits ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τῇ καρδίᾳ and follows the MT יוהֶסֶח יִזְנָפָר יִזְנָפָר of Is 58.6 using the infinitive ἀποστέλλει rather than the imperative of the LXX ἀπόστελλε τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει. The LXX differs slightly from the MT and 1QIsaa where prisoners (יִזְנָפָר)

---

23 The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he anointed me to preach good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim release to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind, to liberate the oppressed, to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord. (Luke 4.18-19)

24 send the oppressed away in freedom.
corresponds to τυφλοῖς, and in the omitted phrase of Is 61.2 vengeance (נָקָם), in both the MT and Qumran, is changed to a giving-back (whether for good or ill–Liddell and Scott 1883) (ἀνταπόδοσις).

The task of reconstructing first century synagogue practice is not helped by the paucity of historical evidence; however, a jumbling of verses in the quotation from Isaiah would seem unlikely to be the prescribed haphtarah (i.e. a synagogue reading from the prophets to be read after the reading from the Law) of the day (cf. Reumann, 1977, pp.117-118). If this were true a careful examination of the adapted ‘quotation’ might indicate its significance in Luke’s narrative.

1a.3 The narrative location of Lk 4.18-19 against Mk andMt

Luke not only added the text of the reading from Isaiah, but his additions to his source(s) also include: the details of handing the scroll to Jesus (4.16c-17); the solemn rolling up of the scroll, handing it back, sitting down and receiving the attention of all preparing for his statement that the Scriptures he read have been fulfilled (and perhaps superseded) in his hearers’ ears (4.20-21); the comparison of himself with the prophets who are despised in their own country (4.23, 25-27); and the reaction of the congregation who tried to kill him (4.28-30). Such an expansion of the synoptic sources is not typical of Luke, and so suggests Luke had a particular interest in the pericope. Furthermore, if Mk 6.2 (also found in Mt 13.54) is taken as Luke’s source, then in changing the pericope’s position in the narrative and supplying the text of his reading, Lk 4.18-19 takes on a particular significance. While for Mark and Matthew the Nazareth synagogue episode occurs in the middle of the Galilean ministry, in Luke it is at the inception of Jesus’ public ministry; it becomes his inaugural
speech defining his mission and answers the question what kind of Messiah Jesus is. In quoting Isaiah 61.1,2 and 58.6 Luke avoided putting a direct messianic claim onto Jesus’ lips at this stage (this would not come until after his death and resurrection 24.26), but made it implicit (ἔχρισέν) in a reading that may not have been his own original choice. Although the passage does not appear to be a *haphtarah* (Morris 1964, p.21) the practice seems to have been that the official would have chosen the passage to be read. However it is debatable whether Luke’s readers would have known this or even attached any significance to Luke’s having mixed the verses from Isaiah as he had done in 3.4-6.25

At first sight it appears Jesus’ Spirit-filled mission was to proclaim good news to the poor, redemption for the oppressed and the inauguration of ‘the year of the Lord’s favour’, and that Luke’s Jesus saw himself as a messiah in keeping with the prophecy of Isaiah.

1a.4  *The response of the hearers*

Although it has been noted that Jesus had a custom of attending the synagogue on the Sabbath, or according to one manuscript witness (D) he attended the synagogue as was customary (for Jews) on the Sabbath: καὶ εἰσῆλθεν κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς (αὐτῶ) ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν καὶ ἀνέστη ἀναγνῶναι (Lk 4.16),26 here we are given the text he read. Green (2013, p.76) suggests this would indicate that the teaching we find here is ‘an exemplar of his synagogue teaching more generally.’ However the apparently ambivalent response: καὶ πάντες ἐμαρτύρουν αὐτῷ καὶ ἐθαύμαζον ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ (4.22); καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν πάντες θυμόν ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἀκούοντες ταῦτα

25 vv. 4 and 5 follow Is 40.3-4 and v.6 appears to refer to Is 52.10b.

26 and he entered, according to (his) custom, on the Sabbath day, the synagogue and stood up to read.
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(4.28), suggests at least the members of the synagogue at Nazareth may not have heard this preaching from Jesus before. With Luke’s narrative position of the pericope there is no previous suggestion that Jesus was known as a rabbi; in fact he need not have been known to have been a rabbi since any man could have been asked to read in the synagogue, nor is it clear what made a man a rabbi at this stage of Jewish history. The expression τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ (v. 22) recalls the aphorism: λόγοι στόματος σοφοῦ χάρις καὶ χείλη ἄφρονος καταποντιοῦσιν αὐτόν (Ecclesiastes 10.12); and also Jesus’ response to the first temptation, completing Satan’s (Lk 4.4) reference to Deut 8.3 ἐπὶ παντὶ ρήματι τῷ ἐκπορευομένῳ διὰ στόματος θεοῦ ζήσεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος, thus the graceful words which Jesus spoke are associated with the Word of God by which one might live.

Fearghus O’Fearghail (1984, pp.60-61) notes the variety of solutions offered regarding the change in attitude towards Jesus in this pericope vary from a ‘conflation of sources’ making the story impossible (Leaney), to disregarding the possible sources and focusing on the omission of ‘the day of vengeance’ which would have been offensive to those who expected political liberation (Jeremias). In Jeremias’ interpretation, in v.22 Jesus’ opponents

27 and they all bore witness (or spoke well) of him and they were amazed at the gracious words coming from his mouth ... and they were all filled with rage in the synagogue hearing these things.

28 the gracious words coming from his mouth.

29 The words from the mouth of the wise are grace but the lips of the fool drown him.


witnessed against him because they were dismayed (ἐθαύμαζον) that he spoke of grace not vengeance. This theory has been rejected by some scholars (e.g. Anderson, 1964, pp. 266-270; Hill, 1971, p. 165) on the grounds of: the initial positive reaction in v.20 (καὶ πάντων οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ ἦσαν ἀτενίζοντες αὐτόν);32 the vengeance in Is 61.2 is not directed at Israel’s enemies but accompanies the ‘day of the Lord’ and the consolation of all who mourn (καλέσαι ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτὸν καὶ ἡμέραν ἀνταποδόσεως33 παρακάλεσαι πάντας τοὺς πενθοῦντας);34 and that μαρτυρέω with the dative and referring to a person is never used in a negative (Jeremias, Violet, Bornhäuser - confirmed by Liddell and Scott ‘to bear witness to or in favour of another’ p.922).

J.A. Sanders (1982, pp. 151-154) interprets the rejection of Jesus’ townspeople as their reaction to the hermeneutics Jesus applied to Isaiah, and sees their violent rejection of him as the harbinger of his crucifixion. He argues that at first they welcome him because he read a favourite passage prophesying their release from Roman oppression, but then are angered that Jesus interpreted the passage as release for all (Lk 4.25-27) not just the Jews. However against this, it must be noted that their negative reaction οὐχὶ υἱός ἐστιν Ἰωσὴφ οὗτος;35 (Lk 4.22) comes before any reference to salvation beyond the confines of Judaism.

The alternative of taking v. 22b (καὶ ἐθαύμαζον ἐπὶ τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος τοῖς ἐκπορευομένοις ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ) in a positive sense of amazement begs the question

32 and all the eyes in the synagogue were fixed on him.

33 Though here the LXX reads reward not vengeance.

34 to summon the favourable year of the Lord and day of reward, to comfort all who mourn.

35 Is this not the son of Joseph?
why did Jesus react negatively in v.23. One solution would be to interpret v.22c, οὐχὶ υἱός ἐστιν Ἰωσὴφ οὗτος; in a pejorative sense (they knew his family background and could not accept that he, the mere son of their τέκτων, might be the fulfilment of a prophecy). O’Fearghail (1984, p.65-66) argues for interpreting μαρτυρέω as witnessing a person’s character from personal knowledge, and connects this with the description of Nazareth as οὗ ἦν τεθραμμένος (4.16); they could witness to his wisdom, stature and favour before God and those who knew him (2.52) because he had grown up with them.

Nolland (1989, p.192) notes the inconsistency of 4.23b δόσα ἣκούσαμεν γενόμενα εἰς τὴν Καφαρναοῦμ ποίησον καὶ ὀδε ἐν τῇ πατρίδι σου, and believes that from a source-critical point of view, the Nazareth pericope could hardly been seen as coming from the same source as v.23b; so far the narrative has not taken the reader to Capernaum. However I suggest it may be that Luke’s source had a preceding reference to Capernaum (Mk 1.21; 2.1) omitted by the evangelist: in modern terms it could be described as a continuity error.

It could be that there is a hint that salvation will extend beyond the confines of Judaism: in between the positive reaction in v.22 and the adverse reaction in v.28 Jesus, the ‘son of their carpenter’ aligns himself within the prophetic tradition of Elijah and Elisha who were chosen by God to minister beyond the confines of Israel and minister to specific gentiles (the widow from Sidon, and Naaman from Syria). The scandal, is not so much that Jesus would minister to Gentiles (e.g. 17.11-19) but that his own people could not see that Jesus could be a prophet.

---

36 where he had been brought up.
37 those things which we have heard done in Caphernaum do here in your own hometown.
38 Goodacre (2001) uses this expression.
However the argument concerning why Jesus was rejected obscures the statement that he was a προφήτης δεκτός (4.24). That a prophet should be δεκτός (v.24) links the verse with Jesus’ reading of the Isaian proclamation of the Year of Jubilee. He is the favourable prophet who will inaugurate the favourable year of the Lord. It is worth noting here that Isaiah adds δεκτός to describe the Year of Jubilee though it is not witnessed in the Jubilee legislation of Lev 25, indeed ἐνιαυτὸς δεκτός is only found in Isaiah 61.2. However δεκτός is found in other parts of Leviticus where it always has the connotation of the cult being acceptable to the Lord (1.3, 4; 17.4; 19.5; 22.19, 20, 21, 29; 23.11). Whilst Lev 25 emphasises the social aspect of the Jubilee, δεκτός in Isaiah alludes to its cultic aspect witnessed in the wider context of the Isaian proclamation of the Jubilee: gold and frankincense are brought to accompany the praise of the Lord (60.6); acceptable (δεκτός) sheep and rams shall be brought to the Lord’s altar and glorify his house (60.7); the Lord’s sanctuary will be beautified with cypress, plane and pine so that the place of his feet might be glorious (60.13); from Zion he will be saviour and redeemer bringing peace and righteousness on the eschatological day of Jubilee (60.16, 17; 61.1, 2). Thus Jesus’ statement that σήμερον πεπλήρωται ἡ γραφή αὕτη ἐν τοῖς ὡσὶν ὑμῶν (v. 21) suggests the fulfilment of the Jubilee year will not be just according to the socio-economic legislation of Leviticus, but primarily according to its cultic eschatology. Jesus will be the acceptable prophet and the anointed Messiah who must suffer (cf. part 2).

---

39 today this Scripture has been fulfilled in your ears.
1a.5  *The role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts*

Addressing the vast subject of the role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts is beyond the scope of this study. However it will be useful to raise some pertinent points which relate to the Nazareth pericope as the inaugural speech of Jesus. Following Isaiah, Luke notes that it is the Spirit of the Lord who is upon Jesus and has anointed him. In its narrative context the presence of the Spirit in 4.18 follows on from the Spirit’s previous activity. It was the Spirit who came upon Mary at Jesus’ conception (Lk 1.35) and she was overshadowed by the power of the most high. The Spirit descended upon him at his baptism accompanying the voice from heaven that declared Jesus to be the beloved and well-pleasing son (Lk 3.22). Like the inspired prophets, John the Baptist (1.15), Elizabeth (1.41), Zechariah (1.67) and Simeon (2.27), who were filled with the Holy Spirit as they prophesied, so too was Jesus full of the Spirit as he was led into the wilderness to be tempted (4.1). After this he returned in the power of the Spirit (4.14) and began teaching in the synagogues.

In the Nazareth pericope the reference to the Spirit might remind the reader of the Isaian prophecy:

καὶ ἀναπαύσεται ἐπ’ αὐτὸν πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ πνεῦμα σοφίας καὶ συνέσεως πνεῦμα βουλῆς καὶ ἰσχύος πνεῦμα γνώσεως καὶ εὐσεβείας (Isa 11.2)

This text appears to be applied to the Chosen One in 1Enoch 49.3 ‘In [the Elect One = Messiah 48.10] dwells the spirit of wisdom, the spirit which gives thoughtfulness and strength

---

40 For studies on this subject see for example: Rea (1990); Shelton (2000).

41 The Spirit makes an even more prominent role in Acts.

42 and the Spirit of God will rest on him; the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of council and power, the spirit of knowledge and piety.
…’ (trans. Isaac 1983, p.36) and the Testament of Judah 24.2 ‘And the heavens will be opened upon [the sinless Star from Jacob] to pour out the spirit as a blessing of the Holy Father’ (trans. Kee, 1983). The Spirit descended on upon Jesus at his baptism (Lk 3.22) just as he rested on the Stump of Jesse in Is 11.2, and hovered over the waters in Genesis 1.2. As he grew up Jesus was filled with wisdom (σοφία) (Lk 2.40, 52), understanding (σύνεσις) (Lk 2.47) and became strong (κραταίω/ἰσχύος) (Lk 2.40). It is worth noting here that these terms were used of God, and even became alternatives to his Name in post-exilic Judaism: σοφία (1 Esdras 4.59,60; 8.23; Ezra 7.25; Sirach 1.1; Baruch 3.14–the dwelling place of God is ‘where there is wisdom (φρόνησις), where there is strength (ισχύς), where there is understanding (σύνεσις), that you may at the same time discern where there is length of days, and life, where there is light for the eyes, and peace’; Dan 2.20 blesses the Name of God ‘to whom belong wisdom (σοφία) and might (µεγαλοσύνη)’; 1Enoch 3.8–wisdom (σοφία) is given by God to the elect; Philo Legum allegiorum 1:35–God breathed his wisdom into Adam when he gave him life; De gigantibus 1:47–describes wisdom as the divine spirit (τὸ σοφίας πνεῦµα θείον).

The anointing by the Spirit suggests the messiahship of Jesus, indeed Luke later presents Peter as preaching that Jesus was anointed by God with the Holy Spirit and with power as a prelude to his ministry and death and resurrection and that all who believed in him might receive forgiveness of sins (Acts 10.38-43).43 Although ‘anointing by the Spirit’ is not witnessed in the OT, the connection between physical anointing and subsequent metaphorical anointing with the Spirit is found in such texts as the anointings of Saul and David who immediately were filled with the Holy Spirit (1Sam 10.1,6,10; 16.13) (Barrett 1970, p.42).

---

43 Conzelmann (1969, p.180) calls this anointing an ‘essential presupposition for Messianic ministry.’
And eschatological hope in the OT was also marked by the outpouring of the Spirit of the Lord: Ez 36.27; 37.14; 39.29; Is 44.3; Zech 12.10.

After twelve references to the Holy Spirit in the first four chapters of the Gospel explicit mention of the activity of the Spirit is not resumed until the seventy return from their mission which included the subjugation of unclean spirits:

Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἠγαλλιάσατο τῷ ἅγιῳ καὶ εἶπεν· ἐξομολογοῦμαι σοι, πάτερ, κόρε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἀπέκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτά νηπίοις· ναι ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι οὕτως εὐδοκία ἐγένετο ἐμπροσθέν σου. (Lk 10.21) 44

Luke added to Q (cf Mt 11.25) that Jesus rejoiced in the Holy Spirit because of the work the Father had done. Further Lucan Sondergut is found in Jesus’ teaching his disciples to pray and saying it was the Holy Spirit who would be given to them by the Father that would be the fruit of their prayer (11.13). Like the other Synoptics, Luke repeats that the Spirit would also provide the disciples all the words they would need to confront those who would persecute them (12.12; Mt 19.20; Mk 13.11), and that those who blasphemed against the Holy Spirit would never be forgiven (12.10; Mt 19.32; Mk 8.29).

Acts has 55 verses referring to the activity of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit is the witness to salvation through Jesus crucified and risen (5.30-32). Key apostles are noted for being full of the Spirit: Peter filled with the Holy Spirit proclaims with extraordinary boldness not expected of an unlettered man (2.13) salvation in the name of Jesus; the first deacons were chosen because they were filled with the Holy Spirit (6.3,5); Stephen was full of the Holy Spirit when

44 In that hour he rejoiced in the Holy Spirit and said: ‘I bless you, Father, Lord of the heaven and the earth, because you have hidden these things from the wise and learned and revealed them to children, yes Father, because thus was your gracious will (= it became a good pleasure before you).
he prophesied (7.55); Saul (9.17; 13.9), Barnabas (11.24); the disciples (13.52) and Agabus (11.28; 21.11) are all described as being filled with the Holy Spirit when they exercised some ministry. The Spirit in Acts guides Philip to bring salvation to the Ethiopian (8.29) and is the fruit of forgiveness of sins (2.38). The Spirit is the guide and power in the life of the community of the followers of Christ (10.19; 11.12; 13.2,4; 15.28; 16.6; 19.21; 20.28), and the inspiration of the apostles (2.4) just as he inspired the prophets and forebears: David (1.16); Isaiah (28.25).

Craig Evans (2001, pp. 36-45) argues persuasively that the activity of the Spirit is the missing link that adds verisimilitude to Neyrey’s (1985) theory of an Adam-Jesus typology in Luke. Neyrey developed Jeremias’ (1964, pp.141-143) idea that Luke introduced this typology in concluding his genealogy with ‘Adam, son of God’ (Lk 3.38) after which follows the account of the temptations in which Satan questions whether Jesus is the son of God (Lk 4.3,9). For Neyrey (1985, pp.167-168) the typology is also manifest at the Passion (the garden and the cross), and ‘Adam, son of God’ has the further link with the baptism (‘my beloved son’ Lk 3.22). Furthermore he compares the three temptations of Jesus with those of Adam: to eat (Gen 3.6; Lk 4.3); to obtain dominion (Gen 3.5; 1.26-30; Lk 4.3); and to defy death (Gen 3.3, 7; 2.17; Lk 4.9-11). Jesus’ temptations conclude with Satan withdrawing until the opportune time (καιρός) (Lk 4.13) which arrives when Satan enters Judas and he sought the opportunity (εὐκαιρία) to betray Jesus (Lk 22.3-6), and Satan tempts Peter sifting him like wheat (Lk 22.31).

Evans (2001) argues that it is on the grounds of Luke’s pneumatology that Jesus can be designated ‘Son of God’: at the announcement of his birth, ‘The Holy Spirit will come upon
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you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you; therefore the child to be born will be called holy, the Son of God’ (Lk 1.35); at his baptism the Spirit, as a dove, witnesses the voice from heaven, ‘Thou art my beloved Son; with thee I am well pleased’ (Lk 3.22); at his transfiguration the voice from the cloud declares, ‘This is my Son’ (Lk 9.35). Not only is Jesus ‘Son of God’, he is also holy (Lk 1.35) and righteous (Lk 23.47; Acts 3.14) and so becomes the ‘arch rival of the unholy Satan and the legion of unclean spirits’ (Evans 2001, p.39). Evans rightly proceeds to draw the parallel with Adam who was also generated by the Spirit (breath) of God (Gen 2.7) and so, like Jesus, can be called ‘son of God’ (Lk 3.38) and points to Philo (De Virtutibus 37.204) who implies the same: that Adam’s ‘Father was no mortal but the eternal God, whose image he was’; and (De Confusione Linguarum 14.63) ‘that man [Adam] is the eldest son, whom the Father raised up, and elsewhere calls him his first-born, and indeed the son thus begotten followed the ways of his Father’ (both cited in Evans, 2001, p.40).

Evans (2001, p.41) argues against the poverty of the comparison that whilst Adam failed in temptation Jesus overcame the tempter. Again he turns to Philo (De Confusione Linguarum 14.62-63; Quaestiones in Genesim 1.4 [on Gen 2.7]) who distinguishes between the Adam of the first account of creation who was ‘created in the image of God’ (Gen 1.26-27) and did not fall, and the Adam of the second account of creation who was ‘formed of the dust of the earth’ (Gen 2.7), who, being sensual45 fell into temptation. Thus at the same time, Adam is a poor type for Jesus since he succumbed to temptation, and a good type being generated in the image of God and obedient to the heavenly laws.

45 I have not yet found the Greek text and so do not know whether this is ὑλικός (material, belonging to matter) or ψυχικός (of the soul, natural, human).
Evans (2001, p.43) continues his analysis of the Spirit in Luke as it is bestowed on the seventy disciples, enabling them to defeat the powers of evil. He argues the Lucan Sondergut:

"I saw Satan fall like lightning from heaven. Behold, I have given you authority to tread upon serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy; and nothing shall hurt you. Nevertheless do not rejoice in this; that the spirits are subject to you; but rejoice that your names are written in heaven" (Lk 10.18b-20)

reflects most closely the language of the Testament of Levi 18.10-12:

"And he shall open the gates of Paradise and shall remove the threatening sword against Adam and shall give to the saints to eat from the Tree of Life and the spirit of holiness shall be upon them and Beliar shall be bound by him and he shall give authority to his children to tread on evil spirits."

Here paradise is regained by reversing the consequences of the fall of Adam and Eve: the sword guarding the entrance is removed (Gen 3.24) giving access to the Tree of Life (Gen 2.9; 3.22, 24), and the spirit of holiness will empower the saints to oppose the spirits of evil. Evans rightly relates this passage to the Testament of Dan 5.9-12 where in the Lord’s salvation the saints are rescued from Beliar and enter the garden of Eden where they are refreshed. Evans (p.43) correctly concludes: ‘because of the paradise theme of these parallel passages, the “serpents” of Luke 10.19 may be an allusion to the serpent of the Garden of Eden, which in the LXX is translated ophis (cf. Gen 3.1-14; Rev 12.9; 20.2).’ This theme of salvation as paradise restored will be developed in Chapter Two.

1a.6 Luke’s use of Isaiah in the context of Second Temple exegesis

The idea that all sixty-six chapters of Isaiah were composed by only one author was seriously challenged at the end of the eighteenth century. At first Döderlein (1775) and Eichorn
(1780-83) argued for a separate author for chapters 40-66, then Duhm (1892) argued for the third author of ‘Trito-Isaiah (chs. 56-66). However there is not a common scholarly consensus to explain its composition. Some (Torrey, König, Kissane) suggest the author was Deutero- Isaiah or a follower of his, others that the section is a collection of sayings from an unknown author (Duhm, Elliger, Sellin) or authors (Cheyne, Budde, Voltz) dating from the period following the return from Babylon. More recent theories challenging the three-part theory, posit dividing the book into two parts (1-33, 34-66) with more coherent literary themes particularly the judgement and restoration of Jerusalem as the unifying elements (Sweeney, 1998, p.78). Despite the theories of the historical composition of Isaiah, it is difficult to ignore the verbal resonance between Is 61 and parts of Proto- and Deutero-Isaiah, most notably the connection between the prophetic announcement of salvation in Is 61 and the suffering servant songs promising salvation as the establishment of the eternal covenant of peace (Is 54.10). Further common thematic interests include: εὐαγγελίζω (Is 40.9; 52.7 both have the sense of proclaiming the good news of salvation); salvation for the πτωχός (Is 41.17; 29.19) and their vindication (Is 3.14-15; 10.2; 14.30); being sent (ἀποστέλλω) by God to announce salvation with the Spirit (Is 48.16); the healing of the hard of heart (Is 6.10 - in this case that they should not be healed) healing by the suffering of the servant (Is 53.5); the restoration of captives (Is 14.2); the salvation of Israel (Is 1.27; 12.2; 14.32 LXX; 19.20; 31.5; 33.21; 35.4; 37.20; 38.6; 43.3; 43.11, 12; 45.17; 45.22; 49.25).

46 cf. Stuhlmueller (1969, p.366)
47 cf. Stuhlmueller (1969, p.380)
I suggest it would be anachronistic to impose compositional demarcations in Isaiah that would have had any relevance in the first century Judaeo-Christian world, but rather the scroll would have been read as a coherent entity. The principle of pesher exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls takes the words of Scripture as mysteries (רָזָם) which need to be interpreted by the chosen interpreter, so in the commentary of Habakkuk:

‘and God told Habakkuk to write down that which would happen to the final generation, but He did not make known to him when time would come to an end. And as for that which he said, That he who reads may read it speedily: interpreted this concerns the Teacher of Righteousness, to whom God made known all the mysteries of the words of His servants the Prophets’ (1QpHab f7, 1-5; trans. Vermes 2011, p.512).

The original historical context of the Scriptures is not considered of primary importance, instead it is ‘atomised; each phrase is made to fit into a new historical situation regardless of its contextual meaning (as we understand it)’ (Bruce, 1960, pp. 9-10). At times a purely allegorical interpretation is given to a particular text, or even just one word taken from the Scriptures, thus ‘Lebanon’ in Habakkuk 2.17 is interpreted as the Council of the Community (1QpHab f11, 17 - f12, 5). Such methods of interpretation are also found in the OT itself; e.g. Balaam’s ships from Kittim in Numbers 24.24 are interpreted as a Roman armada in Daniel 11.30 LXX.

Whilst there is a variety of Second Temple exegetical techniques, in this instance the same principles of exegesis are applied to Isaiah in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Isaiah 11.1-3 is interpreted as the eschatological branch of David who will be given a ‘throne of glory and a crown of holiness’ (4Q161, f.8-10); Isaiah 30.15-18 interpreted becomes the eschatological

---

48 Hengel (2004, pp.82-83) states the book’s unity is attested by Ben Sira (48.24-25) who alludes to Is 40.1; 60.22b; 47.8b; 41.26 and 48.16 thus assuming Proto-, Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah form a composite work.
judgement of those who despise the Law (4Q163); and ‘I will lay your foundations with sapphires’ (Is 54.11c) ‘concerns the priests and the people who laid the foundations of the Council of the Community … the congregation of His elect (shall sparkle) like a sapphire among stones’ (4Q164) (trans. Vermes, 2011, p.500).

Thus it would not be out of place to expect Luke to be more concerned with the narrative context of his Isaian citations than their original historical context (e.g. the original context of Is 61.1-2 appears to have been the renaissance of Jerusalem after the return from exile). Indeed in Luke-Acts all the explicit quotations from Isaiah come from all three theoretical sources (Lk 3.4 / Is 40.3; Lk 4.18 / Is 61.1; Acts 8.32 / Is 53.7; Acts 28.26,27 / Is 6.9,10). So the presence of the Spirit and the mission to proclaim redemption to the poor and the vengeance of God in Isaiah 61.1,2 may have recalled to Luke’s reader the prophecy of the Spirit of the Lord resting on the new shoot to come from the stump of Jesse (Is 11.1-9) who ‘with righteousness … shall judge the poor, and decide with equity for the meek of the earth; and he shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the breath of his lips he shall slay the wicked’ (Is 11.4). Likewise the servant destined to bring justice and light to the nations, sight to the blind and redemption for captives would receive the Spirit from the Lord (Is 42.1-7) (τὸ πνεῦμά μου ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν (v.1)), and the prophet whom the Spirit accompanied to proclaim redemption from Babylon (καὶ νῦν κύριος ἀπέσταλκέν καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ) (Is 48.16), might be recalled (but not exclusively) by the words ‘the Spirit of the Lord is upon me.. he has sent me’ (πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ᾽ ἐμὲ … ἀπέσταλκέν με) (Lk 4.18).
1a.7  *Purposeful anointing—οὗ εἵνεκεν ἐχρισέν με*

Luke follows the LXX usage applying ἄλειφω to human anointing\(^{49}\) (Lk 7.38, 46), and χρίω to being anointed by God for a sacred purpose, thus priests,\(^{50}\) sacrifices,\(^{51}\) and everything connected with the cult,\(^{52}\) and kings\(^{53}\) were anointed. Priests were anointed to consecrate them for the sacred duties of performing the cult, offering worship to God and atoning for sin (Lev 8.14-15). Kings were anointed to reign and save the people from their enemies (1Sam 10.1), they were the Lord’s Messiah (προφήτης Χριστός) who was to be righteous and holy (Psalm of Solomon 17.32). In Psalm 27.1 it appears that the Lord is David’s salvation because the Lord had anointed him. Solomon (1Kings 1.39) and Jehu (2Kings 9.3) had authority to avenge wrongdoing because they had been anointed.

1a.7.1  *Second Temple Messianic Expectations*

With the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls some scholars (e.g. Beasley-Murray 1947; Bruce 1960; Milik 1959) found the much needed evidence for the reading of two Messianic figures in *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* where the final victory and restoration would be won by both a royal Messiah from the house of David and a superior priestly Messiah from the house of Levi (*T. Dan* 5.4; *T. Judah* 1.6; 24.1-6; *T. Joseph* 19.4) (Ginzburg 1922, pp. 227-232 cited in Abegg, 1995). Hitherto the question of messianic expectation in the

---

\(^{49}\) e.g. Ruth 3.3; 2 Sam 12.20. There are however a few exceptions: Ex 40.15; Numbers 3.3; and the pseudepigrapha *Joseph and Aseneth* 8.5.

\(^{50}\) Ex 28.41; 29.7, 29; 30.30; 40.13; Lev 6.13; 7.36; Lev 8.12; *Testament of Levi* 17.2, 3

\(^{51}\) Ex 29.36

\(^{52}\) Ex 30.26; 40.9-10; Lev 8.11; Numbers 7.1

\(^{53}\) Judges 9.8, 15; 1 Sam 9.16; 2Sam 2.4; 5.3; 12.7
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*Testaments* was fraught with the problem of probable Christian interpolations into the older text, and the absence of independent Second Temple data with which to compare the *Testaments*. However the Dead Sea Scrolls were initially seen to confirm the belief in the expectation of two Messiahs, speaking of the priestly ‘Messiah of Aaron’ (CD 9b.1) (or: the ‘priest’ (1QSa 2.20), the ‘Interpreter of the Law’ (CD 6.6), the Star (4Q175)) and the lay royal ‘Messiah of Israel’ (1QSa 2.21) (or: ‘the Branch of David’ (4Q161, f 8-10), ‘the Prince of all the Congregation’ (4Q285), ’the Sceptre’(4Q175)). The former was the final Teacher ‘who shall teach righteousness at the end of days’ (CD 6, 11) and would ‘marshal all the formations’ in the war-liturgy (1QM 15.4). He was the ‘beloved of the King [i.e. of God]’ (4Q471b, 7) but would be despised as none has been (4Q471b, 7, 2, 3; 4Q491, f.11, 8). The latter would herald the ‘kingdom of his people,’ ‘bring death to the ungodly’ and vanquish ‘the [kings of the] nations’ (1QSb v, 21, 25, 28). The discovery of the plural construct מְשֻׁחָּי in the Manual of Discipline (1Qs) was seen by many (e.g. Burrows 1952; Milik 1959) as the proof of the theory of two Messiahs.

However modern scholarship is now divided over the multi-Messianic interpretation of the Dead Sea Scrolls and the *Testaments*. Collins (1995) supports the belief in the two Messiahs at Qumran. Hurst (1999), who opposes the interpretation, notes מְשֻׁחָּה need not necessarily be interpreted as Messiah and in some instances simply ‘anointed one’ might be more appropriate (as in the case of the מְשֻׁחָּה of 1Qs). He challenges those who interpret the Damascus Document as prophesying two Messiahs in four key texts: ‘when the מְשֻׁחָּה comes from Aaron and Israel’ (CD 9b.10); ‘the מְשֻׁחָּה from Aaron and from Israel’ (CD 9b.29); ‘until there arises the מְשֻׁחָּה of Aaron and Israel’ (‘the מְשֻׁחָּה of Aaron and from Israel’ (CD 15.4); and
‘the מְשֹׁיחַ of Aaron and Israel’ (CD 18.7). He asserts that the singular מְשֹׁיחַ implies only one ‘anointed one’.\footnote{However here Hurst may be imposing an anachronistic distinction derived from translation.} Considering the מְשֹׁיחַ of Aaron and Israel Abegg (1995, pp.130-131) argues the מְשֹׁיחַ is the singular construct and agrees with ‘and he will atone (יִוכְפֶה)’ (CD 14.19). Not long after the discoveries near the Dead Sea, Rowley (1952, p.41) suggested ‘Aaron and Israel’ denoted the ‘sect itself…and the title of the Messiah has reference to the character of the sect, and not his personal descent. The Messiah who shall arise from Aaron and Israel is thus the Messiah who shall arise from the sect.’

This hotly debated subject is too vast to enter into greater detail in the present work;\footnote{cf. e.g. Becker (1980); Grollenberg (1988, pp.52-56) for extensive research on the subject} however, it needs to be noted that there appears to be a complex of multi-faceted messianic expectations not just in some of the OT and pseudepigrapha but also manifest in the data available from the Dead Sea Scrolls whose sect, according to the archaeological excavations, appears to have spanned about two centuries (Vermes 2001, p.58). It would be incorrect to try to force the various Messianic ideas and those concerning ‘anointed ones’ into a monolithic construction of Second Temple Messianic expectation. However the data does witness some notions of an anointed priestly figure who is associated with, or may be, the eschatological Messiah who will expiate (כָּפֵר) sin when he comes (CD 14.19).

If then there were expectations of both a priestly as well as royal messianism at the time of Jesus, perhaps for some with a sense of the superiority of the priestly, then Jesus’ application of οὗ εἴνεκεν ἔχρισέν με\footnote{who for this anointed me} might be taken as Luke’s Jesus seeing himself in a
priestly role. In Leviticus it was the priests who announced the Jubilee by blowing the ram’s horn יובל specifically reserved for them (Lev 25.10; Numbers 36.4; Joshua 6.4). Indeed the יובל was so special it became synonymous with the Jubilee and the Day of Atonement on which it started (Numbers 36.4 יִשְׂרָאֵל לִבְנֵי הַיֹּבֵל וְאִם־יִהְיֶה is rendered εὰν δὲ γένηται ἡ ἁφεσίς τῶν γυνῶν Ἰσραήλ in the LXX). I suggest that an anointed one announcing the Jubilee was more a priestly than kingly Messiah. The analysis of Second Temple messianic expectation will continue in part 2 of this chapter (1b.3.2) where it shall be argued that the full sense of χρίω is revealed in Luke when Jesus proclaims he is the crucified and risen Χριστός (Lk 24.26, 27).

Twice in the apostolic prayers and preaching Jesus is referred to as the one anointed by God (Acts 4.27) or by the Holy Spirit (Acts 10.38). If Luke wrote with the LXX context in mind then at least some of the aspects of χρίω examined above may have been applicable to Jesus. His kingly purpose might be expressed in his being appointed Lord of all (Acts 10.36) and to judge the living and the dead (10.42). As saviour he brings ἁφεσίς ἁµαρτιῶν (Lk 1.77; 5.20-24; 7.47-49; 24.47; Acts 2.38,40; 5.31; 10.43; 13.38; 26.18).

It might also be worth noting that in the LXX χρίω was also a sign of favour from the Lord. Ezekiel (16.9) spoke the word of the Lord who had chosen Jerusalem as a rejected newborn baby and prepared to enter into a matrimonial covenant with her in her prime: ‘Then I bathed you with water and washed off your blood from you, and anointed you with oil.’ Thus

57 and when the horn/release comes to the sons of Israel
Jesus’ inaugural speech might be seen to resonate with the voice from heaven at his baptism:

σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἄγαπητός, ἐν σοι εὐδόκησα (Lk 3.22). His favour before God, like Samuel’s (1Sam 2.26 καὶ τὸ παιδάριον Σαμουὴλ ἐπορεύετο καὶ ἐμεγαλύνετο (ἡζ) καὶ ἀγαθὸν
καὶ μετὰ κυρίου καὶ μετὰ ἀνθρώπων) might also be expressed in Καὶ Ἰησοῦς προέκοπτεν [ἐν τῇ] σοφίᾳ καὶ ἡλικίᾳ καὶ χάριτι παρὰ θεῷ καὶ ἀνθρώπως (Lk 2.52) although here this is not connected with his being anointed. Finally we might note the significance that the expected Χριστός in Daniel (particularly in the Theodotian text (TH)) would be a leader associated with the Jubilee, the atonement of sin and the harbinger of everlasting righteousness (Dan 9.24,25):

‘Seventy weeks of years are decreed concerning your people and your holy city, to finish the transgression, to put an end to sin, and to atone (ἁπαλείφω LXX, ἐξιλάσκο TH) for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal both vision and prophet, and to anoint (εὐφραίνω LXX, χρίω TH) a most holy place. Know therefore and understand that from the going forth of the word to restore and build Jerusalem to the coming of an anointed one (μασχάρχις ΤΗ – the LXX stops short at ‘Jerusalem’ and so omits the reference to the coming anointed one), a prince, there shall be seven weeks.’

1a.8 Good news for the poor

In the LXX πτωχός translates variously ἄβιον (‘poor,’ ‘needy’ Deut 15.4; ‘oppressed’ Amos 4.1; ‘the needy one who relies on God’ Psalm 40.18) and ἄνα (‘poor,’ ‘overwhelmed by want’ Lev 19.10; ‘unfortunate,’ ‘wretched’ Deut 24.15). Of the ten occurrences of πτωχός in Luke only twice (4.18; 7.22) does it appear as the object of εὐαγγελίζω in which Jesus defines his mission as bringing good news to the poor. In the Isaianic prophecy to which he alludes (61.1)

58 you are my beloved Son, in you I am well pleased.

59 and the boy Samuel proceeded to grow both in greatness and goodness, both with the Lord and with men.
the poor πτωχοί are the ἵπποι, those who understand themselves to be lowly or humble before God (such as Moses Numbers 12.3, rendered πραΰς LXX, or the Psalmist 10.17, πένης LXX). In Leviticus (25.25-28) though, it is the impoverished (πένηται) who await the redemption in the Year of Jubilee.

The πτωχοί in Luke are never explicitly the object of σῴζω. However they are μακάριοι (6.20). In its secular use μακάριος could refer to the blessed state of the gods who were in need of nothing (in Epicureanism, the gods take no account of human offerings precisely because they are μακάριοι) and in the deutero-Pauline literature it has the same sense in reference God (1Timothy 6) who is the ‘blessed and only Sovereign, the King of kings and Lord of lords’ (v.15) and ‘dwells in unapproachable light’ (v. 16). If μακάριος in Luke has the same sense it becomes paradoxical as an adjective describing the πτωχοί if they are those in desperate want, unless a sense of their total dependence on God is included in their poverty. Elsewhere in Luke μακάριος has the sense of having received a divine favour; they are more blessed who hear the word of God and keep it that the one who bore and suckled Jesus (11.27-28), and they are blessed who will not have children who might suffer in a time of persecution (23.29). However, the πτωχοί are the occasion of charity; through charity to the poor the follower of Jesus may be blessed (14.14) and find treasure in heaven (18.22) and may manifest their salvation (19.8-9).

Drawing from the work of Howard Eilberg-Schwartz’s study of the measures of status and purity in priestly, early Christian (Pauline) and Dead Sea communities, Green (2013, pp. 80-84) argues for understanding πτωχοί more on the basis of those excluded from the community than those defined by their economic status. Entry into the Levitical priesthood
was determined by birth, however, various physical ‘defects’⁶⁰ could lead to exclusion from
the priesthood. One could also be excluded from the Dead Sea community for similar reasons.
Green notes the inclusion of many of these ‘defects’ in Luke’s lists defining the poor⁶¹ who
could not have hoped to receive the good news or blessedness unless it came from Jesus.
Green concludes that ‘the poor’ in Luke signifies ‘a category of people ordinarily defined
above all by their dishonourable status [and] their exclusion’, whilst the rich have ‘power and
privilege, and social location as an insider’ (Green, 2013, p.82). Such a definition might be
helpful when considering Zacchaeus (19.1-10) amongst the poor who receive salvation.
Likewise it might be unlikely that Joseph of Arimathea as a member of the council was poor
but he could be defined as ἄνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ δίκαιος (23.50), he may not have been counted
amongst the ‘rich’ if he did not abuse his position and exclude the poor. Although Jesus’
mission was good news for the poor his parables portrayed his Father as wealthy (15.11-32;
20.9-19), though the good landowner perhaps in implicit opposition to the typical earthly
landlord. The good news for the poor might be hope for the hopeless, the inclusion of those
who could not expect to be included. Whereas for those who wished to continue to exclude
and rely on their status there could be no salvation (6.24-26).

Against such an interpretation we find Luke’s Jesus making clear denunciations of
wealth and insistence on accepting poverty. The word of God will not mature in those who are
choked by the cares of riches and pleasures of life (8.14). Life is not about the abundance of

---

⁶⁰ ‘blemish, blind, lame, mutilated face or limb, broken foot, hunchback, blemish in eyes, dwarf,
itching disease, scabs, crushed testicles’ (Lev 21.18-20) Green (2013: p.80)

⁶¹ ‘poor, captive, blind, oppressed (4.18); poor hungry mournful, persecuted (6.20); blind, lame, leper,
deaf, dead, poor (7.22); poor, maimed, lame, blind (14.13); poor, maimed, blind, lame (14.21); poor,
ulcerated, hungry (16.20,22)’ p. 81
possessions (12.15, 21); a voluntary poverty will bring treasure in heaven (12.33); renouncing everything is the condition for discipleship (14.33); it is as hard for a rich person to enter the Kingdom of Heaven as it is for a camel to enter the eye of a needle (18.25). Acts witnesses the desire of the nascent church to share all their possessions (2.44; 5.1-11), and to care for the poor widows (χῆραι; πτωχός is not found in Acts) (6.1) and beggars (3.1-10), however there is no mention of embracing poverty or the dangers of wealth in the apostolic preaching.

1a.9  Redemption

O’Fearghail (1984, p.68) notes a possible reference in τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος τοῖς ἐκπορευοµένοις ἐκ τοῦ στόµατος αὐτοῦ (4.22) to ἄλλ᾽ ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήµατι τῷ ἐκπορευοµένῳ διὰ στόµατος θεοῦ ζήσεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος (Deut 8.3) and argues the words of grace were the message of salvation, further confirmed by the word σήµερον in the preceding verse (cf. Lk 2.11; 19.9; 23.43). However in this Hellenistic Jewish text it may simply be that what is praised is the Greek ability to speak persuasively with charming or attractive words (χάρις); alternatively, because the power of persuasive speech rests on an appeal to λόγος, and because χάρις is a quality of God, and almost a synonym for God, the persuasive speech owes its persuasion to the channelling of the divine λόγος. However, being rejected, Jesus declines to stay in the region because he was sent to proclaim the message of the kingdom in other districts καὶ ταῖς ἑτέραις πόλεσιν εὐαγγελίσασθαι μὲ δεῖ τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅτι ἐπὶ τοῦτο

---

62 the gracious words coming from his mouth

63 man shall live by all the words which come from the mouth of God

64 cf. also the implication of salvation in χάρις in Acts 14.3; 20.24, 32
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ἀπεστάλην (Lk 4.43).65

1a.10 The year of the Lord’s favour

It was argued at the beginning of this chapter that it appears Luke used the citation from Isaiah 61 as a programmatic statement, announcing the purpose of Jesus’ ministry and what kind of messiah he was. His ministry was not simply to announce good news for the poor and release for the oppressed; these objectives related specifically to the fulfilment of the year of the Lord’s favour, just as they do in Isaiah 61 and Lev 25. In the latter case the year of the Lord’s favour, or the Year of Jubilee, is not just a Sabbath of Sabbaths, when the land must be allowed to rest (v.4-5), this Sabbath year was made holy (v.10) and demanded the ἄφεσις66 of debts and the care for the poor (v.25,35,36). In its Levitical context ἄφεσις has the sense of ‘release.’ However, at least in the Qumran community, there was some sense of an eschatological Jubilee of forgiveness of sins. It is also notable that Luke’s version of the Lord’s Prayer has ἄφες ἡ µῖν τὰς ἁµαρτίας ἡµῶν, (11.4) rather than the Matthean ἄφες ἡ µῖν τὰ ὀφείλµατα ἡµῶν (6.12), and the life-giving (χαρίζωµαι)67 forgiveness of debts in the parable of the two debtors becomes the model for the forgiveness of sins (7.41-47). Various commentators68 have noted the use of Is 61.1 in the Melchizedek document 11Q13 which

65 It is necessary for me to preach the Good News of the kingdom of God in other towns because I was sent for this.

66 ἄφεσις, translating ḥărâ€™ emancipation, is repeated fifteen times in describing the year of Jubilee in Lev 25. In Deut 15.1f ἄφεσις translates ἀφεννέµενµεν release.

67 The life-giving sense of χαρίζωµαι (cf. Esther 8.7 in the LXX Esther’s life was granted and Haman was hanged) is particularly apt in expressing the cancellation of financial debt in the style of the Jubilee and consequently describes the life-giving forgiveness of sin.

connects the liberation of captives in the year of favour with the day of atonement: the sons of light will have liberty and the forgiveness of their sins ‘in the first week of the Jubilee that follows the nine Jubilees. And the Day of Atonement is the e[nd of the] tenth [Ju]bilee, when all the Sons of [Light] and the men of the lot of Mel[ch]zedek will be atoned for.’ 69

As mentioned in the introduction of this paper, Robert Sloan (1977), in his doctoral thesis on the year of the Lord’s favour, argued persuasively for the importance of the image of the Jubilee in the construction of the Gospel of Luke. His argument is that ‘the measure of the importance of the notion of jubilee is seen in relationship to the importance of that which it describes and/or functionally serves in the progress of Luke’s gospel’ (p.174). Sloan’s evidence is:

a. the consistent preaching of the kingdom and its righteousness throughout the Gospel are the unfurling of the programmatic announcement of the mission of Jesus in terms of the eschatological Jubilee in 4.18-19.

b. from a. it follows that the notion of Jubilee is necessary ‘for perceiving certain functional aspects of Jesus’ Messianic self-understanding, and hence for understanding the nature of Jesus’ Messiahship itself.’ (p.174) I shall argue in defence of this particularly in reference to the relationship of the Jubilee to the Sabbath and the Day of Atonement (chapters two and three).

69 trans. Vermes, 2011, p.533
c. Jesus’ response to the disciples of John the Baptist is couched in terms alluding to the Jubilee pericope of Isaiah 61 and summarise Jesus’ ministry as presented throughout Luke’s Gospel. I have argued this at the beginning of this chapter.

d. both the paradigmatic preaching (6.20-38) and the paradigmatic prayer (11.2-4) in Luke are presented in terms of the notion of the Jubilee (p.175, pp.121-145). In Jesus’ preaching this is evidenced in the dialectical tension between the blessings for the poor (6.20-23) against the woes for the rich (6.24-26), and in the concerns relating to economic concerns (6.30-38). Unlike the Matthean οἱ πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι (Mat 5.3) Luke specifies only οἱ πτωχοί (6.20) and further defines them as οἱ πεινῶντες νῦν (6.21), οἱ κλαίοντες νῦν (6.21) and those who are hated, excluded and reviled (6.22), thus aligning his beatitudes with the reversal of fortunes in Is 61. I agree with Sloan in identifying allusions to the legal (Lev 25, Deut 15.18) and prophetic (Is 61,58) texts of the OT concerning the Jubilee. ‘Do no wrong to one another’ is taken up in ‘love even your enemy’ (Lev 25.14, 17/ Lk 6.27-32), the return of property and the redemption of the hopeless poor in the year of release becomes lend without hope of return (Lev 25.10, 28, Deut 15.10 / Lk 6. 30-34). The case for the latter connection with the legislation on the Jubilee is strengthened by Luke’s use of δίδωμι linked to his unique employment of δανείζω (6.30, 34), which suggest a dependence on Deut 15.8 δάνειον δανείζει αὐτῷ (a slightly unusual rendering of the infinitive absolute נתנך נתזכן) and Deut 15.10

70 you shall certainly lend
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διδοὺς δώσεις αὐτῷ καὶ δάνειον δανιεῖς αὐτῷ71 (expanding the MT idols חַנְנ). The possibility of this dependence is strengthened by the parallel blessings: εὐλογήσει σε κύριος ὁ θεός σου (Deut 15.10);72 καὶ ἔσται ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολὺς (Lk 6.35).73 The presence of ἀπαιτέω (Lk 6.30 παντὶ αἰτοῦντι σε δίδου),74 only used twice by Lk and not occurring elsewhere in the NT, also suggest the link with the Deuteronomic legislation on the Jubilee:

‘And this is the manner of the release: every creditor shall release what he has lent to his neighbour; he shall not exact (ἀπαιτέω) it of his neighbour, his brother, because the LORD’s release has been proclaimed. Of a foreigner you may exact (ἀπαιτέω) it; but whatever of yours is with your brother your hand shall release.’ (Deut 15.2, 3).

In Isaiah the πτωχοί are named (61.1; Lk 6.20), and the συντετριμμένους τῇ καρδίᾳ (Is 61:1)75 could describe those set apart (ὑφορίζω) and reviled (ὀνειδίζω) (Lk 6.22) just as πάντας τοὺς πενθοῦντας (Is 61.2)76 readily identifies with οἱ κλαίοντες (Lk 6.21),77 especially when one considers the respective woe οὐαί, οἱ γελῶντες νῦν, ὅτι πενθήσετε καὶ κλάσετε (Lk 6.25).78 The consoling (anointing) joy promised in Isaiah άλειψ ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ εὐφροσύνης (Is 61.3)79 is matched by Luke’s χάρητε ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ...

71 give him freely and generously lend to him
72 the Lord your God will bless you
73 and your reward will be great
74 give to all who ask
75 crushed in heart
76 all who mourn
77 those who weep
78 woe those who laugh now because you shall mourn and weep
79 oil of gladness
σκιρτήσατε (Lk 6.23). With this analysis I suggest Jesus’ command Γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες καθὼς [καὶ] ὁ πατὴρ ήμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν (Lk 6.36) summarises the theology of the Jubilee.

The petition of the Lord’s prayer: καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἰδίους παντὶ ὀφειλοντι ἡμῖν (Lk 11.4) is also highly suggestive of a reference to the Jubilee injunction: ἰδίους παντὶ χρέος ἵνα ὁ ὀφείλει σοι ὁ πλησίον (Deut 15.2).

Although the Lucan text is similar to Matthew particularly in respect of the key words ἰδίους and ὀφείλει: καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἰδίους ὀφειλαμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν (Mt 6.12). Luke does not include the qualifying comment that the debts are moral or spiritual rather than financial (Mt 6. 14-15) and so retains a strong link to the Jubilee. Although one might be tempted to connect ἄφες ἁμαρτίας and ἰδίους τοῖς ὀφειλόντι thus spiritualising our debts (which makes sense as the Father can forgive sin but cannot cancel financial debt), I suggest the two clauses might relate to the Jubilee which started with the forgiveness of sin on the Day of Atonement and because of this forgiveness God’s people were called to cancel their debts owed to them by the poor.

---

80 rejoice on that day and skip for joy
81 be merciful just as your Father is merciful
82 forgive us our sins, even as we forgive all who are in debt to us
83 you shall cancel every debt which your neighbour owes
84 forgive us our debts as we forgive those indebted to us
e. Sloan also argues for Luke’s allusion to the notion of the eschatological Jubilee in two strategic points of the Gospel: ἄφεσις in the commissioning of the apostles (24.47), and the eschatological restoration (ἀποκαθιστάνω/ἀποκατάστασις) introducing the Acts of the Apostles (1.6; 3.21). With regard to the latter, Sloan notes Philo’s (De Decalogo 164) use of ἀποκατάστασις in reference to the ordinance of the Jubilee year, this he says ‘is not difficult to understand given the fact that the two greatest wellsprings of Jewish thought – creation and redemption from Egyptian bondage – are presuppositionally united in the Jubilee legislation, thereby confirming its fundamental connection with the idea of restoration’ (p.15). I suggest the connection of redemption and creation motifs is not only present in cultic legislation concerning the Jubilee and Isaiah (40.27-31; 42.5-7; 44.21-24; 48.12-19) but creation itself is the ordering of chaos and salvation the restoration of Edenic order lost by sin (see above 1a.5 and Chapter Two).

1a. 11 Conclusion

The Nazareth pericope sets out the Lucan Jesus’ agenda both in the social and cultic fulfilment of the Isaiahanic eschatological interpretation of the Year of Jubilee. As the Gospel unfolds Jesus’ programatic statement of his mission is verified, socially the barriers are removed until the apostolic church shared everything in common (Acts 2.44; 4.32), and sinners are forgiven (Acts 8.18-24). The anointing by the Spirit is suggestive of a priestly messianic identity, and recalls the activity of the Spirit confirming Jesus’ divine sonship. As the obedient ‘Son of God’ Jesus brings salvation as the restoration of the Eden lost by Adam ‘the son of God’.
Chapter One

Part 2

The road to Emmaus: the expected redemption and the Year of Jubilee

1b.1 Introduction

Having examined the text of the inaugural speech of Jesus in the Nazareth pericope and argued that its proclamation of the Year of Jubilee will be fulfilled in the ministry of Jesus (Chapter One part 1) we can turn to the appearance of the Risen Jesus to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus (Lk 24.13-35). As Lucan Sondergut this is arguably a particularly useful guide to Luke’s distinctive theological concerns. This part of Chapter One examines the text of the Emmaus pericope and argues that λυτρόω (v.21) might be an allusion to the Year of Jubilee (λύτρον Lev 25. 24, 26, 51, 52), rather than the expectation of a political messiah which the passion predictions might preclude. With the ironies that pervade the story it is hard to ignore the possibility of reading Cleopas’ reason for their sadness, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἠλπίζομεν ὅτι αὐτὸς ἐστιν ὁ λύτροῦσθαι τὸν Ἰσραήλ (Lk 24.21),85 as yet another irony. This was their hope and, although their hearts were closed to it, this hope had been fulfilled. The Emmaus pericope suggests the passion and glorification have become the fulfilment of the ‘prophetic’ Year of Jubilee and the effective cause of ἀφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν, and that the necessity of the suffering and glorification of the Christ, as foretold and fulfilled by him, is complementary to the interpretation of the Jubilee in Lk 4.18-19.

85 we were hoping that he is the one about to redeem Israel
It will be argued that Luke not only took over Mark’s three passion predictions; he embellished them and added to them to emphasise the necessity of the passion and glorification of Jesus, and to signal that this will be a fulfilment of prophecy. However, in the unfolding plot of the Gospel this is not understood by the disciples, including the two of them who encountered the stranger on the road to Emmaus.

1b.2 The hope of Cleopas versus the passion predictions

As a spokesman for the disbelieving disciples Cleopas answered the stranger’s question as to what things had come to pass in Jerusalem which they had been discussing with such sadness:

\[\text{τὰ περὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναζαρηνοῦ, δὲ} \text{ἐγένετο ἀνὴρ προφήτης δυνατός ἐν ἐργῳ καὶ λόγῳ ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ, ὁπως τε παρέδωκαν αὐτὸν οἱ ἄρχερα τε καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες ἦμων εἰς κρίμα θανάτου καὶ ἔσταυρωσαν αὐτὸν. ήμεῖς δὲ ἠπείξομεν ὅτι αὐτὸς ἰστιν ὁ μέλλων λυτροῦσθαι τὸν Ἰσραήλ· ἀλλὰ γε καὶ σὺν πάσιν τούτοις τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν ἄγεν ἄρε ὦ τὑ ὑμᾶς ἐγένετο. \] 

\[\text{καὶ γυναῖκες τινες εξ ὑμῶν ἐξέστησαν ἡμᾶς, γενομέναι ὑδρήναι ὑπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον, καὶ μὴ εὐροῦσαι τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ἠλθον λέγουσαι καὶ ὑπασίαν ἀγγέλων ἐωρακέναι, οἱ λέγουσιν αὐτὸν ζην. καὶ ἀπῆλθον τινες τὸν σὸν ἰστιν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ εὗρον οὕτως καθὼς καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες εἶπον, αὐτὸν δὲ οὐκ ἤδε. (Lk 24.19-24)\]

From the point of view of the narrative of the Gospel as it has unfolded up to this point the reader might sympathise with the stranger who gently chides the two disciples for being ‘foolish and slow of heart to believe the words of the prophets’ (v. 25). They had expected Jesus would be the one who was about to redeem (λυτρῶ) Israel (v.21) but their hopes had

---

86 the things concerning Jesus of Nazareth, who became a prophetic man, powerful in deed and word before God and all the people. And how the high priests and our leaders handed him over for the death sentence and they crucified him. And we were hoping that he is the one about to redeem Israel. And besides all this three days have passed since. Furthermore some women from our number amazed us. coming early to the tomb, and not finding his body, they came back saying they had seen a vision of angels who said he was alive. Some of us went out to the tomb and found it just as the women had said, but him they did not see.

87 An alternative analysis might see Cleopas and the other disciples as proxies for Luke’s ideal readers.
been dashed when he was crucified. Even though the women had reported the angelic message that Jesus was alive (v.23), they were still despondent. However Jesus’ response, explaining that it was necessary for the Christ to suffer these things in fulfilment of the Scriptures (and his own passion predictions), might transform the disciples’ hope that he was about to redeem Israel into irony; as the reader knows, he was going to redeem it, but not in way the disciples on the road had been hoping.
1b.2.1 The passion predictions in Luke

1b.2.1.1 The first prediction

Luke 9.20-22

20 καὶ αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; Πέτρος δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν· τὸν χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ.

21 ὁ δὲ ἐπιτιμήσας αὐτοῖς παρὴγγειλεν μηδενὶ λέγειν τοῦτο

22 εἶπον ὅτι δεὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ἀρχιερέων καὶ γραμματέων καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθῆναι.

23 Ἐλεγεν δὲ πρὸς πάντας· εἰ τις θέλει ὁπίσω μου ἔρχεσθαι, ἀρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καθ’ ἡμέραν καὶ ἀκολουθεῖτο μοι.

Mark 8.29-34

29 καὶ αὐτὸς ἑπηρώτα αὐτοῖς· ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος λέγει αὐτῷ· σοὶ εἶ ὁ χριστὸς.

30 καὶ ἑπετιμησαν αὐτοῖς ἑνα μηδενὶ λέγωσι περὶ αὐτοῦ

31 Καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς ὅτι δεὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῇ ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ἀρχιερέων καὶ γραμματέων καὶ ἀποκτανθῇ καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθῇ.

32 καὶ παρρησίᾳ τὸν λόγον ἑλάλει· καὶ προσλαβόμενος ὁ Πέτρος αὐτῷ ἐπιτίμησεν αὐτῷ.

33 ὁ δὲ ἐπιστραφεὶς καὶ ἰδὼν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἑπετιμήσε πέτρῳ καὶ λέγει· ὑπάγε ὡς ὡς ὁπίσω μου, σατανᾶ, διὸ ὅτι φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄλλα τά τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

34 Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ἐπηρώτα αὐτοῖς· εἰ τις θέλει ὁπίσω μου ἀκολουθεῖν, ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖτο μοι.

In Lk 9.22, like Mark 8.31, the announcement of the necessary (δεῖ) death of the son of man follows Peter’s confession that Jesus is ὁ χριστὸς (9.20) and so suggests that it is necessary for the anointed Messiah to die. The addition of τοῦ θεοῦ (9.20) in Luke (an unique

---

88 He said to them ‘who do you say I am?’ Peter answering said: ‘the Christ of God.’ But warning them he commanded them to say this to no one. Saying: ‘it is necessary for the Son of man to suffer much and to be reject by the elders, and high priests and scribes and be killed and on the third day to be raised.’ And he said to all: ‘if anyone wishes to come after me let him deny himself and pick up his own cross daily and let him follow me.’ (Lk 9.20-22)
LXX qualification in Luke) reminds the reader that Jesus is not just the Messiah; his purpose is determined by the One to whom he is subjugated. He is the one who has been anointed by the Spirit (of God) to herald the year of the Lord’s favour (4.18-19). In Mark and Luke Jesus explains ὅτι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ημέρας ἀναστῆναι (Mk 8.31 /Lk 9.22). In Mark Peter subsequently remonstrates with Jesus (8.32) who then commands Peter ὑπαγε ὀπίσω μου, σαταν (8.33). Luke omits this misunderstanding and continues with Mk 8.34 where Jesus declares that whoever wishes to follow behind (ὀπίσω) him must take up his cross (Lk 9.23). It is in accepting their own cross that his followers will be saved (σῶζω τὴν ψυχὴν, 9.24). The sense here is not the Hellenistic ‘soul’ rather than ‘body’, but rather an expression of the whole ‘self’ which is either absorbed in earthly matters or transcends them (Fitzmyer 1981, p.788), thus somewhat different from the expression σῶζω τὴν ψυχὴν found in Gen 19.17 (Lot’s life is saved); 1 Sam 19.11 (Michal warns David to save his life lest he be killed); and Jer 48.6 (the Lord warns Israel to flee for their lives). The addition of καθ’ ἡμέραν in Lk 9.23 implies the metaphorical meaning of carrying one’s cross which does not appear to have a precedent nor is it attested in later Rabbinic writings (Schneider, 1971, vol 7, p.578). Here in the first passion prediction the cross is the identifying mark of Jesus. Thus Luke develops the first prediction of the necessity

89 it is necessary for the Son of man to suffer much and to be reject by the elders, and high priests and scribes and be killed and on the third day to be raised.

90 go behind me satan
of Jesus’ passion with salvation through accepting the cross which will be part of Jesus’ identity, and that the ‘saved’ will need to be identified with him in their daily cross-bearing.\textsuperscript{91}

Thus this thesis disagrees with Evans (1993, p.404): ‘The statements of messiahship and rejection are simply juxtaposed, and no explanation is given of what messiahship means or of why it is elicited only to be banned, or of who the Son of man is and why the prophecy of rejection should be made in terms of him.’ On the contrary Luke, in omitting Peter’s remonstration, has linked the necessity of the suffering of the messiah with the necessity that his followers accept their sufferings as he did in order to be saved. The passion predictions in Luke form part of his corroboration of the early kerygma as he will present it in Acts (and as Paul proclaims it: salvation was effected (\textit{εἰρηνοποιέω}–to make \textit{shalom}) by the blood of Christ on the cross, Col 1.20). Peter preaches Jesus’ death at the hands of the Jews was planned by God (Acts 2.23), God fulfilled what he had foretold through the mouth of all of his prophets; that the Christ should suffer (Acts 3.18). Stephen preached the coming of the righteous one who was foretold (\textit{προκαταγγέλλω}) by the prophets and who was betrayed and murdered by those who had received the Law but had not kept it (Acts 7.52-53). Philip explained to the Ethiopian eunuch that the good news of Jesus was that he was the one to suffer whom Isaiah had prophesied (Acts 8.35). Central to Paul’s kerygma was his argument from Scripture ὅτι τὸν χριστὸν ἔδει παθεῖν καὶ ἀναστῇ ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστὸς [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς ὃν ἐγὼ καταγγέλλω ὑµῖν (Act 17.3):\textsuperscript{92} in the Corinthian synagogue every

\textsuperscript{91} Conzelmann (1969, p.233) notes that for Luke’s readers ‘imitatio’ had been superseded by discipleship ‘therefore there is no ideal of the ‘imitatio’ of the apostle either.’ Thus in the ‘Middle Time’ it is not a matter of suffering with Jesus but \textit{confessing} him in persecution.

\textsuperscript{92} that it was necessary that the Christ should suffer and to be raised from the dead and this is Jesus the Christ whom I proclaim to you.
Sabbath Paul testified from the Scriptures to the Jews that the Christ was Jesus but they rejected him (Acts 18.5). Paul says he testified only to what the prophets and Moses said would come to pass: εἰ παθητὸς ὁ χριστός, εἰ πρῶτος ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν φῶς μέλλει καταγγέλλειν τῷ τε λαῷ καὶ τοῖς ἑθνεσιν (Acts 26.22-23). Here we find Luke’s principle of faith in Christ as the hermeneutic for interpreting the Scriptures. (See 1b.3.2 for further comments on the suffering Messiah.)

1b.2.1.1.2 The Transfiguration

Like Mark, Luke follows the first passion prediction with the account of the transfiguration of Jesus. On the mountain with clothes resembling those of the high priest on the day of atonement (ὁ ἱµατισµὸς αὐτοῦ λευκὸς ἐξαστράπτων Lk 9.29, λινοῦς (בַּד) in the LXX: Lev 16.4, 23, 32; Ez 44.17), Jesus discusses with Moses and Elijah his exodus which was about to be accomplished in Jerusalem. Although the language of typology in not explicitly employed, it may not be inappropriate to use it here, especially if Luke were aware of the contemporary employment of typological interpretation of Jewish Scripture in Alexandria, most notably by Philo. Amann (1950, p.1941) comments that:

‘Juifs et chrétiens [d’Alexandrie] ont cependant ceci de commun: pour eux, l’essentiel est moins de comprendre la lettre elle-même de l’Écriture que ce que nous dérobe le

93 If the Christ were subject to suffering and if he were the first to rise from the dead, then he must be destined to proclaim light to the people and to the Gentiles.

94 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες δύο (Lk 24.4) links with Moses and Elijah at the transfiguration (9.30) and the two men at the ascension (Acts 1.10) (Leaney, 1971, p.71).
The road to Emmaus: the expected redemption and the Year of Jubilee

Here in particular the fact that the passage features Moses on a mountain shrouded in cloud from which the voice of God is heard (Lk 9.34, 35) recalls Exodus 24.12-18. Thus in comparing Jesus’ impending death, which was to be fulfilled in Jerusalem, with the Hebrew paradigmatic act of redemption, the Exodus, Luke is making this the type for understanding the death of the Messiah. Although ἔξοδος could simply mean ‘death’ or ‘departure from this life’ as in 2Peter 1.15, here in the Transfiguration, with the presence of Moses and the theophany reminiscent of Sinai, ἔξοδος seems more likely to be linking Jesus’ own death with the redemption of the Exodus. Perhaps on the mount of transfiguration Moses and Elijah act as the two witnesses who were required to validate their prophetic testimony which could lead to the death sentence (Deut 17.6). After his ἔξοδος is fulfilled the stranger on the road to Emmaus appeals to Moses and the prophets as witnesses to the necessity of the death and glorification of the Christ. In the absence of any obvious OT texts indicating the necessity of the death of the Messiah, the prophetic discussion at the Transfiguration gains a quasi-prophetic role. Thus necessary death and glorification of the Messiah might be the fulfilment of Jesus’ own prophetic self understanding. He knew, as he had discussed with Moses and Elijah, that it was necessary for him to die.

95 However, Jews and Christians (from Alexandria) have this in common; form them the essential point is less to understand the letter itself of the Scriptures which the text conceals from us, but more, for both, the sacred Book became an integral text of which, before all else, one should grasp its profound meaning.

96 It is worth noting here that according to 4Q379 f12 the Exodus took place on a Year of Jubilee.
Ib.2.1.2 The second prediction of the passion

In the second prediction, with greater force than Mark 9.31, θέσθε ὑμεῖς εἰς τὰ ὄτα ὑμῶν τούς λόγους τούτους (Lk 9.44), in the face of the disciples’ lack of perception, the Lucan Jesus declares that the Son of Man will be handed over into the hands of men (v.45). But like the two on the road to Emmaus (24.25), the disciples were unable to understand this saying since, rather enigmatically, ‘it was concealed from them, that they should not perceive it’ (Lk 9.45). After the dispute concerning who was the greatest, again emphasising the disciples’ lack of understanding, Jesus set his face for Jerusalem where the days of his ἀνάληψις would be fulfilled (9.51).

In Luke 13.32-33, responding to the warning from the Pharisees that Herod was out to kill him, Jesus responded that after his ministry of exorcisms and healing he would achieve his (real) goal (τελειόω passive) which was implicitly his death, since it was ‘not possible for a prophet to die outside Jerusalem’ (v. 33). Thus his purpose was not just to fulfil a ministry of healing but more importantly, after that ministry, it was necessary that he should die as a prophet in the holy City. So the Lucan Jesus styles himself as a prophet who will die in the City towards which he was making his way (9.51). This thesis elucidates on the possible allusions to the cult, of which Jerusalem was the focal point (cf. Chapter Two). It may be that

97 and in the style of the LXX (e.g. Gen 20.8; Ex 24.7) (place your ears to these words)
98 With the exception of Zechariah (2Chronicles 24.20-22) the murderous death of a prophet is not found in the OT. However, the pseudepigraphic Lives of the Prophets relates the tradition that Isaiah ‘died under Manasseh by being sawn in two, and was buried underneath the Oak of Rogel, near the place where the path crosses the aqueduct whose water Hezekiah shut off by blocking its source’ (Lives 1.1 trans. Hare 1985, p385). Jeremiah was stoned to death by his people but buried in Egypt (Lives 2.1). Micah (Lives 6.1-2) was killed by his own son but buried in his hometown מִשְׁכָּה. Amos (Lives 7.1-3) was tortured and killed and buried in Tekoa his hometown. Zechariah (Lives 23.1) was killed by King Joash near the altar (2Chronicles 24.20-22; Matthew 23.35).
Luke, in only reporting Jesus’ operation within the Temple after his arrival at the city, implies a connection between the necessity of the death of the Messiah with that Temple cult. Thus the cult to which the evangelist alludes (the Jubilee (Chapter One), the Sabbath (Chapter Two) and the Day of Atonement (Chapter Three)) might be an interpretative tool for understanding the significance of that death. This idea will be explored throughout this thesis.

1b.2.1.3 The third prediction of the passion

The third prediction of the passion and resurrection of Jesus in Luke (18.31) witnesses the addition to Mark 10.33 (and Mt 20.18): καὶ τελεσθῆσεται πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα διὰ τῶν προφητῶν τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου.99 Here we find the same conviction that the passion and resurrection of the Son of Man were foretold in the Scriptures and must be fulfilled (τελέω) in Jesus. Mark does not use τελέω at all, however Luke had already used it in the sense of Mary and Joseph fulfilling all the requirements of the Law concerning their child (2.39). More significantly, Luke uses it in 12.50 as he refers to his impending fate as a baptism: βάπτισμα δὲ ἔχω βαπτισθῆναι, καὶ πῶς συνέχοιμαι ἐως ὅτου τελεσθῇ.100 This text is also unique to Luke, though Mark 10.38 also uses βάπτισμα in the same sense. After the institution of the Eucharist in Luke Jesus predicts Peter’s denial (22.33) and Luke gives a further reinforcement of the necessity (δεῖ) that what had been written about him in the prophetic sufferer of Isaiah 53.12, καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη,101 must be fulfilled (τελέω) in him (22.37): this is fulfilled in the two κακοδρόμοι crucified with Jesus (23.32, 39-43). The flow of the passage from the reference

99 and all that is written through the prophets about the Son of Man will be fulfilled

100 I have a baptism (with which) I must be baptised, and how I am tormented until it is accomplished

101 he was counted among the lawless
to the fulfilment of Jesus’ suffering leaves no doubt that the fulfilment is the death of Jesus (22.16, 37). If Luke presumed his reader would be familiar with the passage from Isaiah 53.12 the presumption would also be that they would remember the words immediately preceding the quote Luke gives: παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη. It would be impossible to do justice to the vast and complex subject of the suffering servant here, however what is relevant here is that the Lucan Jesus, along with his Philip (Acts 8.34), understood the sufferer of Isaiah to have prefigured the suffering Jesus.

Luke continues by reinforcing the necessity that the things (written) about him must have their fulfilment (καὶ γὰρ τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει: 22.37). If this has the sense of ‘all that has been written’, as is explicit in 24.27, then the remainder of Isaiah 53.12 LXX, καὶ αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήνεγκεν καὶ διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη, would indicate that his death would be vicarious on behalf of sinners. The last phrase is stronger in its soteriological import than the MT יַפְגִּיעַוְלַפֹּשְׁעִים (he interceded on behalf of transgressions (participle m, pl., abs)). The LXX makes it clear that the servant is delivered up (παραδίδω) for the sake of, or because of, (διὰ) the sins of the lawless (ἄνομος, MT: פָּשַׁע rebels).

It has been argued above that Luke not only copied Mark’s three passion predictions, he embellished them and added to them to emphasise the necessity of the passion and glorification of Jesus, and to signal that this will be a fulfilment of prophecy. However, in the unfolding plot of the Gospel this is not understood by the disciples, including the two of them

---

102 his life was handed over to death and he was counted among the lawless
104 and he bore the sins of many and was handed over for their sins
who encountered the stranger on the road to Emmaus (though there is no indication whether they heard the passion predictions or not).

1b.3 *Messianic expectation and the Year of Jubilee*

The vast and complex subject of messianic expectation at the dawn of the Common Era was briefly considered in 1a.7.1, here we will consider what might have been the hopeful expectation of the two disciples on the road to Emmaus concerning ὁ μέλλων λυτροῦσθαι τὸν Ἰσραήλ (24.21).

The *Testament of Levi* 2.10 (a first cent CE Jewish pseudepigraphon arguably with later Christian interpolations) witnesses a similar expectation. An angel speaks to Levi, the servant of the Lord, and commands him that having revealed the mysteries of God to humanity, καὶ περὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος λυτροῦσθαι τὸν Ἰσραήλ κηρύξεις. The expectation is that the Lord was about to redeem Israel and through Levi and Judah even the gentiles would be saved having seen the Lord (2.1). Salvation would be life ‘from the Lord’s provision; he shall be to you as field and vineyard and produce, as silver and gold’ (trans. Kee, 1983, p.788). However the expected salvation was to come from the Lord, not the servant to whom the text is addressed.

It could be argued that Lk 24.21 might be understood as the expectation that Jesus was going to be a political messiah, but for the reader, having read the previous twenty-three chapters, this would not seem a very realistic expectation considering the Lucan Jesus’ apparent lack of interest in the political situation and distaste for being involved in local animosity, and also Luke’s generally positive evaluation of the Roman Empire and its

105 and you shall preach about the one who is about to redeem Israel
works. From the point of view of the story, the expectation of Cleopas and his companion should have been the fulfilment of Jesus’ mission as he had stated it at its inception in the Nazareth synagogue: κηρύξαι ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτόν (Lk 4.19). Thus, although the disciples on the road are ironically ignorant, the reader understands that λυτρόω would be consonant with the release of the year of Jubilee (Lev 25.24, 25, 26, 30, 33, 48, 49, 51, 52, 54) and it was for this that the Christ (Χριστός 24.26) was anointed (χρῖω 4.18).

1b.3.1 Messianic expectation in the Dead Sea Scrolls

The expectation of a Messiah to whom heaven and earth will listen is found in the Messianic Apocalypse (4Q521). The specific role of the Messiah is not clear in the text. He may be the Messiah-king to be announced by an eschatological Elijah (Puech 1992, p.497 cited in Evans 2000, p.696) who may be the anointed one of the scroll (Collins 1995, p.117-122; 1998, pp. 112-116 both cited in Evans 2000, p.696). Collins contends that the Messiah is preceded by the anointed one who ‘liberates the captives, restores sight to the blind, straightens the bent’ [and]… will heal the wounded, and revive the dead and bring good news to the poor’ (4Q521f2, trans. Vermes, 2011, p.413). The allusions to Isaiah are notable: liberty to captives (61.1); sight to the blind (35.5); make straight the way (40.3; 45.13).

---

106 e.g.: 4.19 the omission of the day of vengeance; 6.22-23 the blessing of accepting persecution; 7.1-10 healing the centurion’s servant; 12.13-14 Jesus not the arbitrator of personal strife; the apparent lack of interest in Pilate’s atrocities 13.1-2; avoiding blaming the Romans for the crucifixion–Jesus was brought (ἀγωνόμενος) not delivered (παραδίδω) Mk 15.1; Mt 27.2), the centurion declared Jesus to be δίκαιος (23.47); furthermore the use of Roman dating for Jesus’ life (3.1), the humble Roman centurion who built a synagogue at his own expense (7.5), John the Baptist’s advice to the Roman soldiers (3.14), the fact that Augustus’s decree gives the reason why Jesus is born in Bethlehem (2.1), Paul’s appeal to Caesar, and the role of Roman soldiers in safeguarding him from Jewish hostility (Acts 25.11-12), and the absence of any reference to Paul’s death in Acts, suggest Luke’s positive feelings towards the Roman Empire.

107 to proclaim the favourable year of the Lord
696) admits the possibility of the wounded alluding to Isaiah 53.5 αὐτὸς δὲ ἐτραυματίσθη διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν καὶ μεμαλάκισται διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν to heal the brokenhearted. 108 however there is no sense in Isaiah that this wounded person would be healed; 61.1 ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τῇ καρδίᾳ would be the more likely allusion. The rising of the dead could allude to Is 26.19 ἀναστήσονται οἱ νεκροὶ καὶ ἐγερθήσονται οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις and bringing good news to the poor (πτωχοῖς ἄνεοι) to 61.1 εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς ἄνεοι. 111 Like Mary’s Magnificat, there is an expectation of the reversal of fortunes ‘he will lead the uprooted and make the hungry rich’ (4Q521f2, trans. Vermes, 2011, p.413; Lk 1.52, 53). The allusions to Isaiah 61 link the coming of the Messiah with the Year of Jubilee (v.2), as do the reversals of fortunes for the poor (Lev 25.25-26), and the presence of the Spirit ‘hovering’ over the poor and ‘renewing the faithful with his [God’s] power’ (fragment 2, line 5).

The allusion to Malachi 4.5-6 ‘the fathers will return [ἀποκαθιστάνω] to their sons’ (fragment 2 column 3, Evans, 2000, p.696) and those ‘who are doing good before the Lord’ (fragment 7 line 4) links the coming of the Messiah with the Great Day of the Lord when the wicked shall be destroyed and the righteous shall rise (Malachi 4.1-3). The expectation was for the ‘pious [to be glorified] on the throne of the eternal Kingdom’ (4Q521f2 line 6).

108 and he was wounded because of our lawlessness and bruised (crushed MT) for our sins
109 to heal the brokenhearted
110 the dead shall rise and those in their tombs shall be raised
111 to bring good news to the poor. רָשָׁע bear tidings, good or bad
1b.3.2 A suffering Messiah

Despite the apparent absence of clear prophecies of a suffering messiah in Second Temple literature, the nascent church, according to Luke, manifestly believed such a messiah had been foretold by ‘all’ the prophets. The early kerygma of Paul and Barnabas (in their Sabbath speech in the synagogue of Antioch in Pisidia, Acts 13.14-41) taught that salvation, forgiveness of sins, was effected by the death and resurrection of the messiah as foretold by the prophets.

However the Lucan Jesus is somewhat equivocal in his self-identification as the Χριστός. On the one hand he is specifically denoted as such by the narrator: the angels announce to the shepherds that a saviour is born to them ὃς ἐστιν χριστὸς κύριος (Lk 2.11); it had been revealed to Simeon that he should not die before he had seen τὸν χριστὸν κυρίου (Lk 2.26) and when he held the child Jesus he declared he could part in peace (a synonym for salvation, see Chapter Two and Col 1.20 ‘For in him all the fulness of God was pleased to dwell, and through him to reconcile to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, making peace (εἰρηνοποιέω) by the blood of his cross.’) (Lk 2.29); John the Baptist declared he was not the Χριστός but implicitly declared the Χριστός to be the who is coming (3.15,16).

However, on the other hand, the Lucan Jesus consistently avoids claiming the title Χριστός for himself and charges others not to make such an identification known: only in Luke does Jesus forbid the demons to speak ὅτι ἠδεισαν τὸν χριστόν αὐτὸν εἶναι (Lk 4.41; cf Mk 3.12; Mt 8.4);112 like Mark and Matthew, in Luke Peter responds to Jesus’ question as to who he was,

112 because they knew him to be the Christ
that he was τὸν χριστὸν τοῦ θεοῦ (Lk 9.20; cf. Mk 8.29; Mt 16.16), but Jesus sternly warns the disciples not to reveal this to anyone (Lk 9.21; Mk 8.30; Mt 16.20); at his trial\(^\text{113}\) before the chief priests and scribes the Lucan Jesus declines to answer whether he is the Χριστός because if he answered they would not believe and if he asked them they would not answer, instead, as in Matthew (26.64), he speaks of himself as ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου who would be seated at the right hand of God but, unlike the other synoptics, declined to answer if he were the son of God (22.67-69) (in Mark 14.62 Jesus confirms he is the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed One). At the trial before Pilate, only in Luke (23.2,3), the whole company of chief priests and scribes accuse Jesus of having said he was a kingly Messiah, but Jesus declined to answer. In his dispute with the Sadducees about the resurrection of the dead, having refuted their question concerning the woman who had married seven brothers (Lk 20.27-40; Mk 12.18-27; Mt 22.23-33), Jesus responds with a dilemma for the Sadducees: how can the Χριστός be both the son of David and his lord? (Lk 20.41; Mk 12.35-37a; Mt 22.41). Although Luke follows Mark and Matthew, he re-sites the question of the greatest commandment (to Lk 10.25-28) thus connecting the Messiah with the question of the resurrection of the dead. Here too the Lucan Jesus is not claiming to be the Χριστός. And yet after his passion the risen Jesus identifies himself, if still obliquely, as the Χριστός who had to suffer (Lk 24.26, 46).\(^\text{114}\)

In Acts, Peter speaks of God making Jesus the Χριστός foreseen by David (2.29-36), and preaches repentance and baptism ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (2.38). From this point

\(^{113}\) If it can be called a ‘trial:’ it is questionable whether the Temple authorities could conduct a trial, or if so, whether they could do it in this way. cf. e.g. Winter (1974); Bammel (1970)

\(^{114}\) The concept of the suffering Messiah, Χριστός, is unique to Luke and not attested in either the OT or Jewish writings of the first century CE (cf Fitzmyer 1981, p.200).
the identification of Jesus as the Χριστός is confirmed by miracles in his dual name (3.6; 4.10; 9.34; 16.18) and the early kerygma preached is the good news that the Χριστός had to suffer and rise from the dead (3.18; 17.3a; 26.23) and that Jesus is the Χριστός (5.24; 8.12; 9.22; 17.3b; 18.5; 18.28).

In Luke-Acts then it appears that Jesus does not become the Χριστός until he has suffered, after which point Jesus clearly identifies himself as that Χριστός destined to suffer, and this suffering Messiah is the focus of the apostolic kerygma. From this point of view the anointing of Lk 4.18 does not achieve its full significance until Jesus definitively proclaims he is the crucified and risen Χριστός. Luke, however, prepares his reader to understand that Jesus will be a Χριστός-σωτήρ (2.11) who will be associated with suffering (2.35 Mary’s soul will also (καὶ … δὲ) be pierced). Χριστός τοῦ θεοῦ (9.20) is unique to Luke but follows LXX (usually without the definite article: 1Sam 24.11; 2Sam 1.14; lam 4.20). The genitive indicates the source of his anointing and to whom he belongs; the anointed one’s mission comes from God, and he is commissioned by God to undertake God’s saving work. Luke develops his sources making Jesus ὁ Χριστός τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐκλεκτός (23.35); on his cross one of the κακονομικοι mocks Jesus: if he is the Χριστός he could save himself and them by coming down from the cross (23.39). The other κακονομικος upbraids him and gives a different sense of σώζω: σήμερον μετ’ ἐμοῖ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ (v.43); thus the ultimate end of salvation is now to join Jesus in paradise.

\[\text{115 the Christ, the chosen one of God}\]

\[\text{116 criminal/evildoer}\]

\[\text{117 today you will be with me in paradise}\]
Ib.4 Parallels with Philip’s encounter with the Ethiopian eunuch

The Emmaus pericope exhibits certain parallels with Philip’s encounter with the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts 8.26-40): the journey from Jerusalem; the discussion/reading; the sudden appearance of Jesus/Philip; the question, what are you discussing/reading?; the slowness/lack of understanding; Jesus/Philip joining in the journey of the disciples/eunuch; the explanation of the Scriptures; the allusion to or celebration of a sacrament, Eucharist/Baptism; the disappearance of Jesus/Philip; the burning hearts/rejoicing. Whilst in the Emmaus pericope we are only given the general statement: καὶ ἀρξάµενος ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν διερήνευσεν αὐτοῖς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς τὰ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ (Lk 24.27), with Philip and the eunuch we are given the text of the prophet Isaiah (53.7-8) he was reading. Some have tried to identify specific texts Jesus was referring to in the Emmaus pericope, and others (Fitzmyer 1985, p.1558; 1981, p.200) have remarked on the futility of such an exercise. However, if one accepts the unity of Luke and Acts, the similarities between the two pericopes suggest this passage from Isaiah as a possible reference: the suffering servant was the starting point from which Philip explained the good news about Jesus. As discussed above, Jesus had already quoted from the suffering servant passage (Is 53.12) at the Last Supper

---

118 Goulder (1994 p.787) attributes the origin of this theory to Dupont but does not cite the source.

119 and beginning from Moses and all the prophets he interpreted to them from all the Scriptures the things concerning himself

120 e.g. Browning (1960, p.170) suggests Ez 37.5-6 ‘is fulfilled in a better way than the prophet had imagined.’

121 The ‘suffering servant’ is not the same as ‘suffering messiah’. The identification of servant and messiah only comes in Targum Nebim Is 52.13 cf. Fitzmyer (1981, p.200). cf. also Lk 24.46, Acts 3.18; 17.3; 26.23 The explicit notion of a suffering messiah is unique to Luke. It could be said to be implicit in Mat 16.20-21 and Mk 8.29, 31.
prophesying that what had been written about him must be accomplished: καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἔλογίσθη (Lk 22.37). Now Philip is making the prophecy of the suffering servant the point of departure as he preaches the good news. But this was the same word (εὐαγγελίζω) which Jesus had quoted from Isaiah in announcing the year of the Lord’s favour. If Jesus heralded the good news of the Year of Jubilee in his inaugural speech, and Philip identifies the good news of Jesus beginning with his fulfilment of the prophetic suffering servant, then there would seem to be the connection that the Year of Jubilee is accomplished through the same fulfilment of the suffering servant. So if Luke did have the Year of Jubilee in mind in the irony of 24.21 (‘but we had hoped that he was the one to redeem Israel’), then Jesus’ interpretation of Moses and the prophets concerning the necessity that the Christ should suffer and also enter into his glory (prophesied in Lk 9.22; 18.31-33; 22.15 and confirmed in 24.36), was the λύτρωσις of the Jubilee (Lev 25.48) brought to its fulfilment.

Such an interpretation would not be out of keeping with the expectation of an eschatological messiah who delivers the people from sin found in some contemporary literature. In the shorter recension (A) of 2 Enoch 64.5 all the people prayed blessing Enoch: ‘For the Lord has chosen you, [to appoint you to be] the one who reveals, who carries away our sins’. And in the longer recension (J) he is blessed as: ‘the one who carried away the sin of mankind’ (trans. Anderson 1983, p. 190,191) dated by Charlesworth to 1-50 CE. The Testament of Levi 17.2 prophesies the eschatological anointed priest who ‘will be great, and

---

122 and he was counted among the lawless

123 The earlier dating is preferred due to references which appear to assume to Temple had not yet been destroyed.
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will speak to God as father: and his priesthood will be perfect with the Lord, and in the day of his joy he will arise for the salvation of the world’ (μέγας ἔσται, καὶ λαλήσει θεῷ ὡς πατρί· καὶ ἡ ἱερωσύνη αὐτοῦ πλήρης μετὰ κυρίου· καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ χαρᾶς αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ κόσμου αὐτὸς ἀναστήσεται). There were of course other messianic hopes such as the expectation of divine deliverance from oppression so that God would reveal himself to the nations (Sirach 36.1-22).

1b.5 The ironic fulfilment of prophecy in the Emmaus pericope

Dawsey (1986, pp.142-156) reflects cogently on the irony that pervades the Gospel of Luke. Having prefaced his work with a dedication to the notable κράτιστε θεόφιλε in a cultured classical style, Luke goes on to report that the secrets of the kingdom are hidden from the wise and the learned but revealed to humble babes (10.21). The healing of the ten lepers is completed with the irony that only the one who is excluded from Temple worship, ἀλλογενὴς (17.18), falls down on his face at the feet of Jesus and worships him. Despite the supererogation of the Pharisee he does not return from his worship in the Temple at rights with God but the sinful tax collector does (18.14).

Just as Jesus teased the ‘men of this generation’ Lk 7.32f:

ὁμοίοι εἰσίν παιδίοις τοῖς ἐν ἁγορᾷ καθημένοις καὶ προσφοροῦσιν ἀλλήλοις ἡ λέγει· ἡμᾶς ἔχετε ξυπνήσωμεν ὑμῖν καὶ οὐκ ὠρχήσασθε, ἐθρηνήσαμεν καὶ οὐκ ἔκλαύσατε.\footnote{126}

\footnote{124} Whereas in Parable of the Sower it is those with ‘an honest and good heart’ (Lk 8.15) who are ‘given to know the secrets of the kingdom of God’ (Lk 8.10).

\footnote{125} A category excluded from the inner barrier of the Temple (Dawsey, 1986, pp.146-147).

\footnote{126} they are like children playing in the marketplace calling to each other: ‘we piped to you and you did not dance, we sang a dirge and you did not mourn’
The road to Emmaus: the expected redemption and the Year of Jubilee

challenging their presuppositions with an ironic aphorism, so too, here on the road to Emmaus, the Lucan Jesus brings in a new perspective for his audience.

The encounter on the road to Emmaus is also charged with ironies: the disciples do not recognise that it is Jesus but they are describing him as they speak to him; Jesus affects ignorance of the recent happenings; the women had not found the body but, unknown to the disciples on the road, he was before them. This suggests the possibility of the further ironic interpretation of the disciple’s hope that Jesus of Nazareth would be the prophet mighty ‘in deed and word’ (Lk 24.19) who was about to redeem Israel. Luke’s apparent approval for the title ‘prophet’ accorded to Jesus particularly in specifically Lucan material (Lk 7.16, 39; 9.54; 13.33) stresses the irony of Lk 24.21; yes he is the prophet ὁ μὲλλών λυτροῦσθαι τὸν Ἦσραήλ but the manner of redemption was not what they expected (24.25-27).

1b.6 Conclusion

This chapter has argued that the Emmaus pericope complements the programmatic statement of Luke 4.18-19, where Jesus defines his mission in terms of the fulfilment of the eschatological Jubilee. After his resurrection the Lucan Jesus confirms he is the Messiah who had to suffer. Luke had not simply repeated Mark’s three passion predictions, he adapted them to include the idea that his death would be the necessary fulfilment of the Scriptures, and

---

127 The Greek concept of ἐιρωνεία ‘dissimulation, i.e. ignorance purposely affected’ (Liddell and Scott 1883, p.421) is perhaps best exemplified by Socrates who professed his ignorance to argue against the Sophists and highlight their lack of logic.

128 Jesus the prophet in word and deed recalls Psalm 145.13 (MT) πιστὸς κύριος ἐν τοῖς λόγοις αὐτοῦ καὶ ὅσιος ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἐργοῖς αὐτοῦ (the Lord is faithful in his words and righteous in all his deeds) and ἐν ἐργῷ καὶ λόγῳ τίμα τὸν πατέρα σου ἵνα ἐπέλθῃ σοι εὐλογία παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ (Sir 3.8). (Honour your father that he may fill you with his blessing).

129 cf. 2Kg 1.12 the prophet Elijah calls down fire from heaven to consume the fifty men of Ahaziah.
added further predictions to his narrative. Ironically Jesus was the mighty prophet who would redeem Israel, not as a political revolutionary, but a suffering Messiah who could lead repentant sinners to paradise.
Chapter Two

The Sabbath–Salvation in Luke as the re-establishment of Eden-based שָׁלוֹם

2.1 Introduction

This chapter presents arguments for the possibility that Luke’s Jesus is presented as healing on the Sabbath in order to re-establish the state of שָׁלוֹם which in the creation stories could have been seen as a cause of the sanctification of the day of rest. The diversity of meaning of שָׁלוֹם in Biblical thought (including its interpretation in the LXX) is examined (2.2) in preparation for an exegesis of Genesis 1-3 arguing that the idea of שָׁלוֹם is present even though the word itself is not witnessed in the text (2.3), and for the possibility that in Second Temple Judaism the Sabbath may have been considered to include the sense of having been consecrated to celebrate this created state of שָׁלוֹם. With the loss of this original state of שָׁלוֹם as a consequence of sin, the prophetic promise of the return of שָׁלוֹם and the announcement of the beginning of the re-establishment of שָׁלוֹם in the dominical ministry of exorcism is treated (2.4). Section 2.5 argues for the mythical association of Eden and the Temple in Second Temple Judaism and indicates the Temple cult was seen as a prophetic re-enactment of the return of Edenic שָׁלוֹם. The expectation and fulfilment of salvation as the re-establishment of שָׁלוֹם in Luke is then argued (2.6). This chapter concludes with the argument that Luke may be indicating the healing ministry of Jesus, especially on the Sabbath, brought the re-establishment of שָׁלוֹם in fulfilment of the prophetic sense of the Temple cult’s שָׁלוֹם, and so,
like the ministering Temple priests, Luke’s Jesus was exempt the Sabbath proscription to ‘work’.

The unanimous attestation of all four canonical Gospels to Jesus’ apparently deliberate habit of performing healing miracles on the Sabbath (Lk 4.33-36 (//Mk 1.23-27); Lk 4.38-39 (// Mt 8.14-15; Mk 1.29); Lk 6.6-10 (// Mt 12.10-13; Mk 3.1-5); Lk 13.10-13; Lk 14.4-5), and consequently provoking the anger of the Pharisees and Jewish authorities (Lk 6.2, 7, 11; 13.14; 14.4), begs the question as to why it was important in the plot of all four Gospels. Matthew has only one explicit Sabbatical healing miracle (12.9-13 // Mk 3.1-5) where Jesus heals the man with a withered hand in response to the provocative question of the some unspecified people in the synagogue: ‘Is it lawful to heal on the sabbath?’ (Mt 12.10). This episode, like Mark 2.23-28 and Luke 6.1-5, followed the Pharisee’s complaint that it was not lawful for Jesus’ disciples to pick ears of corn on the Sabbath, but Jesus refers them to David and his companions who ate the bread of the Presence which is reserved for the priests alone. In Matthew alone Jesus cites the guiltless breaking of the Sabbath in the Temple (v.5) before rejoining the parallels where he declares κύριος γάρ ἐστιν τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (12.28). In Matthew (8.14-15) the account of Jesus healing Peter’s mother-in-law is not explicitly on a Sabbath, unlike Mark (1.29) and Luke (4.38-39).

Mark has four healing miracles. 6.5 is a simple summary statement unique to Mark ‘And he could do no mighty work there, except that he laid his hands upon a few sick people and healed them.’ Mark 3.1-5 is parallel to Matthew 12.9-13 discussed above. In the sabbath (v.21) pericope 1.23-27 (// Lk 4.33-36) Jesus exorcises the man with an unclean spirit in the

\footnote{130 for the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath}
synagogue who declares Jesus to be ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ (v.23)\textsuperscript{131} and immediately afterwards Jesus heals Peter’s mother-in-law (Mk 1.29-31 // Lk 4.38-39). In Mark the disciples tell (ἐρωτάω) him about her; in Luke’s account they ask (ἐρωτάω) him. This pericope is also in Matthew (8.14-15) where Jesus saw (ὁράω) her; however this is grouped with some other healings, but not on the Sabbath.

In John (5.1-9) Jesus asks the sick man if he wants to be healed, afterwards the ‘Jews’ take offence that the healed man carried his pallet (vv.10, 11), and that Jesus healed on the Sabbath (v. 16) and made himself equal with God (his Father) who continued to work (on the Sabbath) (v.17). Later John’s Jesus justifies his Sabbatical healing replying that a man may be circumcised on the Sabbath that the Law may not be broken (7.23). In John 9.14 the man born blind is healed ‘that the works of God might be made manifest in him’ (v.3).

Luke has five Sabbatical healings. Apart from the parallels mentioned above there are the Sondergut Lk 13.10-13 (the healing of the crippled woman) and Lk 14.4-5 (the man with dropsy)\textsuperscript{132}. It is interesting to note that none of these healings were requested (except Lk 4.38-39 mentioned above). However, with the exception of two exorcisms (8.26-39 // Mt 8.28-34; Mk 5.1-20 the Gerasene demoniac; 11.14 // Mt 12.22-30 the dumb demon) and the raising of one corpse (7.12-17 the widow’s son), none of whom could be expected to speak for themselves, all of the non-Sabbath healings are explicitly, or implicitly, requested (4.40-41 // Mt 8.16; Mk 1.32-34 summary of various healings; 5.12-15 // Mt 8.1-4 the leper; 5.18-26 //

\textsuperscript{131} the holy one of God

\textsuperscript{132} cf. sections 2.4.1 for Jesus’ justification for the necessity (δεῖ) of healing her on the Sabbath, and 1a. 1 for their restoration as a sign of the eschatological Jubilee.
Mt 9.1-8; Mk 2.1-12 the paralytic; 6.17-19 summary of various healings; 7.1-10 the Centurion’s servant; 8.41-56 // Mt 9.18-26; Mk 5.21-43 Jairus’ daughter & woman with a haemorrhage; 9.38-42 // Mt 17.14-21; Mk 9.14-29 the exorcism of the demoniac boy; 17.11-19 the ten lepers; 18.35-43 // Mt 20.29-34; Mk 10.46-52 the blind man).

One could argue that, in healing on the Sabbath, Jesus was simply indicating the supremacy of a morally good deed over the cultic observance of God’s commandment to ‘remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy’ (Ex 20.8; Deut 5.12). This appears to be Mark’s and Matthew’s Jesus’ justification: ‘Is it lawful on the sabbath to do good or to do harm, to save life or to kill?’ (Mk 3.4); ‘it is lawful to do good on the sabbath’ (Mt 12.12). However Lohmeyer (1961, p.29) disagrees and argues for the inadequacy of such a simple explanation and sees these Sabbath miracles ‘primarily [as] signs of the breaking in of the time of eschatological fulfilment: “if it is by the finger of God that I cast out demons, then the kingdom of God has come upon you” (Lk 11.20)’, such an eschatological time, he argues, is witnessed by Jesus’ power to break the Sabbath (κύριός ἐστιν τοῦ σαββάτου ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου (Lk 6.5)). However, the focus of the argument below (2.6) is that the eschatological time is not marked by breaking the Sabbath but rather by restoring the Sabbath to its original meaning as the celebration of Edenic שָׁלוֹם, thus Jesus’ explanation for healing on the Sabbath was the appropriateness of unbinding chaos (disability) to recreate order (שָׁלוֹם) (Lk 13.14-16).

Another opinion is voiced by E.P. Sanders (1985, pp. 264-267) who, in examining the authenticity of various Gospel sources, denies any real significance in the reports of Jesus’ violation of the Sabbath. He says none of the healing miracles transgressed the Sabbath since none involved a specific work prohibited by the law (such as removing a rock that might be
crushing someone). Touching or speaking was not a violation of the Sabbath. Nina Collins (2014, p.8) too, makes a similar point as she emphasises there are no allusions or statements in contemporary Jewish texts to the idea that healing is a ‘work’ forbidden on the Sabbath. This point of view forms part of her argument which is focused on whether the historical Jesus actually did perform any miracles on the Sabbath, and whether there were any Pharisees or other Jewish officials who witnessed the cures (Collins 2014, p.202). Whilst Sanders’ and Collins’ researches are of great value in themselves this study focuses on the function of Sabbath healing within the narrative of Luke. Here the reader finds an intense reaction against Sabbath day healings (6.7, 11; 13.14; 14.1). From the point of view of the narrative there is an understanding that Jesus had violated the Sabbath even if it could be argued he had not explicitly transgressed the Law. Furthermore the absence of explicit apostolic Sabbath healings in Acts suggests the reason why Luke’s Jesus permitted himself to heal on the Sabbath was not transferable to his apostles.

The question addressed in the first part of this chapter is whether Luke and his readers thought the Sabbath was exclusively about resting from the ardour of six day’s work, or whether it was resting in the celebration of the state of שָׁלוֹם that God had achieved. By the time of the Second Temple, during which a multiplicity of laws concerning Sabbath observance evolved, the former would seem to be applicable, and implied in the Deuteronomistic fourth commandment (Deut 5.14-15 ‘the seventh day is a sabbath to the LORD

133 e.g. whether ‘a tailor should not go out carrying his needle near [Sabbath] nightfall’ (Mishnah Shabbat 1.3); that nothing may be carried either by hand, on the lap or shoulder (10.3)
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your God; in it you shall not do any work,… the LORD your God brought you out thence
[from Egypt] with a mighty hand and an outstretched arm; therefore the LORD your God
commanded you to keep the sabbath day’). However the book of Jubilees (2.17-24) explains
that the sanctification of the Sabbath by God was a sign that he would bless his people in the
manner that he had blessed the Sabbath (שָׁלוֹם carries the characteristic of being blessed cf.
below 2.2). The Sabbath was a day of rest on which his chosen people would ‘eat and drink
and bless the one who had created all things’ and on which God would receive their prayers as
the pleasing fragrance of incense (Jubilees 2.24). Furthermore a close reading of Genesis 1-3
might suggest indications that there was more to the Sabbath than the demand that men,
women, their slaves and animals (Deut 5.14) should participate in God’s anthropomorphic
rest. This broader interpretation might be indicated in the Decalogue in Exodus (20.11 ‘for in
six days the LORD made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested the
seventh day; therefore the LORD blessed the sabbath day and hallowed it’) where the Sabbath
appears to be enjoined on the people as a remembrance of God’s creativity and implies that
human work is only stewardship of God’s creation (Jacobs, 1995, p.434).

The chapter continues (2.5) with an exposition of the Temple-as-Eden mythology in
Second Temple Judaism, where Adam becomes the archetypal priest ministering in the
sanctuary in which is found שָׁלוֹם. The cult becomes a vision of eschatological hope for
salvation (2.6) as the promise of future שָׁלוֹם. As suggested below (2.6.1) Luke’s Jesus
deliberately chose to heal on the Sabbath because the healing miracles were a feature of his
salvation by which he re-established שָׁלוֹם according to its Eden-based model. The sick did not
have שָׁלוֹם. They did not have physical wholeness or health. Their’s was not a good life. They
were vulnerable and so had cause for fear, and they were excluded from social and spiritual life because God had not blessed them (cf. 2.2). When Jesus healed them he gave them the fruit of the priestly benediction, peace (Numbers 6.26) the divine gift (Psalm 29.11).

The possibility that the Sabbath rest of Genesis may have been understood to have been consecrated because the state of שָׁלוֹם reigned when the work of creation had been completed will be examined in section 2.3. From this foundation it will be explored whether it might be of the essence of Luke’s story of Jesus-salvation that his healing, as restoration of שָׁלוֹם, should take place (at least sometimes) on the Sabbath (2.6.1). If so, for him the Sabbath was the appropriate day on which to do good (ἀγαθοποιέω Lk 6.9) just as the Creator consecrated the Sabbath because what he had done was good (Gen 1.4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31). This was not just a moral good or a kindness (as argued by Lohmeyer, 1961, p.29); in doing good he restored the שָׁלוֹם of Eden (Psalm 34.15).

2.2 The diversity of meaning of שָׁלוֹם

The absence of the root שָׁלם in Genesis 1-3 does not necessarily preclude that its meaning is not present in other forms. To establish this it is necessary to investigate the variety of meanings of the root in Second Temple sources and identify whether these concepts are present in the stories of creation and the Garden of Eden. In this way we may be able to evaluate how Jesus and his contemporaries understood Genesis.

According to Koeler (1999, p.1507) the meaning of שָׁלם ‘is a general idea with an extremely wide circle of associated meanings in almost all its occurrences.’ Gerleman (1997 vol. 3, p.1340) gives a comprehensive array of meanings. He suggests the sense of the verb
The Sabbath—Salvation in Luke as the re-establishment of Eden-based שָׁלוֹם in the piel שָׁלֵם consistently means ‘to pay or repay’ (ἀποτίνω), especially in the covenantal code demanding restitution (שִׁלַּם) of property (Ex 21.33-34 ‘When a man leaves a pit open, or when a man digs a pit and does not cover it, and an ox or an ass falls into it, the owner of the pit shall make it good (יְשַׁלֵּם); he shall give money to its owner, and the dead beast shall be his’), but also in the positive sense of satisfy by repaying with good (1 Sam 24.20134 ‘So may the LORD reward (שָׁלֵם) you with good (ἀνταποτέισει αὐτῷ ἀγαθά) for what you have done to me this day’), and consequently there is a sense of requital underlying all forms of the root שָׁלֵם. Occasionally the related verbal adjective שָׁלֵם indicates the satisfaction of all one’s needs (Gen 33.18 ‘And Jacob came safely135 (שָׁלֵם) to the city of Shechem’) or the ready suitability of unwrought, or complete, stones (אֶבֶן־שְׁלֵמָה) (ἄκροτοµος cut off sharp, abrupt) for the Temple (1 Kg 6.7). The sense of sufficiency in שָׁלוֹם can be both internal (desire, joy, pleasure) and external (not lacking in means), and develops into a greeting; are you satisfied? - how are you? (καὶ ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν εἰς εἰρήνην)(Judges 18.15).136 If the emphasis is on the manner in which the satisfaction is achieved then the sense of שָׁלוֹם is a covenant or agreement; let them lay hold of my protection, let them make peace with me, let them make peace with me. However in both cases the reference is still to making an agreement.

134 v.19 in the RSV
135 Here the LXX just has εἰρήναι
136 and they asked him: peace? (i.e. is all well?)
137 The verse reads quite differently in the LXX ‘its inhabitants shall cry: ‘we shall make peace with him, we shall make peace.’ The MT reads: ‘Or let them lay hold of my protection, let them make peace with me, let them make peace with me.’ However in both cases the reference is still to making an agreement.
connection with salvation as atonement. However it must be noted that the meaning of a particular word must be derived from its wider context, that is its function in a specific sentence or sequence of sentences (cf. Barr 1978, p.263).

The sense of שלם also covers to be complete, to be finished (Harris, 1980, p.1080; Brown-Driver-Briggs, 2010, p.1022). As a noun שלם can express prosperity, success expressed as εἰρήνη or its cognates(Lv 26.6; Numbers 6.26; Dt 23.7 (εἰρηνικός); Is 48.18; 60.17; Nah 2.1; Jer 29.7), intactness, personal safety and freedom from fear, welfare, physical wholeness, state of health, public and private peace, friendliness, deliverance, salvation (Koehler, 1999, pp. 1506-1510). It is a divine gift (Psalm 29.11) and can be bestowed by priestly blessing (Numbers 6.26).

To these meanings this thesis will include the sense of the loss of שלם caused by sin (e.g. Isaiah 48.22 and 57.21 ‘there is no joy (שלם χαίρω) for the wicked’; Jeremiah 8.11 εἰρήνη in ks Qmg (vv. 11 and 12 are missing in other mss.); Ezekiel 7.25 (εἰρήνη); 1Enoch 3.4-5; 12.5 (εἰρήνη)) and the promise of restored שלם εἰρήνη as an aspect of eschatological redemption (e.g. Jeremiah 30.1-5; Micah 5.4; Nahum 2.1; 1Enoch 1.8; Testament of Levi 18.4; Testament of Judah 22.2.

Schmid (1977-92 XI, p.605 cited in Stendebach, 2006, p.20) aptly summaries the concept of שלם thus:

‘it can refer not only to the political and military realm but also to the realms of law, the cult, social order, and even fertility. A stable order within these individual realms and also between these various realms makes life possible. Only when this order is in place can one speak of שלום, “peace.”’
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The cultic aspect of שָׁלוֹם will be developed in (2.6) and its connection with life, in particular the loss of שָׁלוֹם and the deprivation of access to the tree of life will be relevant in (2.3.2.3).

2.3  The concept of שָׁלוֹם in the creation stories and the Garden of Eden

Although the Hebrew root שָׁלוֹם is not present in the stories of creation and of Eden in Genesis, a close examination of the text and corresponding later Jewish reflections on creation suggest the concept שָׁלוֹם is at the very heart of the stories as the state in which God planned his creation should exist, and so was likely to be appreciated by Luke and his readers. Indeed the association of שָׁלוֹם and creation becomes so intimate that the two can be almost synonymous. Speaking the word of God reflecting on his creation Isaiah (45.7) said:

יגר אנור וברר תישע שָׁלוֹם והברר את עתת תישע קהלא

ἐγὼ ὁ ἐκτεκνύσας φῶς καὶ ποιήσας σκότος ὁ ποιῶν εἰρήνην καὶ κτίζων κακὰ ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ ποιῶν ταῦτα πάντα

שָׁלוֹם, at least for Deutero-Isaiah, was as much a fundamental part of God’s creativity as light and darkness and all that exits including what is bad. Psalm 104 celebrates the order God established as his creation overcame the powers of chaos. Although the word שָׁלוֹם εἰρήνη is not present in this psalm the concept is indicated by the peaceful co-existence of birds, animals and people (vv.10-15) who are all provided for by the generosity of God.

Philo attributes the original state of joy experienced by man and woman to the εἰρήνη they enjoyed (De opificio mundi 1.142). Likewise Philo identifies Eden as: the place of luxury

138 שָׁלוֹם is witnessed in the paraphrase of Genesis found in 4Q422 I (Vermes, 2011, p.478), however, although שָׁלוֹם does not appear out of place, the manuscript is too fragmentary to offer a particular reading of the establishment of שָׁלוֹם in the work of creation.

139 I formed light and created darkness, making peace and creating evil, I the Lord made all these
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where peace (εἰρήνη), ease (εὐπάθεια) and joy (χαρά) abide (Legum Allegoriarum 1.45); the place of perfect happiness (τέλεια εὐδαιµονία) leading to virtue (De plantatione 1.37-38); and Nod, the opposite of Eden as the place of turmoil (κλόνος) (De posteritate caini 1.32).

This state of שָׁלוֹם was to be ruptured by sin, but many OT prophecies looked forward to the eschatological re-establishment of this state (Is 11.6-8; 65.25 also Ezekiel 34.25; Job 5.23). שָׁלוֹם was promised by the Lord as the reward for keeping the Covenant, it would mean the absence of fear, physical threat from animals and people (Lev 26.6).

2.3.1 שָׁלוֹם in the Priestly source

The Priestly account of creation in Genesis 1.1-2.2 emphasises the goodness (טוֹב - καλός) of creation (1.4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31) transforming chaos (וָבֹהוּ תֹהוּ formless and empty - ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκεύαστος unseen and unformed, Gen 1.2) to order. According to von Rad (1972, p.52) טוֹב ‘contains less an aesthetic judgement than the designation of purpose and correspondence’. von Rad’s comment might be verified by Psalm 104 which celebrates the order of creation established by God’s wisdom (v.24). Although שָׁלוֹם is not found in the psalm

140 τὸ τῆς [Εδέµ] δε ἐστὶ τρυφή; ἀρετή δὲ ἀρμόττων εἰρήνη καὶ εὐπάθεια καὶ χαρά, ἐν οἷς τὸ τρυφάν ὡς ἀληθῶς ἐστὶ (this [Eden] is luxury; virtue joining peace, comfort and joy; in which is true luxury)

141 Thus the more Platonic and Aristotelian sense of εὐδαιµονία rather than the Ionic meaning of ‘prosperity, good fortune, wealth’ (Liddell and Scott 1883, p. 596).

142 ‘Therefore, we must suppose that the bounteous God plants in the soul, as it were, a paradise of virtues (παράδεισον ἀρετῶν) and of the actions in accordance with them, which lead it to perfect happiness. On this account, also, he has assigned a most appropriate place to the Paradise, called Eden (and the name Eden, being interpreted, means “delight”(τρυφή)), an emblem of the soul, which sees right things, and revels amid the virtues, and exults by reason of the abundance and magnitude of its joy; proposing to itself one source of enjoyment in the place of the innumerable things which are accounted pleasant among men, namely the service of the one wise God.’

143 γὰρ Ναίδ, τὸν κλόνον, εἰς οὖ η ὕπονη μετωκίσατο, ἀπέναντι Εδέµ. (For Nod –that is tumult–into which the soul has migrated, is the opposite of Eden)
(except for good things that are provided v.28) God is praised for the orderly goodness of creation rather than its beauty. Elsewhere in the OT שָׁלוֹם is associated with the state of טוב for instance: Abram is promised he shall rest in שָׁלוֹם after reaching a good (טוֹב) age (Gen 15.15); Isaac made his covenant with Abimelech stressing he had only done good (טוֹב) to the latter and sent him and his men away in שָׁלוֹם (Gen 26.29); Jacob (Gen 28.20-21), after his revelatory dream, vows the Lord will be his God if he keeps him in a good state (clothed and fed) and so returns to his father’s house in שָׁלוֹם; when Pharaoh asked Joseph to interpret his dream, Joseph replied אֶת־שְׁלוֹם יַעֲנֶה אֱלֹהִים (Gen 41:16)–God would answer him with favour/good (שָׁלוֹם). (The LXX gives a double negative answer to Pharaoh interpreting שָׁלוֹם as salvation: άνευ του θεον ουκ ἀποκριθησεται το σωτηριον Φαραω: without God Pharaoh will not be answered with salvation.) Jeremiah (14.19) makes peace and goodness synonymous, he prayed for שָׁלוֹם but no טוב came.

It would not be out of place here to recall Augustine who, as he draws his Confessions to a close, reflects on the goodness of God’s creation. While considered separately each individual work on creation is described as ‘good’, beholding them altogether they are ‘very good’. It seems he suggests the Sabbath rest comes because God’s creative work produced what was very good, and the promise of eternal rest in God will be due to the great goodness of our works (Book XIII. 36).144

---
144 Dies autem septimus sine vespera est nec habet occasum, quia sanctificasti eum ad permansionem sempiternam, ut id, quod tu post opera tua bona valde, quamvis ea quietus feceris, requievisti septimo die, hoc praeloquatur nobis vox libri tui, quod et nos post opera nostra ideo bona valde, quia tu nobis ea donasti, sabbato vitae aeternae requiescamus in te. (But the seventh day is without an evening, nor does it have have sunset, for you have consecrate it for eternity. After all you works of creation, which were very good, you rested on the seventh day, although you had created them without rest–this that the voice of your book might speak to us with the assurance that after our works which are also good because you gave them to us–we may rest in you in the Sabbath of eternal life)
2.3.1.1 שָׁלוֹם among the beasts

The suggestion of an original vegetarian creation (Gen 1.29), where there is no violence between people and animals and vice versa, gives the sense of harmony which reigned amongst all the creatures God had made (von Rad, 1972, p.61, describes this as ‘the only suggestion of the paradisiacal peace in the creation as it came God-willed from God’s hand’; this thesis contends the exclusivity of his statement and seeks to unfold various indications of peace in the state of creation). As the Yahwist source takes over the story and sin entered the world, one of the indications that שָׁלוֹם no longer reigned was that the man and woman became carnivorous (Gen 9.3). Other indications of the demise of the state of שָׁלוֹם included Cain slaying his brother Abel (Gen 4.1-16) (Philo de Cerubim 1.12, states that Cain was sent to the land of Nod which Philo interprets as ‘commotion’ σάλος, which is the opposite of Eden meaning ‘delight’ τρυφή in which the soul exists in ‘tranquility’ ἀταλαίπωρος), and the wickedness of people such that God rued the day he created them (Gen 6.7) and he sought to destroy all except the just Noah and his family who ‘walked with God’. Later prophecies prophesied the return of שָׁלוֹם εἰρήνη in the eschatological age (Is 11.6-8 and 65.25 (in both the future peaceful co-existence of animals is prophesied though שָׁלוֹם εἰρήνη is not used); also Ezekiel 34.25; Job 5.23 εἰρηνεύω). שָׁלוֹם εἰρήνη would be the mark of God’s salvation (יְשׁוּעָה - σωτηρία) (Is 12.1-6) and the characteristic of those who keep the Covenant (Lev 26.6). God declares through the prophet Isaiah the wicked shall not have שָׁלוֹם χαίρω (Isaiah 48.22; 57.21). The sinful nation is deprived of שָׁלוֹם εἰρήνη even when they try to fool themselves that they have God’s שָׁלוֹם (Jeremiah 8.11) and the proud will not find שָׁלוֹם (Ezekiel 7.25).
2.3.1.2 The completion of creation

The P source concludes:

וְכָל־צְבָאָם׃ וְהָאָרֶץ הַשָּׁמַיִם וַיְכֻלִּו
(Gen 2.1,2)

καὶ συνετελέσθησαν ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ η γῆ καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος αὐτῶν καὶ συνετέλεσεν ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν έργων αὐτῶν ἐποίησεν καὶ κατέπαυσεν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν έργων αὐτῶν ὃν ἐποίησεν

Here we have two occurrences of the root נול (finish). In verse 1 it is in the pual שָׁלוֹם, and in verse 2 in the piel נלך. Thus we have both a passive and active use of intensifying binyamin accurately rendered συντελέω in the LXX (note the prefix συν- can indicate ‘completely’ e.g. συγκαλύπτω (to cover completely translates כּסה piel e.g. Ex 26.13–the curtains completely cover the tabernacle). With the repetition of נל the sense then appears to be that not only was the work of creation finished; it had been brought to a state of completeness or wholeness. Considering this point of the completion of creation Midrash Rabbah (X.9) answers the rhetorical question ‘what was created therein? … Tranquility (שָׁלוֹם),

145 Thus the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them. And on the seventh day God finished his work which he had done, and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had done. The texts are not witnessed in the Qumran scrolls.

146 The discrepancy in rendering the numeral שביעי (Gen 2.1-2 is not witnessed in the Qumran scrolls) as ἑκτός (in all LXX manuscripts) is notable but not relevant to this discussion.

147 This is the only occurrence of the pual of נלך except Psalm 72.20 marking the end of the Psalms of David.

148 Other examples of this usage include, for example, God completed all he had to say to Abraham (Genesis 18.33).
ease (נחת), peace (שלום) and quiet (שקט). The connection here between והשקט שלוה ונחת (שקט) is suggested in the use of שָׁלֵם indicating ‘to be finished’ and is rendered τελέω in the LXX (Ezra 5.16).

The implication is that God could rest on the seventh day because the state of wholeness reigned. This would be supported if לֵדוּת had its etymological origins in שַׁבָּת; cease, come to an end, be complete, but the theory has yet to be proved satisfactorily (cf. Soggin, 1993, p.665, Brown-Driver-Briggs, 2010, p.991, Stolz, 1997 vol. 3, pp.1297-1302). However even if the etymological origins were fanciful, the identical roots are suggestive of a popular connection between the concepts of rest and completion. I argue then that, by the time Luke was writing, it could have been understood that God consecrated (קדש piel - εὐλογέω Gen 2.3) the Sabbath not just because he had worked hard for six days, but because the Sabbath rest was a celebration of the wholeness of creation.

The significance of the sense of the completion of God’s creative work as the reason for the Sabbath day’s rest was explicitly referred to by the second century BCE Aristobulus of Paneas, whose Commentaries on the Writings of Moses was preserved by Eusebius:

‘But what is clearly stated by the Law, that God rested on the seventh day, means not, as some suppose, that God henceforth ceases to do anything, but it refers to the fact that, after He has brought the arrangement of His works to completion, He has arranged them thus for all time.’ (Praeparatio XIII, 12. trans. E.H. Gifford, 1903)

2.3.2  *Indications of Edenic שָׁלוֹם in the Yahwist source*

Despite the differences in authorship, date, narrative style, and theological interest between the J and P sources in Genesis both demonstrate complementary aspects of the original state of שָׁלוֹם in God’s work of creation. As mentioned above the Priestly source emphasises the goodness and completeness of God’s work. By contrast the Yahwist source emphasises the beauty of creation, the fulfilment of the human race in creating complementary sexes, the delight they experienced together and their loss of שָׁלוֹם due to their sin.

2.3.2.1 *The goodness of creation*

As God created the garden of Eden (גַּן, παράδεισος in the LXX, κῆπος in Josephus *Antiquities* 1.45) he made it desirable or beautiful (ション - ὡραῖος Gen 2.9). The same idea is related to the Sabbath by Isaiah (58.13) albeit with synonymous vocabulary: עֹנֶג τρυφερός. Amongst the trees were the tree of life and the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. We shall return to the tree of life presently, however for the moment it is worth noting that life (חַי) itself was the masterpiece of the goodness of creation, thus all the living creatures (כָּל־נֶפֶשׁ - πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ζῴων) were good (Gen 1.21, 24, 30).

---

150 This adjective was applied to the trees, but it is suggested here that it implies the delight of the whole garden.

151 niphal participle of חָמַד to desire

152 principally ‘timely’ but also of things in LXX and NT ‘beautiful, graceful’ (Liddell and Scott 1883, p.1768)

153 ‘daintiness, exquisite, delight’ (Brown Driver Briggs 2010, p.772)

154 ‘delicate, dainty’ (Liddell and Scott 1883, p. 1586)
2.3.2.2 Remediying the loneliness of man, creating wholeness

However God saw Adam’s loneliness and said:

155(Gen 2.18)

οὐ καλὸν εἶναι τὸν ἀνθρώπον μόνον. Ποιησομεν αὐτῷ βοήθησον κατ’ αὑτὸν.

In the Priestly account of creation where men and women appear to have been created together (1.27) we read ‘God saw all that he had made καὶ ἰδοὺ καλὰ λίαν’ (Gen 1.31). In the Yahwist account of creation the fact of man’s loneliness without woman is the first point in the narrative at which we find something was not good (לֹא־טוֹב - οὐ καλὸν) with God’s creative work. The Midrash Rabbah comments that the solitude of Adam was not good because he was without help (עזר), without joy (שמחה), without a blessing (ברכה), without atonement (כפרה), without peace (שלום), without life (חיים) and he was also incomplete (שלם). 156 Note not only is Adam without peace (שלום), his incompleteness is the absence of being complete or at peace (שלם).

Philo appears to disagree. For him sin entered the world because God created two sexes, man no longer resembled in his soul the characteristics of God his creator and the world, but both man and woman were driven by mutual desire for sexual intercourse: ‘And this desire caused likewise pleasure to their bodies, which is the beginning of iniquities and transgressions, and it is owing to this that men have exchanged their previously immortal and

155 It is not good that the man should be alone; I (we LXX) will make him a helper fit for him.

happy existence for one which is mortal and full of misfortune’ (*De opificio mundi* 1:152). He
does, however, argue for the perfection of the number six (when considering the sixth day of
creation) since he says of the number:

‘it is formed so as to be both male and female, and is made up of the power of both
natures; for in existing things the odd number is the male, and the even number is the
female; accordingly, of odd numbers the first is the number three, and of even numbers
the first is two, and the two numbers multiplied together make six.’ (*De opificio mundi*
1:13)\(^{157}\)

So perhaps for him the complementarity of male and female is not so disastrous after all.

The helper (עֵזֶר - βοηθός) whom God would create for Adam was to be fit for him (כְּנֶגֶד
c)'- αὐτόν). The word נֶגֶד suggests the woman was not simply fit for him, but with the
preposition כ she would be ‘a help corresponding to him i.e. equal and adequate to
‘a help answering to him,’ that is, ‘one with whom the self can enter into responsible
relations’. In the LXX כ is rendered κατ’ αὐτόν; κατά with the accusative indicating a
relationship–‘proportionate to him.’\(^{158}\) So as counterparts the two would find wholeness in
their mutual relationship, no animal could fulfil that role. One without the other would be
incompletion in the work of creation, but together they would find fulness. When God brought
the woman to the man, the latter declared:

\(^{159}\) (Gen 2.23)

\[\text{Yah ū-hāqem ū-ḥēqem vēnūqōtērē}' (23)\]

\[mîḇśāri ṻĕḇśāri mēsūṭām mēsūṭām zōētōn ṭōūtō nōn ōstōōn ēk tōōn ōstēōn mōu kāi sārē' ēk tēh sārkōs mōu\]

\(^{157}\) trans. Bohn, 1854-55

\(^{158}\) with the acc. use IV ‘of fitness or conformity to a thing’ (Liddell and Scott 1883, p. 749)

\(^{159}\) This at last is bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh.
Thus he expressed that the two were made for each other. However the word for bone, ובש, also expresses the sense of total being, or complete identity,160 thus the woman, made from man’s side, is a complete and whole person herself. The sense then, for a rough contemporary of Luke, might have been that man and woman, though whole in themselves, were created for each other, and through communion with the other they would find their fulness.

2.3.2.3 peace and delight without shame and the consequence of sin

The unashamed nudity of the man and woman also suggests the שלום and delight that characterised their shared life in Eden (Gen 2.25). However, in consequence of their sin, this שלום was ruptured. Their nudity became a cause of shame (3.7), and they were afraid to walk with God in the cool of the day (3.8). Just as their breaking of the first covenant led to fear so the reward of שלום to those who would keep the levitical covenant would include freedom from fear (Lev 26.6; cf Judges 6.23; Lk 1.74). According to Josephus this sin of Adam and Eve caused their loss of ‘a happy life, without any affliction, and care, and vexation of soul’161 (Antiquities 1.46), and they no longer sought ‘to come before God and converse with him’ (Antiquities 1.45). The trusting intimate communion which had existed between the man and the woman was now marred as he blamed her for their joint sin of eating the forbidden fruit (Gen 3.12). Their fulness and utopian health was now shattered, she would bear children in pain and, whilst she would desire her husband, he would dominate her (3.16). He in turn

160 e.g. Ex 24.10 (םבש as the ‘bones’ of heaven is rendered ὠσπερ εἶδος στερεώματος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ as the foundation of heaven); Proverbs 15.50; 16.24 (pleasant words are … health to the body, סְבֹא, מַרְפֵּא - ἰασίς ψυχῆς; Is 66.14. cf Brown, Driver, Briggs, 2010, p.782

would struggle to make the land fruitful for their sustenance (3.17-19). The final consequence of their sin was to be banished from the garden lest they should eat of the tree of life and live forever (3.22). It was noted above one of the consequences of the first sin was the change of the whole of creation from being vegetarian to being omnivorous: license was given to people to eat flesh, but not blood (Gen 9.3). The blood was the life of the animal (and reserved for the sacrificial cult Lev 17.11), just as the man and woman were deprived of access to the tree of life, so too they were deprived of the life that might come to them from the blood of animals.

2.4 *The Sabbath consecrated to celebrate שָׁלוֹם and the promise of its re-establishment*

It is suggested here the sense of the combined creation stories of Genesis 1-3, as Luke and his readers would understand it, is that what God had created was so good that the state of שָׁלוֹם (completeness, fulness, peace, delight, freedom from care and shame) reigned supreme; this is why the Sabbath of Genesis was consecrated. It was a holy rest because God’s creative work had made what was good and holy. This was God’s intention, and yet the sin of Adam and Eve spoilt that gift of שָׁלוֹם, the gift of life was marred. However the new state of creation was not hopeless, time and again the Hebrew people received prophecies of an eschatological return of the peace for which they longed. Isaiah prophesied that all the nations would turn to Jerusalem (which appears means ‘foundation of peace’ (Brown-Driver-Briggs, 2010, p.436))

Where Psalm 76.3 equates Salem with Zion בְצִיּוֹן וּמְעוֹנָתוֹ סֻכּוֹ בְשָׁלֵם יְהִי (his dwelling is in Salem and his habitation in Zion) the LXX renders Salem as εἰρήνη; καὶ ἐγενήθη ἐν εἰρήνῃ ὁ τόπος αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ κατοικητήριον αὐτοῦ ἐν Σιων (his place was in peace and his dwelling in Zion) (Ps 75.3).
11.1-9). The future Davidic child-messiah would be שַׂר־שָׁלוֹם who would establish an everlasting peace confirming it with justice and righteousness (Is 9.5, 6, 7). Jeremiah prophesied the future branch of David would be a ruler of justice and righteousness, his peace would be the salvation (ישׁע) of Judah and the security (בֶּטַח) of Jerusalem (Jer 33.15, 16). Having prophesied against the false shepherds of Israel, Ezekiel looked forward to the Davidic prince-shepherd, in whose time God would bless his people with a covenant of peace and security; there would be abundant fruit from the trees and the land, slavery would come to an end, there would be peace with enemies and security from wild animals, this peace would mean freedom from fear (Ez 34.23-31).

Micah’s prophesy (quoted in Matthew 2.6) concerning the child-ruler from Bethlehem, foretold the peace and security that his flock, which he would pasture, would find; they would be delivered from the hands of their Assyrian enemies (Micah 5.1-9). Matthew (21.5) also quoted Zechariah’s (9.9-10) prophecy of Zion’s humble king arriving on the foal of an ass who would command peace for the nations. In Zechariah (9.11) the peace amongst nations is guaranteed by the blood of the covenant (דַם־בְּרִית - αἷµα διαθήκης) and would bring freedom to captives. 1Enoch also speaks of the salvation of the righteous in terms of peace:

‘And with the righteous he will make peace, and upon the elect will be preservation and peace, and mercy will be given to them, and all will be of God, and he will give approval to them and

---

163 ‘Prince of peace’ The LXX diverges from the MT and reads ἐγὼ γὰρ ἄξων εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τοὺς άρχοντας [εἰρήνην–Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Alexandrinus, Codex Marchalinus] καὶ ὑγίειαν αὐτῷ (for I will bring peace upon the rulers–and health to him) (Is 9.5) making the rulers the recipients of peace and health.

164 the verb is נפאל niphal she will be saved - σωθήσεται

165 LXX κατασκεύωσει πεποιθώς - it will dwell at ease
he will bless all, and he will take hold of all, and he will help me, and light will appear to them and upon them he will make peace. (1Enoch 1:8)\textsuperscript{166}

All those without sin will rejoice, and there will be for you release (λύσις) from sin and all mercy and peace and kindness, there will be salvation for you, a good light, and they will inherit the earth’ (1Enoch 3:6)

It is suggested here then, that Luke’s Jesus’ Sabbath day miracles of healing the sick were signs that the πτωχοὶ were receiving the eschatological שָׁלוֹם for which they longed: they did not have physical wholeness or health; their’s was not a good life; they were vulnerable and so had cause for fear; and they were excluded from social and spiritual life because God had not blessed them. Furthermore, restoring the sick to שָׁלוֹם on the Sabbath was a sign the re-establishment of Edenic שָׁלוֹם; the original the reason for consecrating the Sabbath. Thus Luke’s Jesus was fulfilling the warning of Isaiah (58.7-13) to care for the hungry and afflicted, fulfilling righteousness, and turning away from self-seeking, that the Sabbath might be a day of delight in the Lord.

2.4.1 Exorcisms: the defeat of evil reversing the rupture of שָׁלוֹם in Eden

Genesis identifies the serpent as the initial cause of sin in Eden which resulted in the rupture of the state of שָׁלוֹם. Although in the Genesis narrative the serpent is just one of the created animals, in late Second Temple literature the serpent becomes a synonym for evil and is associated with the work of devil. Philo identifies the serpent as an allegory of sinful pleasure: ‘because in the first place he is destitute of feet, and crawls on his belly with his face downwards. In the second place, because he uses lumps of clay for food. Thirdly, because he bears poison in his teeth, by which it is his nature to kill those who are bitten by him’ (De

\textsuperscript{166} trans. Swete, 1899
The Sabbath–Salvation in Luke as the re-establishment of Eden-based שָׁלוֹם. The Sibyl line Oracle speaks of apocalyptic evil rulers who are identified as ‘the serpent’ (5.29; 11.41; 12.81, 264). When Death revealed himself to Abraham he had the head of a serpent and the head of a sword (Testament of Abraham B 14.1). In the Apocalypse of Moses Eve tells her children and grandchildren how she and Adam fell. The devil tempted the serpent promising him the fruit of paradise. The devil spoke through the mouth of the serpent and so tempted Eve (Apocalypse of Moses 16-17; also cf. Philo Quaestiones in Genesim 1.36). In the History of the Rechabites (20.3) the devil entered the serpent to tempt Adam. In Wisdom (2.24) death entered the world though the devil’s envy. Revelation (20.2) identifies Satan as a serpent: ὁ ὡφίς ὃ ἀρχαῖος, ὃς ἐστιν Διάβολος καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς.\footnote{167}

Luke’s Jesus explicitly states that the Sabbath day was the appropriate day on which the crippled woman, a daughter of Abraham, should (ἀπελευθέρωσεν) be loosed from the bonds with with Satan had bound her (Luke 13.16), thus for him the restoration of peace was the appropriate work of the Sabbath. Furthermore, it is suggested here the exorcisms in Luke, even though they are not reported to be Sabbath healings, might be an indication of Jesus’ re-establishment of Edenic שָׁלוֹם. In defeating the demons he was reversing the work of the demon-possessed serpent and making the eschatological sign of bringing שָׁלוֹם to the world.

2.5 The mythical association of Eden and the Temple

Having argued for the possibility that Luke’s Jesus both healed the sick on the Sabbath and exorcised the possessed as signs of his salvation being the eschatological re-establishment of

\footnotetext[167]{167 the ancient serpent who is the Devil and Satan}
Edenic שָׁלוֹם, we shall now consider the question of the mythical connection between Edenic שָׁלוֹם and the Temple as it might have been understood by Luke and his contemporaries.

Ancient Near Eastern religions of the early first millennium BCE commonly held their particular mountain to be the dwelling place of their god (Stager, 1999: Clements, 1965: Cross, 1973, pp.37-39). For both the Hebrew people and the neighbouring religions each one’s mountain became the cosmic mountain where heaven and earth touched and so was the ideal locus for their Temple as the god’s dwelling place. They held in common not only the presence of the deity on the mountain, but also the image of the primordial waters being subdued, creating order out of chaos, and from these life-giving waters (Psalm 36.9-10)\(^{168}\) sprouted the garden of the god where trees were transplanted and throve. The garden temple expressed the divine order that was the model of creation, here the state of שָׁלוֹם was epitomised in a tranquillity that could be likened to that of the presence of a lover (Song of Songs 4.12-16):

“A garden locked is my sister, my bride, a garden locked, a fountain sealed. Your shoots are an orchard of pomegranates with all choicest fruits, henna with nard, nard and saffron, calamus and cinnamon, with all trees of frankincense, myrrh and aloes, with all chief spices – a garden fountain, a well of living water, and flowing streams from Lebanon. Awake, O north wind, and come, O south wind! Blow upon my garden, let its fragrance be wafted abroad. Let my beloved come to his garden, and eat its choicest fruits.’

Writing after the destruction of the city (70 CE) the author of the Apocalypse of Baruch explained that the Jerusalem they had known was not the true city; a thought that may have been known to Luke and his readers. The true city had been revealed to Adam while he was in

\(^{168}\) cf. Cross, 1973, pp.147-156 for the Canaanite storm god on the waters
paradise as he offered sacrifice, and to Moses on Mount Sinai when the Lord showed him ‘the likeness of the tabernacle and all its vessels’ (2Baruch 4.2-7). Deutero-Isaiah (51.3) looked for the time when Zion (usually synonymous with Jerusalem and with cultic overtones (Stolz, 1997 vol. 2, pp.1072-73)) would become like Eden, the garden of the Lord. In terms borrowed from Canaanite mythology (Clements, 1965, p. 8: Cross, 1973, pp. 38, 44), Ezekiel, lamenting the fall of the king of Tyre who succumbed to pride thinking himself equal with God saying ‘I am a god’, described the mountain of God as his Eden-Temple, and the king as a priestly Adam expelled from Eden:

‘You were the signet of perfection, full of wisdom and perfect in beauty.
You were in Eden, the garden of God; every precious stone was your covering, carnelian, topaz, and jasper, chrysolite, beryl, and onyx, sapphire, carbuncle, and emerald; and wrought in gold were your settings and your engravings. On the day that you were created they were prepared.
With an anointed guardian cherub I placed you; you were on the holy mountain of God; in the midst of the stones of fire you walked.
You were blameless in your ways from the day you were created, till iniquity was found in you.
In the abundance of your trade you were filled with violence, and you sinned; so I cast you as a profane thing from the mountain of God, and the guardian cherub drove you out from the midst of the stones of fire.’ (Ez 28.12-16)

Moreover in the LXX the list of stones matches those prescribed for the high priest’s breastplate in Exodus 28.17-20 and 36.17-20, each stone was to represent one of the twelve tribes and were interwoven with gold. Although the order of stones in the MT is not identical as shown in the table below, the list is the same.

---

169 Unfortunately Ex 28.17-20; 36.17-20 and Ez 28.13 are not witnessed in the Biblical Qumran scrolls (cf Ulrich, 2013 vols. 1&2) and there are no variations in the order of the stones noted in Swete (2009) so we cannot account for the mismatch between the MT and LXX.
The prophecy indicates not only a mythical connection between the mountain and Eden but also that Eden and the Temple were connected in some manifestations of Second Temple thought. The priest-like king, adorned with Aaron’s ritual gems signifying he is acting on behalf of the twelve tribes, is described in terms reminiscent of Adam, the representative of the human race. Having been created he walked blamelessly in the garden of God, after his sin he was excluded from the garden which was guarded by a cherub.
When Ezekiel described his vision of the Temple on the high mountain he described it in terms evocative of Eden. A dazzling man guarded the gateway (Ez 40.3; Gen 3.24), the Temple was full of trees (Ez 40.16, 22, 26, 31, 34, 37; 41.18, 19, 20, 25, 26; Gen 2.9) and from it flowed fertile waters (Ez 47.1-12; Gen 2.10-14; Zech 14.8; Joel 4.18). The Temple is also linked with Eden in being the dwelling place of the shekinah. The psalmist earnestly desires to be brought into the dwelling (מִשְׁכָּן) of God on his holy mountain where he will go to the altar of God (Ps 43.3-4; cf. also Ps 132.7). After the expulsion of Adam and Eve the Lord made his shekinah dwell in the east of the Garden of Eden (Jerusalem Targum Genesis 3.24).

As Second Temple theology developed the Temple shifted from being God’s dwelling place (Ez 43.7), where he might be controlled by the cult, to the dwelling place of his name (deuteronomist e.g. Deut 12.5, 11, 21) or his glory (Ezekiel 43.4) or his peace (12 testaments, Dan 1-6 (Ginzberg, 1968 Vol2, p.208)).

The mythical evocation of Eden as the Temple of the Lord is found in the book of Jubilees which sees Eden as set apart because it is more holy than the land (3.12,13) and describes the garden as the sanctuary (3.12) and one of the four sacred places on earth (4.26). It is the ‘holy of holies and the dwelling of the Lord’ (9.19). The Miscellaneous Rules (4Q265 fragment 7), like the book of Jubilees (3.9, 10), speaks of the holiness of the garden of Eden and applies the same ritual laws concerning entry into the Temple to the garden. On giving birth to a son a woman was considered unclean for forty days (Lev 12.2) and so Adam

\[\text{trans. Wintermute, 1985, p.73}\]

\[\text{Formerly thought of as part of the Damascus Document, e.g. Vermes 2011, p.155: cf. Hempel 2000 (BM 488.D2 H) for the fragment’s inclusion in the Miscellaneous Rules}\]
could not enter the Eden-temple until forty days after his creation, and on the birth of a
daughter a woman could not enter the Temple for eighty days (Lev 12.4) likewise Eve could
not enter the Eden-temple until eighty days had passed since her creation. 1Enoch 24.4-25.6
praises the holy mountain of God on which stands the fragrant tree, not to be touched until
God ‘descends to visit the earth with goodness’ and at the great judgement ‘the elect will be
presented with its fruit for life’ and enter into the holy place.\textsuperscript{172} This image of eternal life as
entry into the garden sanctuary and eating of the tree of life is also present in the Testament of
Levi (18.11).

With Eden as the mythical sanctuary, Adam could be visualised by some of Luke’s
contemporaries as its ministering priest. The Apocalypse of Moses (29.1-6) describes how
Adam was permitted to collect the spices (κρόκος, νάρδος, κάλαμος, κιννάµον\textsuperscript{173}) from
paradise to make incense after his expulsion so that he might offer sacrifice to God. These are
the same spices found in the garden to which the beloved is compared in the Song of Songs
(4.14).

Wenham (1994, pp.400-402) notes the verbal corollaries between Gen 2-3 and
descriptions of the sanctuary. God walks (ךְַהַל) in Eden (Gen 3.8) as he does in the sanctuary
(Lev 26.12; Deut 23.15; 2Sam 7.6-7). Eden (Gen 3.24) and the Jerusalem Temple were both
entered from the east which was guarded by cherubim (1kgs 6.23-28 they were also above the
ark-throne Ex 25.18-22, and decorated the sanctuary curtains and walls Ex 26.31; 1Kgs 6.29).
The menorah was modelled on the tree of life; both the tree and menorah symbolised fulness

\textsuperscript{172} trans. Isaac, 1983, p.26

\textsuperscript{173} crocus/saffron, nard, calamus, cinnamon
of life. (Wenham (1994, p.401) refers to Meyers (1976) who argues the ‘menorah was a stylised tree of life, a conclusion she reached on the basis of archaeology and its description in Exod 25:31-35’.) This thesis concurs with Wenham on the basis of Gen 3.22; the priest Asaph prays before the cherubim throne ‘give us life, and we will call on thy name!’ (Ps 80.18) and the cultic song of ascents speaks of the assurance God ‘will keep your life’ (Ps 121.7). The Midrash Rabbah Genesis 16.5 interprets Gen 2.15 ‘to till (עָבַד) it and keep (שָׁמַר) it’ as an ‘allusion to sacrifices’ (cited in Wenham, 1994, p. 400). Certainly עָבַד and שָׁמַר are both witnessed in cultic contexts: in Ex 3.12 the LXX renders עָבַד as λατρεύω in ‘you shall serve God on this holy mountain,’ and in Numbers 28.2 the sons of Israel are commanded to take heed (שָׁמַר διατηρέω) to offer sacrifice to the Lord in due season. Similarly in 2 Kings 21.3 Manassah built altars to Baal and worshipped (עָבַד/δουλεύω) the false gods, and in 2 Kings 22.14 Harhas is the keeper (שָׁמַר) of the cultic vestments (ἰματιοφύλαξ keeper of the wardrobe). Genesis Rabbah 21.8 ‘compares the expulsion of man from the garden to the destruction of the temple’ (Wenham, 1994, p.400). However the Midrash does not note that the only concurrences of עָבַד (ἐργάζομαι) and שָׁמַר (φυλάσσω) in the Torah (Numbers 3.7-8; 8.26; 18.5-6) refer to the priestly office in the sanctuary. Wenham suggests then that Adam might be the architypal Levite in the Eden-sanctuary, and corroborates this with verbal resonance between God clothing (לָבַשׁ hiphil) Adam and Eve in tunics (כֻּתֹּנֶת) (Gen 3.21) and Moses clothing (לָבַשׁ hiphil) Aaron and his sons at their ordination as priests in tunics (כֻּתֹּנֶת) (Ex 28.40,41; 29.8; 40.14; Lev 8.13). Wenham also notes that whilst Sumerian priests were naked
in their temple the Torah insists on the modesty of Hebrew priests in the sanctuary (Ex 20.26; 28.42) just as God preserved the modesty of Adam and Eve.

Wenham (1994, p.402) argues further for the links between Eden and the sanctuary made by: the description of rivers flowing from the garden (Gen 2.10-14) alluding to the 'river whose streams make glad the city of God, the holy habitation of the Most High' (Ps 46.5) and the river flowing from the Temple (Ez 47.11-12); the ‘good gold’ (Gen 2.11-12) from the land of Havilah corresponding to the sacred cultic furnishings of the sanctuary all covered in gold; the gems אַדְמָן, only occurring once more in the MT where it is compared with the manna that would later be kept in the holy of holies inside the ark, and שֹׁהַם, already noted in table 1 but also mentioned as forming part of the high priest’s ephod and engraved with the names of the twelve tribes of Israel and set in gold filigree (Ex 28.9-14); the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, which was ‘a delight to the eyes [and] … to be desired to make one wise’ (Gen 3.6), might be recalled in Psalm 19.8-9 praising the law which makes the ‘wise simple, … rejoice[s] the heart … [and] enlighten[s] the eyes.’ The decalogue was kept in the ark and death came to any who touched the ark or saw it uncovered (2Sam 6.7; Numbers 4.20) just as eating from the forbidden tree bought death (Gen 2.17).

2.5.1 Further evidence of the mythical interpretation of the Eden sanctuary in wider cultic aspects of Genesis.

Kearney (1977, pp.375-378) argues, with a certain amount of literary gymnastics, for the six commands for the construction of the sanctuary in Exodus 25-40 corresponding to the six days of creation:

1. Light.
2. Division above and below.
3. The sea (יָם) and the bronze laver (called יָם in 1Kgs 7.23).
4. The sun and the moon (linked by the anointing oil מִשְׁחַת־קֹדֶשׁ ‘with my holy oil I have anointed him,’ the psalm goes on to say the anointed one’s (David) dynasty shall be as the sun before God and endure forever like the moon).
5. The fish–Ex 30.34 includes the ingredient שִׁחֵלֶת (onycha from the mollusk strombus) for making incense.
6. The dominion/supervision (רָדָה) of people.
7. Rest.

Cassuto (1974, p.476) notes parallels from the same account of the construction of the Temple in Exodus 25-40 with creation in Genesis. Weinfeld (1981, pp.501-512) argues God’s Sabbath rest corresponds to his resting/dwelling in the sanctuary, and that the completion of creation ‘parallels the completion of the tabernacle’ (cited in Wenham, 1994, p.403)
The evidence argued above is highly suggestive of a mythical connection between the creation stories, especially the garden of Eden, and the Temple cult which may have been known to Luke and his contemporaries even if it came to him in a Greek translation.

2.5.2 \( \text{שָׁלוֹם} \) in the Temple

Having argued above for the understanding that God established \( \text{שָׁלוֹם} \) in Eden, and the mythical connection between Eden and the Temple, it is not surprising to find the Temple was also seen to be the place of \( \text{שָׁלוֹם} \). The Testament of Dan (5.9-13) speaks of the salvation of the righteous who will enjoy eternal peace in his sanctuary, they ‘will rest in Eden’ and rejoice in the New Jerusalem. Jerusalem becomes equated with the Temple ‘for the Lord will be in the middle of it, living among the people’. Haggai (2.9), prophesied the Lord \( \text{παντοκράτωρ} \) would make the latter Temple more glorious than the former and would make it a place of peace: \( \text{שָׁלוֹם} \). And Philo (\text{Legatio ad Gaium} 1:306), who might be taken as a probably slightly earlier contemporary of Luke and his readers and a representative of Biblical interpretation in their time, reports that on the Day of Atonement the high priest prayed for peace for all mankind:

‘in the very holy of holies itself, into which, once in the year, the high priest enters, on the day called the great fast, to offer incense, and on no other day, being then about in accordance with our national law also to offer up prayers for a fertile and ample supply of blessings, and for peace to all mankind (καὶ εἰρήνην ἅπασιν ἄνθρωποις).’

\(^{175}\) trans. Charles, 1908

\(^{176}\) and in this place I will give peace
The Sabbath—Salvation in Luke as the re-establishment of Eden-based שָׁלוֹם

2.6 שָׁלוֹם the fruit of salvation

In the OT we find various indications of a connection between an expectation of salvation and שָׁלוֹם. In Psalm 55, attributed to David who pleaded for deliverance from his enemies who threatened his life, the psalmist prayed that the Lord would redeem my soul in peace causing peace to be heard/announcing the news of peace and announcing salvation (would redeem my soul in peace)

(isaiah (52.7) spoke in prophecy of the beauty of the feet of the one who would come announcing peace (causing peace to be heard/announcing the news of peace)

The prophetic suffering servant would be the one by his suffering would make us whole (causing salvation to be heard/I shall make salvation heard)

The connection was also made in the Dead Sea Scrolls:

‘Thou alone didst [create] the just and establish him from the womb for the time of goodwill, that he might harken to Thy Covenant and walk in all (Thy ways), and that [Thou mightest show Thyself great] to him in the multitudes of Thy mercies, and enlarge his straitened soul to eternal salvation, to perpetual and unfailing peace.’ (IQH VII,15 Vermes, 2011, p.256)

177 would redeem my soul in peace

178 causing peace to be heard/announcing the news of peace

179 causing salvation to be heard/I shall make salvation heard

180 the chastisement that brought our peace was upon him

181 his circumcision became my salvation, I have run the way of salvation in peace
2.6.1 Salvation and שָׁלוֹם in Luke

The prophetic announcements of salvation in Luke indicate a connection between salvation and the expectation of peace. As Zachariah held his new-born son John in his arms he announced that the child would go before the Lord, preparing the way to give knowledge of salvation, and that in the light of the day of the saviour our feet will be guided in the way of peace (Lk 1.68-79). The angel announced the Good News of the birth of the saviour to the shepherds who then witnessed the chorus of the heavenly host singing of shalom for those enjoying the divine favour:

δόξα ἐν ὑψίστοις θεῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς εἰρήνη ἐν ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας (Lk 2.14)

Finally Simeon blessed God for preserving him for the day when he would behold the Saviour and hold him in his arms; having received this gift he could die in peace (Lk 2.29).

Although in Luke 12.51 Jesus said he had not come to bring peace but division, this was in the context of the demands of discipleship παντὶ δὲ ὁ ἐδόθη πολύ, πολὺ ζητηθῆσεται παρ᾽ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὁ παρέθεντο πολὺ, περισσότερον αἰτήσουσιν αὐτόν (Lk 12.48); the reader of the Gospel of Luke should not be surprised to find themselves rejected by their family (vv. 52, 53). However this is not the purpose of salvation in the Gospel but rather a warning of its effect. It is argued here that the purpose of salvation in Luke, following the OT tradition (Is 57.18; Jer 14.19; 40.6), is that Jesus should make the establishment of שָׁלוֹם in the individual the characteristic of his healing ministry. Luke’s Peter spoke of the work of Jesus as spreading glory to God in the highest, and upon earth peace to men in God’s favour

182 glory to God in the highest, and upon earth peace to men in God’s favour

183 from all who have been given much, much will be required of him, and to whom is entrusted much, even more will be demanded of him
the good news of peace established (διὰ + genitive indicating the instrumentality) by him (Acts 10.36). Thus the sinful woman is told πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην (Lk 7.50), likewise the woman who had suffered from a haemorrhage for twelve years was healed and given the same irenic command. The seventy are sent out ahead of Jesus and are told to proceed in peace and heal the sick (Lk 10.5,9). Their fearless proclamation of the kingdom would be accompanied by the signs of the restoration of Eden-based שָׁלוֹם: the sick would be returned to health (10.9); the power of Satan would be overcome (10.18); no animal would injure them (10.19). Although שָׁלוֹם is and was a standard Jewish greeting, it is suggested in this thesis that it takes on a particular soteriological significance as Luke’s Gospel unfolds. Thus according to some manuscripts\textsuperscript{184} the risen Jesus greets his disciples with the words εἰρήνη ὑµῖν (Lk 24.36); this could be interpreted as the standard greeting, but in the context of the Gospel which stresses peace as Jesus’ gift to those who are being saved, it may be the final proclamation that the long-awaited messianic peace has arrived. This interpretation is supported by Jesus’ proof of his identity by showing his fearful disciples the marks of their salvation—his pierced hands and feet (24.39).

This sense of שָׁלוֹם as the fruit of messianic salvation is not unique to Luke. John’s Gospel, with its allusions to Genesis, points to salvation as the reversal of the sin of Adam. Pilate presents Jesus to the people: ἴδον ὁ ἄνθρωπος (Jn 19.5): Jesus, laden with the burden sin, is to be deprived of life on the wood of a tree, and cast out of the city modelled on Eden (see above), just as God points out Adam הָאָדָם הֵן ἱδον Ἀδὰμ (Gen 3.22) who was to be

\textsuperscript{184} P75 et reliqui in NA26. P75 is one of our earliest papyri. While this does not guarantee that this is the ‘original reading,’ it does demonstrate that it was in circulation from a very early date.
deprived of life and cast out of the garden because he and his wife succumbed to the temptation to eat the forbidden fruit of the tree of knowledge. From the tree of the cross, the new woman, is granted new life as she is entrusted to the disciple. The week of resurrection appearances marks the re-creation of the world to be characterised by שָׁלוֹם (John 20.19,21,26; also cf 16.33).

2.7 Conclusions

It has been argued in this chapter that the miracles of Luke’s Jesus re-established Edenic שָׁלוֹם as salvation for the individual, and, as the Sabbath was understood to have been consecrated in part because of the original establishment of שָׁלוֹם in creation, the Sabbath was an appropriate day for this salvation. Further this salvation as the re-establishment of שָׁלוֹם was foreshadowed in the Temple cult, mythically linked to Eden, and, just as the work of priests sacrificing in the Temple did not violate the Sabbath (e.g. Lev 24.8; 28.9-10; Mt 12.5; Jn 7.23) so too, Luke’s Jesus’ re-establishment of שָׁלוֹם in the πτωχοί was not a violation of the Sabbath. Thus the salvation that came from the healing miracles was intimately related to the Temple cult.
Chapter Three

The Day of Atonement–the prayer of the parabolic tax collector, an allusion to Yom Kippur

3.1 Introduction

Historical Biblical critics and narrative critics alike see the prayer of the parabolic tax collector in Luke 18.13: ὁ θεός, ἱλάσθητι μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ,185 as a reference to Psalm 51. However the absence of any verbal resonance with the psalm and the unusual employment of ἱλάσκομαι could put this hypothesis into question. In this section, I will suggest Luke echoes the language of the priestly psalms of Asaph or, more interestingly, that of the prayer of the high priest at Yom Kippur. A few scholars (e.g. Fletcher-Louis, 2006: and van Til, 2006) have suggested other allusions to priesthood and cultic practice in Luke, as I also have done in Chapters One and Two of this thesis. In putting priestly language on the lips of the tax collector the evangelist may have been making it part of the theological point he was making. The forgiveness that he had been proclaiming in the ministry of Jesus was now available outside the Temple cult, and no longer mediated by the levitical priesthood.

One of the common literary features of the NT is each author’s use of the OT. The NA26 list of citations and allusions spans 36 pages and includes all of the books of the NT; in addition there are influences from OT themes, idioms and LXX/MT style. With this in mind I

185 God be merciful/propitious to me the sinner
shall examine the possibility that the prayer of the tax collector was a citation or an allusion to a Hebrew prayer. Deliberate reference to the OT by introductory formulae and other exegetical terminology as well as midrashic techniques also pervade the pages of the NT.

Kimball (1994, p.47), who wrote his doctoral thesis on citation and allusion in Luke, defines a quotation as:

‘OT material preceded by an IF [introductory formula] or an OT citation that lacks an IF, but that poses a substantial verbatim agreement with an OT text (i.e., more than a brief phrase) or that is identified as a quotation by the NT context. The latter includes paraphrastic renderings that are intended to be more than mere allusions but may not possess an exact verbal agreement with our LXX or MT because of such reasons as interpretive renderings of the text. An allusion is a more indirect reference that has some intended verbal or material parallelism to a specific OT text.’

Taking this as a model definition, I shall research whether Lk 18.13 is a citation or an allusion, and if so, to what. Of the 525 allusions in Luke referred to by Kimball the vast majority relate to the Pentateuch, Isaiah and the Psalms. They vary from almost exact quotations to ambiguous references to the OT.

3.2 The Temple in Luke

The Temple plays a significant part in Luke’s Gospel. This thesis accepts Peter Head’s (2004) argument for an ambivalent attitude towards the Temple in Luke, finding the positive in the infancy narratives, later implicit references to the Temple in the central section of the Gospel (e.g. 5.14 where the cleansed leper is told to fulfil the requirements of Lev 14.10-32), and the claiming of the Temple as his own as he cleansed it (19.46). The more negative might be found in the lament at the imminent demise of the city and its Temple (οἶκος in 13.35; ἱερόν in
Head (2004, p.119 cf. also p.116) argues Jesus’ ‘vindication beyond rejection elevates him to a key position as cornerstone of a renewed Temple.’

The Temple is more than just the locus of certain events in the life of Jesus: for Luke it is an important theological theme that sheds light on the person of Jesus. The Gospel begins with the appearance of the angel Gabriel to the priest Zechariah in the Temple announcing John’s conception (Lk 1.8-9) and ends with the disciples καὶ ἦσαν διὰ παντὸς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ εὐλογοῦντες τὸν θεόν (Lk 24.53).

After his introduction Luke takes us to the sanctuary of the Lord where Zechariah burns incense before the altar acknowledging the Shekinah (Lk 1.8). Immediately after announcing the birth of the John the Baptist, we are taken to the backwater town of Nazareth in Galilee, far away from Jerusalem and the Temple cult, to be told of the announcement of a new Shekinah. Just as the Spirit of the Lord rested as a cloud over the Ark of the Covenant (Lv 16.2) so too the Virgin would be overshadowed by the Holy Spirit (Lk 1.35) signifying a new divine presence. Already Luke presents us with a tension that would eventually lead to his death. In the Temple, Simeon thanks God for preserving him for the day when he would see the salvation ἃ ἦτοιµασας κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν λαῶν, φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν καὶ δόξαν λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ (Lk 2.31-32), but prophesied that he would also be the sign that would be rejected.
The only detail of Jesus’ childhood beyond infancy that Luke gives us is his being lost and found in the Temple at Passover. The impression emerges that for Luke, Jesus’ presence in the Temple may have been more important than the details of his being lost and found. Already before his public ministry we are given Luke’s clue as to how he considers we should understand Jesus. The cryptic answer Jesus gives to Mary and Joseph in the Temple, οὐκ ἦδειτε ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρός μου δεῖ εἶναι με; (Lk 2.49) could be considered a leitmotif for Luke’s Gospel. Jesus’ ministry and mission are intimately intertwined with Temple (or ‘the things of [his] Father’) which he revered so much (Lk 19.45) and apparently knew would ultimately be destroyed (Lk 21.6). It is from the Temple that the priestly tradition of Jewish faith saw God’s mercy emanating: the sacrifice of atonement (Lv 16) was the locus operandi of God’s free gift of the forgiveness of sin. Yet Jesus came claiming to forgive sins (Lk 5.24) without being a levitical priest nor offering the atonement sacrifice prescribed in Leviticus 16.

As we are taken into Jesus’ public ministry we find that whilst he attracts a following, he also stirs up a hornets’ nest with his criticism of the Pharisees, and his prophetic signs of eating with sinners, not least, the epitome of Jewish infidelity: the collaborating tax-collectors (Lk 5.30). However what made matters far worse was Jesus’ claim to mediation in the forgiveness of sins (Lk 7.48, 49). It was not simply that only God could forgive; in proclaiming (God’s) forgiveness Jesus set himself up as a rival to the Temple. Jesus, angered at the aberrations of true Hebrew faith seen by the priests’ arrogance (Lk 10.31) and the

---

188 did you not know that I must be about my Father’s affairs?

189 In the parable of the Good Samaritan the priest neglected the duty of charity to preserve his ritual purity.
Pharisees’ Halakah, especially concerning the Sabbath (Lk 6.7), becomes the new Temple of God’s presence which might be seen in his response.

In Chapter nine the Gospel takes a new turn. Peter declares Jesus to be the Christ, and Jesus makes two prophecies of his passion, in between which we read the account of the Transfiguration. Luke takes care to point out Jesus, Moses and Elijah appeared in glory and were talking about τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ, ἣν ἠμελλέεν πληροῦν ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ (Lk 9.31). Then in verse 51 Jesus ‘sets his face’ towards Jerusalem, which might be taken as a synonym for, or an implication of, the Temple (when he arrives, Jesus acts all his ministry in the Temple). His pilgrimage reaches its climax at the end of chapter 19 with his triumphal entry in monarchic style, his lament for the city and the expulsion of the vendors in the Temple emporium.

At the climax of the Gospel, Jesus dies at the hour of evening sacrifice and, following Mark and Matthew, the veil of the Temple sanctuary is torn ‘right down the middle’ (ἐσχίσθη ... μέσον Lk 23.45), perhaps signifying the imminent end of the cult. After the resurrection, Luke relates only the episodes situated in or around Jerusalem, and it is from there that Jesus commands his disciples to preach μετάνοιαν εἰς ἁμαρτίαν (Lk 24.47) in his name to all the nations. The holy city with its Temple cult and Shekinah now starts to be superseded with a new atonement for the forgiveness of sins and a new access to the divine presence: the Crucified and Risen Lord. However, in Acts the Temple continues to be a key point of

---

190 his exodus, which he was about to fulfil in Jerusalem

191 Riding a donkey was a sign of royalty cf. Zech 9.9; Gen 49.10. Judges 12:14 may also imply royal pretensions.

192 repentance for/leading to the forgiveness of sins
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reference and only gradually becomes obsolete in Luke’s narrative theology, and access to the divine presence becomes associated with the role of the Spirit.

3.3 The parable of the Pharisee and the tax collector

It may well be that Luke intended the parable of the Pharisee and the tax collector to be read within this context. It was spoken specifically against τινας τοὺς πεποιθότας ἐφ’ ἑαυτοῖς ὅτι εἰσίν δίκαιοι καὶ ἐξουθενοῦντας τοὺς λοιποὺς (Lk 18.9); possibly the priests and Pharisees. The drama is enacted in the Temple precincts, the ἱερὸν, the locus of God’s presence and in which is the sanctuary, ναός, housing in the Holy of Holies the ἱλαστήριον, ritually sprinkled with blood in the plea for God’s mercy. And yet Jesus turns the Temple upside down. The Pharisee, who considers himself righteous because he exceeds the requirements of the Law fasting twice a week and pays tithes on all his purchases (Lk 18.11,12), does not return home at rights with God but the tax collector does (Lk 18.14). (Thus while the Law-abiding Pharisee is not righteous before God Zechariah and Elizabeth are, and are described as blameless (ἄµεµπτος), the contrast between the Pharisee and the tax collector recalls the reversal of fortunes for the proud and humble in the Magnificat (Lk 1.48, 51-53).) The latter begs God to be merciful with the words ἱλάσθητι μοι rather than ἐλέησον με as we might have expected from its use in the LXX psalms (e.g. 41.5), or ἄφες μοι as in the Lord’s Prayer (Lk 11.4 ἄφες

193 those who trusted in themselves, that they were righteous and despised the rest

3.3.1 The penitential Psalms

The most popular assumption for the allusion made by Luke in the prayer of the tax collector in 18.13 is that the evangelist is recalling Psalm 51 (e.g. Fitzmyer, 1985 p.1188, Jeremias, 1963, p. 144). However, consistent with the rest of the psalmody of David, this psalm of repentance attributed in both the MT and LXX to David after having sinned with Bathsheba, uses ἐλεέω:

ἐλέησόν με ὁ θεός κατὰ τὸ μέγα ἐλέος σου καὶ κατὰ τὸ πλήθος τῶν οἰκτίρμων σου ἐξάλειψον τὸ ἀνόμημά μου.

From the point of view of vocabulary, this bears no resemblance to ὁ θεός, ἡμῖν’, or οἰκτίρμων as in the command of Jesus: Γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες καθὼς [καὶ] ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν. (Lk 6.36)

have mercy on me God according to your great mercy and according to the fulness of your merciful love wipe out my transgression

RSV; ‘God, be merciful to me, the sinner!’ New American Standard Bible; ‘God, show mercy to me, a sinner.’ Common English Bible; ‘God, be merciful to me, a sinner!’ English Standard Version (2011); ‘God, have mercy on me, a sinner.’ New International Version; ‘God, be merciful to me, a sinner.’
argue below ὁ θεός, ἡλάσθητι μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ is priestly language and not that associated with the Davidic Psalms.

A careful examination of the vocabulary of mercy in the psalms shows a difference between those attributed to David and those to Asaph. Of the twenty occurrences of ἐλεέω in the psalms, all of which translate the qal of יָנַן only 26.8 makes a reference to the Temple:

κύριε ἡγάπησα εὐπρέπειαν οἴκου σου καὶ τόπον σκηνώματος δόξης σου 199

Psalm 30 was composed for the Dedication of the Temple but does not mention the holy place beyond the attribution:

εἰς τὸ τέλος ψαλμὸς τῶν ἐγκαινισμῶν τοῦ οἴκου τῷ Δαυίδ 200

Psalm 51 at the end makes the un-priestly reference to the Lord taking no delight in sacrifices until he has seen the broken contrite heart. 202 Of the twenty occurrences of ἐλεέω all are found in psalms attributed to David except the two anonymous psalms 118 and 122.

ἡλάσκομαι is found in Psalm 79.9, translating the piel imperative כַפֵּר (atone, be propitious, forgive):

καὶ ἡλάσθητι ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν ἐνεκα τοῦ ὅνόματός σου 203

199 Lord I have loved the beauty of your house and the place of the dwelling of your glory

200 to the last psalm, an ode for the dedication of the house of David

201 A psalm, a song for the dedication of the house of David

202 However it goes on to refer to the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem, at least the last three verses are unlikely to have been composed by David but suggest a time after the return from exile.

203 forgive our sins for the sake of your name
The psalmist is pleading for mercy for Jerusalem and the holy Temple which have been defiled by the blood-thirsty heathen. Verses 8 and 9 plead that the iniquities of Israel may not be remembered, that they may be delivered from their iniquities and their sins forgiven. Perhaps this psalm of Asaph uses כפר rather than David’s choice of חנן, because it refers to the propitiation / expiation that came from the Temple that had been defiled. Asaph, a seer (2Ch 29.30), and a priest (2Ch 5.12; 20.14, 29.13-19), shows a concern for the Temple cult and uses vocabulary associated with that cult. In Psalm 73.17, we read that, going into the sanctuary, he understood the end of the iniquitous. In Psalm 74.3, 7 again this psalmist refers to the sanctuary which had been desecrated by the enemies of Israel. In Psalm 76 he encourages the people: ‘Make your vows to the LORD your God, and perform them; let all around him bring gifts to him who is to be feared, who cuts off the spirit of princes, who is terrible to the kings of the earth.’ (Ps 76.11-12).

Asaph consistently uses ἡλάσκωμαι to refer to the forgiveness of sins in Psalm 78.38:

αὐτὸς δὲ ἐστὶν οἰκτίρμων καὶ ἡλάσεται ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις αὐτῶν

and again refers to the sanctuary in v.69, but this time the Lord’s own sanctuary he built for himself in the heavens. He makes the priestly exhortation to the people: ‘Blow the trumpet (שׁוֹפָר) at the new moon, at the full moon, on our feast day’ (Ps 81.3).

204 For he is merciful and forgives our sins

205 The ram’s horn blown by priests, and announcing a theophany (Ex 19.16, 19; 20.18; Lev 25.9; Joshua 6.6; 2Sam 6.15; 1Chron 15.28; Is 27.13), deliverance (Judges 3.27; 6.34) or the anointing of a king (1Kings 1.34, 39, 41; 2 Kings 9.13), but also by Saul (1Sam 13.3) and Joab (2Sam 2.28; 18.16) and in war (Nehemiah 4.20; Job 39.25; Jer 4.5)
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Twice ἱλάσκομαι is used in psalms attributed to David. In Psalm 25.11 no reference is made to sacrificial cult or the Temple. Here, in the middle voice ἱλάση, it translates the adjective πρόσερχομαι ready to forgive / forgiving. In Psalm 65.4, again as ἱλάση, it translates ἱλάσῃ in the context of forgiveness granted by the Lord to those he chooses to dwell in his holy Temple. So the only example of ἱλάσκομαι/כפר in the psalms attributed to David is used in the context of the Temple. Otherwise it is used in the psalms attributed to the priest Asaph. This suggests Luke chose his vocabulary with careful purpose: rather than alluding to the Davidic pleas for mercy (ἔλεος), the prayer of the tax collector appears to be inspired by those of the priests who performed the Temple cult.

3.3.2 The prayer of Manasseh

Goulder (1989, p.670) suggests the Prayer of Manasseh is a more likely influence on Lk 18.13 than Ps 51. King Manasseh is presented as an archetypal idolatrous king of Judah (2Kg 21). In punishment the Lord would hand Jerusalem over to its enemies (v.13; Jer 15.4). However according to 2Ch 33, after Manasseh had been taken captive by the Assyrians and taken to Babylon (v. 11), he repented of all his evil. The Lord heard his supplication favourably and restored him to Jerusalem where Manasseh purged the Temple of the idol worship he had instigated (v. 15) and restored the sacrificial cult (v.16). It is said his prayer of repentance is in

206 הַשָּׂלָח qal waw consecutive perfect 2nd person masculine singular

207 The only two other occurrences of חֲלָשׁ in the MT Psalms are 86.5 (ἐπιεικῆς (adj. gentle, kind, tolerant) in the LXX and used as a synonym for προσεκρατούμενος) and 103.3 (ἐὐιλατεύοντα (present participle acc. of εὐιλατεύω to be merciful to i.e. ‘being merciful towards’) only used elsewhere in Dt 29.19 where it also translates הֵשָׁל and Jdt 16.15 LXX only)

208 כְּפַר piel imperfect 2nd person masculine singular suffix 3rd person masculine plural
the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel (v.18). North (1968, p.425) explains the introduction of Manasseh’s conversion is due to his long reign (687-642) which in ancient Hebrew culture would have been understood as the Lord’s blessing for a good life. The Chronicler resolved the contradiction of an evil life being blessed, by supplying details of the king’s conversion from Esarhaddon’s Prism (Pritchard, J. (ed.), 1955, p.291 (non visum) cited in North, 1968, p. 425).

The apocryphal Prayer of Manasseh, present in Greek in Codex Alexandrinus and other mss. appended to the Psalms, was translated into Syriac and incorporated into the 3rd cent. Didascalia. If Brown’s (1968, p.541) dating of the first or second cent C.E. is correct, then it is most unlikely to have been known to Luke for him to have been alluding to it. In the text the king, like the tax collector, does identify himself as τῷ ἁµαρτωλῷ appointed by God to repent unlike the righteous Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (v.8) who had no need of repentance. The phrase is not used in the LXX by a sinner referring to himself in a prayer of repentance. However Manasseh’s imperative request for forgiveness is:

αἰτοῦµαι δεόµενός σου ἄνες µοι κύριε ἄνες µοι µὴ συναπολέσῃς µε ταῖς ἁνοµίαις µου µηδὲ εἰς τὸν αἰώνα µηνίσας τηρήσῃς τὰ κακὰ µοι µηδὲ καταδίκασῃς µε ἐν τοῖς κατωτάτοις τῆς γῆς ὅτι σὺ εἰ ἐκ κύριε ὁ θεός τῶν µετανοούντων.  

---

209 according to Bright cited in North, 1968, p.425

210 It is not mentioned in the earliest lists of canonical Scripture that contain the Old Testament (Athanasius, Augustine, Decretum Gelasianum, Codex Sinaiticus, Melito’s Palestinian Canon as recorded by Eusebius).

211 Odes 12.13, ‘I earnestly beseech thee, forgive me, O Lord, forgive me! Do not destroy me with my transgressions! Do not be angry with me for ever or lay up evil for me; do not condemn me to the depths of the earth. For thou, O Lord, art the God of those who repent’ RSV
Rather than using the Lucan ἰλάσκομαι, pseudo-Manasseh has an unusual employment of ἀνίημι\(^{212}\) as if he were beseeching God to untie the bonds of his sin or send them forth. The only example of this use of ἀνίημι in the LXX is Ps 39.14 / 38.13 where ἄνες μοι translates the MT יָשַׁע מִמֶּנִּי;\(^{213}\) in his prayer of repentance, the psalmist David pleads for the Lord to ‘look away from [him]’ that he might be happy again before he should die.

To conclude, even if the Prayer of Mannasseh antedated Luke, or his source, only the self-identification τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ can be seen to bear any resemblance to Lk 18.13; ἄνες μοι cannot be equated with ἰλάσθητι μοι.

3.3.3 Yom Kippur

A third possibility for the referent of the prayer of the tax collector, apparently hitherto not posited, is the prayer of the high priest on the Day of Atonement found in the Mishnah.

However before considering the text we must consider the charge of anachronism. In his thesis on the impact of Yom Kippur on early Christianity Stökl ben Ezra (2002) examined whether the prayer of the high priest related in the Mishnah was historically reliable. The Mishnah was probably redacted round 220 CE (Stökl ben Ezra, 2002, p.19), the time of Rabbi Yehudah HaNasi. It is true in some aspects of the mishnaic description of the ritual exegetical impositions are at variance with contemporary sources. The ark in \textit{m.Yoma} 5.2 and mentioned in Lev 16 was no longer present in the Second Temple, having been replaced by the foundation stone (Stökl ben Ezra, 2002, p.21). The high-priestly vigil on the eve of Yom Kippur (\textit{m.Yoma} 1.4-7) is at variance with Josephus (\textit{Antiquitates} 17:165-166).

\(^{212}\) Liddell and Scott (1883) rare use ‘to let go unpunished’ p.131.

\(^{213}\) ‘Look away from me’ the imperative hiphil of יָשַׁע means literally be made blind.
Ezra, 2002, p.22). The Mishnah’s antipathy towards priests (m.Yoma 1:5; 1:6; 4:1) is unlikely if priests, being the only guardians of the cult, were the source of information. (Stökl ben Ezra, 2002, p.23). Finally the dubium concerning the exact moment of offering the sacrifices; all these ‘[confirm] the impression that exegetical skills rather than ritual memory played a significant role in the formation of Mishnah Yoma’ (Stökl ben Ezra, 2002, p.23).

However some aspects of the rites as they are described in m.Yoma are attested by independent Second Temple sources. ‘To this group belong most of the details concerning the scapegoat ritual, the high-priestly prayer in the sanctuary and the bowl - the artifact [sic] that holds the sacrificial blood until it is sprinkled’(Stökl ben Ezra 2002, p.19). Although the number of prayers recited by the high priest is debatable, the text of the confession appears to be authentic.

The Mishnah tells us of the two confessions made by the high priest on the Day of Atonement; one for himself and one on behalf of the people. For his own sins he prepares to sacrifice an ox, forcefully laying his hands on it he confesses:

\[
\text{וּבֵיתִי אֲנִי לְפָּנֶיךָ} \wedge \text{שֶׁחָטָאתִי} \wedge \text{וְלַחֲטָאִים} \wedge \ldots \wedge \text{נָא כַּפֶּר, הַשֵׁם אָנָּא}. \\
\text{וּבֵיתִי אֲנִי לְפָּנֶיךָ} \wedge \text{חָטָאתִי}, \ldots \wedge \text{הַשֵׁם אָנָּא} 215
\]

Using the LXX as a model, in Greek this could read:

\[
\text{δέομαι τὸ ὄνομα (ὁ θεός) … ἡμαρτον πρὸ προσώπου σου ἑγώ καὶ (ὁ) οἶκος μου, δέομαι}
\]

Using the LXX as a model, in Greek this could read:

\[
\text{δέομαι τὸ ὄνομα (ὁ θεός) … ἡμαρτον πρὸ προσώπου σου ἑγώ καὶ (ὁ) οἶκος μου, δέομαι}
\]

\[
\text{δέομαι τὸ ὄνομα (ὁ θεός) … ἡμαρτον πρὸ προσώπου σου ἑγώ καὶ (ὁ) οἶκος μου, δέομαι}
\]

---

214 Stökl be Ezra footnotes: ‘see mYoma 5:1 and Philo, Legatio ad Gaium 306.’ Note Philo does not give the text of the high priest’s prayer.
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τὸ ὄνομα (ὁ θεός), ἱλάσθητι216 μοι … τὰ ἁμάρτηματα ἡ ἡμαρτον πρὸ προσώπου σου ἐγὼ καὶ (ὁ) οἶκος μου.

He recites a virtually identical prayer as he lays his hands on the scapegoat confessing the sins of the people, beseeching the Lord that their sins might be forgiven ( yansı) (m.Yoma 6.2).

This would be much closer to the prayer of the tax collector. Luke’s unique use of the vocative ὁ θεός here (and on the Pharisee’s lips) invoking the divine name, which was only pronounced by the high priest on the Day, and his use of the cultically significant ἱλάσκομαι make this the best match for the allusion. If Luke were deliberately alluding to the prayer of the high priest on Yom Kippur the implication might be that the tax collector was pleading for the same atonement effected by ritual sacrifice but without the sacrifice being performed. This was the same effect of the forgiveness Jesus proclaimed in his ministry. By alluding to Yom Kippur, Luke indicates that the shedding of the blood of Jesus on the cross is the new atonement sacrifice replacing that of Lev 16. In this respect the parable of the Pharisee and the tax collector bears a similarity to the story of the sinful woman washing the feet of Jesus.

Van Til (2006, pp.74-75) argues convincingly for textual allusions to the sacrificial cult in the episode of the sinful woman anointing the feet of Jesus (Lk 7.36-50). By using a

216 The piel imperative רכש, or רכש in the MT, is rendered ἱλάσθητι aorist passive imperative 2ps (Ps 78.9 / 79.9), ἠλέω γενοῦ (Dt 21.8) and the aorist middle imperative 2ps ἔξιλάσκαι (Lv 9.7; Nm 17.11). Although the vowel shortening רכש to רכש is not witnessed in the MT, it is exhibited in other words e.g. רכש (Gen 24.33) and רכש (Is 36.11). The cognate ἐξιλάσθητι would also serve here, of the 92 occurrences of ἐξο (piel) 81 render it as ἱλάσκομαι, 3 as ἱλάσκομαι (Ps 65.4; 78.38; 79.9), and one each as ἑγάζω consecrate, ἑγάζειων present infinitive and ἑγάζαι aorist infinitive both in Ex 29.36, ἀθοῦω let go unpunished (ἀθοῦσης subjunctive aorist 2ps Jer 18.23), ἀπαλείψῃ wipe off (ἀπαλείψαι aorist infinitive Dan 9.24), ἐκκαθαρίζω clear away (ἐκκαθαρίζω indicative future 3ps Dt 32.43), καθαρίζω purify (καθαρίζω indicative future 2ps Ex 29.37), καθαρός γίνομαι become clean (καθαρόν nominative singular genitive aorist inative aorist middle Is 47.11) and ἰερός γίνομαι become propitious (ἱερός γενοῦς aorist imperative 2ps Dt 21.8). Leviticus and Numbers, in describing the Day of Atonement, only have ἱλάσκομαι. Stökl ben Ezra (2002) suggests the intensifying ἐκ ‘was added here to better signify also the removal of the impurity’ (p.104). He also notes the LXX deviates from the usual Greek usage in making God the object of the verb: God expiates sins, and thus follows the Hebrew syntax of רכש.
chiastic structure focusing on the parable of the two debtors, and the repeated use of ἀφίημι, Luke highlights forgiveness as the central theme of the narrative, and by using ἀλείφω, rather than χρίω in Matthew and Mark, Luke loses the royal messianic implication. He mentions the πούς of Jesus seven times in the narrative to stress that these were the object of her libation. Just as the High Priest, after smearing the blood of the offering on the horns of the altar, would pour the remaining blood from the sacrifice on the foot of the altar, so too this woman, with the same symbolic gesture, effected the atonement of her many sins. ‘Like the priest, [Jesus in] his concluding statement of forgiveness implies that she has made an acceptable offering and may now go in peace’ (Van Til, 2006, p. 75). Thus both the pericope of the sinful woman anointing Jesus’ feet and the parable of the Pharisee and the tax collector may be allusions to Temple sacrifice, and both proclaim the forgiveness of sins apart from the cult.

The point of the parable might be at one level that πᾶς ὁ ὑψῶν ἑαυτὸν ταπεινωθήσεται, ὁ δὲ ταπεινῶν ἑαυτὸν ὑψωθήσεται (18.14), but at another level it may be Jesus’ announcement that the Temple and it’s cult has had its day. The expiation of sin no longer comes from animal sacrifice and the blood sprinkled on the Mercy Seat, as arguably signified by the veil being rent in two (Lk 23.45), but it is available to all who approach God humbly and with a contrite heart. Locating the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican in the Temple brings Jesus’ claim to bring forgiveness of sins outside the Temple cult to a climax. His forgiveness is the atonement that only comes from the presence of God in the Holy of Holies

---

217 Though in the parable Luke uses χαρίζομαι (vv. 21, 42, 43), the remission of the debt was freely granted, this is not used of sin in the LXX, but Paul uses it for God’s forgiveness in Ep 4.32, and human forgiveness in 2Cor 2.10.

218 all who exalt themselves will be humbled, the one who humbles himself will be exalted.
mediated by the levitical priesthood. Little wonder they cried ‘crucify him!’ We cannot then underestimate the importance of this parable as an attack on two of the fundamental bastions of first century Jewish orthodoxy; the Temple as the assurance of God’s presence and the pharisaical righteousness that comes from the observance of Halakah.
Conclusion

This paper has argued, contra Conzelmann, who asserts that there is no salvific significance in the death of Jesus in Luke, that the allusions to the cult in the Gospel (the Jubilee, Sabbath, and Day of Atonement) are suggestive that Luke understood the death of Jesus in terms of the fulfilment of the cult which made Israel mindful of God’s salvation. The unifying concept in the multivalent Second Temple ideas of salvation might be that salvation is always God’s initiative, and is freely given because he loves his people. Although the cult includes the plea for the atonement of sin, it is still God’s free action that redeems his people, the cult impressed this upon the people.

It has been argued that the quotation of the Isaian proclamation of the Year of Jubilee (Lk 4.18-19) is programatic in Luke in that it defines Jesus’ mission and answers the question what kind of Messiah Jesus will be. He will bring about the eschatological expectation of the Jubilee, where the socio-economic restoration of the poor will accompany the life-giving restoration of sinners to righteousness before God. The Christ was anointed for the purpose of redeeming Israel and, as the Risen Lord explained to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus, he would achieve this by his necessary and prophesied death.

In Chapter Two it was argued that, Luke and his readers may have thought God consecrated the sabbath in Genesis, not just because he needed to rest after working for six days and wished his people to participate in his rest each week, but because the sabbath was a celebration of the wholeness of creation summarised in the concept of shalom. The Temple
The cult expressed God’s salvation as the mythical restoration of Edenic shalom, a task performed by priests who, in this respect, had the unique privilege of breaking the sabbath rest with impunity. It was argued in this chapter that Luke’s Jesus performed miracles which re-established the Edenic shalom as salvation for the sick individual (who perhaps could represent the corporate Jewish identity lacking shalom and so needing salvation). In healing on the sabbath, Jesus was applying the priests’ privilege of ‘working’ on the sabbath to himself. His work was equivalent to, or greater than, that of the priests. Rather than violating the sabbath, in restoring shalom by healing, he brought the sabbath back to its original, God-designed, state of celebrating the wholeness of creation.

Chapter Three argued that the prayer of the parabolic tax collector does not allude to Psalm 51 as many assume, but rather it reflects the prayers of the high priest on the Day of Atonement, and consequently the tax collector returns home with the justification that would be expected to be accorded to the high priest. The penitent sinner is forgiven, not just because he repents with humility, he receives the salvation that would come through the cult, the words of which he had used, and prayed in the Temple itself. Although not a priest himself, he signally proleptically, that through the shedding of the blood of the new covenant for many, a new atonement would replace and perfect the old.

This research would be greatly benefitted by a more in-depth examination of the concepts of salvation in Second Temple thought. The relationship between such concepts and the cult, especially that of atonement sacrifice and possible Second Temple thought regarding vicarious sacrifice, also needs development along with research into the understanding of how
the cult was thought to be effective, and the significance of the blood of Jesus, the new blood of the covenant, shed for many.

I hope recent unpublished work in the field of Lucan soteriology may also be available to compare with my work. The 2014 British New Testament Society conference witnessed three papers all looking at different aspects of the theme of atonement in Luke’s soteriology. Monique Cuany (‘He was numbered with the lawless (Luke 22:37): Substitution in Luke’s Passion Narrative’) examined the quotation of Is 53:12 (καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη) in Luke’s passion narrative. ‘Far from an insignificant allusion to the suffering servant, [she argued] that Luke develops the theme of substitution throughout the passion narrative, showing Jesus as suffering the punishment which should have been inflicted on those around him’ (abstract). Michael Flowers (‘Did Luke believe that Jesus’ death had any ‘redemptive’ significance?’) argued that Jesus’ rebuke to his disciples on the way to Emmaus, οὐχὶ ταῦτα ἔδει παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν καὶ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ; (Lk 24:26), indicated ‘that the disciples had failed to appreciate the redemptive significance of Jesus’ death.’ Flowers went on to suggest the typological connection Luke made between Christ’s ‘passion’ (πάσχω Lk 22.15) and the ‘Passover’ (πάσχα Lk 22:1,7, 11, 13, 15) festival (abstract). Finally Tim Carter (‘Drinking the blood of the covenant’) linked:

‘[the] act of drinking what has been identified as blood as a way of exploring Jesus’ understanding of the atoning effects of his death. Those who shared in the wine were engaged in a covenant-making ritual, and it will be suggested that in symbolically breaking this ancient taboo Jesus was displaying a unique authority in asserting the atoning significance of his blood. The paper offers an exegesis of Lev. 17:11: rather than

\[219\] and he was counted among sinners

\[220\] was it not necessary that the Christ should suffer and enter into his glory?
offering a definitive understanding of how blood effects atonement the text should be read as an example of gazerah shawah, juxtaposing a reference to the life being in the blood with the comparatively rare view that blood atones for one’s life, thereby arriving at the notion that the life in the blood atones for the life of the worshipper.’ (abstract)²²¹

I also understand Simon Gathercole recently supervised a doctoral thesis on the subject of Lucan soteriology which may be publish soon.

Over all this research suggests the Hebrew understanding of cultic salvation as atonement included the concept of the restoration of creation. The high priest, as the new Adam, walked with God in the Holy of Holies, the cultic representation of the Garden of Eden. The priest brought with him the life-gift of blood and in the Edenic Temple made the annual pronunciation of the Divine Name in its earthly dwelling place. The Divine Name itself signified the life-giving God יהוה who, with the gift-offering of life-blood, restores life to his creation. Although the nascent church appears to have applied a substitutionary understanding of the death of Jesus, modelled especially on the suffering servant of Isaiah, there is no sense of the appeasement of divine wrath in substitutionary sacrifice that we find in neighbouring religions. For the Hebrew people, it was God alone who freely saves because of his steadfast love, by restoring the cosmos to the state of at-one-ness with himself; this is atonement.

Luke’s soteriology is in continuity with this rich OT tradition. God visits his people to redeem them, and through them, redeems the whole world. Their redemption is the restoration of life-giving shalom once lost in Eden, but re-created through the life-gift of the blood of the

new covenant: Jesus’ blood. Thus Luke’s soteriology might be summed up in the name Jeshua–God saves.
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