

Salvation in Luke: the impact of allusions to the cult on his soteriology

**by
Anthony John Talbot**

A thesis submitted to the University of Birmingham for the degree of
MASTER OF ARTS BY RESEARCH

Department of Theology and Religion
College of Arts and Law
University of Birmingham
December 2015

UNIVERSITY OF
BIRMINGHAM

University of Birmingham Research Archive

e-theses repository

This unpublished thesis/dissertation is copyright of the author and/or third parties. The intellectual property rights of the author or third parties in respect of this work are as defined by The Copyright Designs and Patents Act 1988 or as modified by any successor legislation.

Any use made of information contained in this thesis/dissertation must be in accordance with that legislation and must be properly acknowledged. Further distribution or reproduction in any format is prohibited without the permission of the copyright holder.

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.

למרים?

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my profound thanks to my supervisor, Dr Philip Burton, for his invaluable constructive criticism and encouragement.

AT

Contents

0	<i>Introduction</i>	1
0.1	<i>The question</i>	1
0.2	<i>Aspects of the cult relevant to this research</i>	3
	0.2.1 <i>The Year of Jubilee</i>	3
	0.2.2 <i>The Sabbath</i>	4
	0.2.3 <i>The Day of Atonement</i>	5
	0.2.4 <i>Salvation, Cultic Sacrifice and Atonement</i>	6
0.3	<i>Methodology</i>	118
	0.3.1 <i>A Taxonomy of Allusions</i>	18
1a	<i>Chapter One Part One: The Year of Jubilee announced in Nazareth as the programme for salvation in Luke</i>	25
1a.1	<i>Introduction</i>	25
	1a.1.1 <i>Jesus replaces John: the field of scholarship</i>	26
1a.2	<i>The Isaian citation</i>	28
1a.3	<i>The narrative location of Lk 4.18-19 against Mk and Mt</i>	29
1a.4	<i>The response of the hearers</i>	30
1a.5	<i>The role of the spirit in Luke-Acts</i>	35
1a.6	<i>Luke's use of Isaiah in the context of Second Temple exegesis.</i>	40
1a.7	<i>Purposeful anointing– οὗ ἕνεκεν ἔχρισέν με</i>	44
	1a.7.1 <i>Second Temple Messianic Expectations</i>	44
1a.8	<i>Good news for the poor</i>	48
1a.9	<i>Redemption</i>	51
1a.10	<i>The year of the Lord's favour</i>	52
1a.11	<i>Conclusion</i>	57
1b	<i>Chapter One Part Two: The road to Emmaus: the expected redemption and the Year of Jubilee</i>	58
1b.1	<i>Introduction</i>	58
1b.2	<i>The hope of Cleopas versus the passion predictions</i>	59
	1b.2.1 <i>The passion predictions in Luke</i>	61
	1b.2.1.1 <i>The first prediction</i>	61

	1b..2.1.1.2 <i>The Transfiguration</i>	64
	1b.2.1.2 <i>The second prediction of the passion</i>	66
	1b.2.1.3 <i>The third prediction of the passion</i>	67
	1b.3 <i>Messianic expectation and the Year of Jubilee</i>	69
	1b.3.1 <i>Messianic expectation in the Dead Sea Scrolls</i>	70
	1b.3.2 <i>A suffering Messiah</i>	72
	1b.4 <i>Parallels with Philip's encounter with the Ethiopian eunuch</i>	75
	1b.5 <i>The ironic fulfilment of prophecy in the Emmaus pericope</i>	77
	1b.6 <i>Conclusion</i>	78
2	<i>Chapter Two: The Sabbath - Salvation in Luke as the re-establishment of Eden-based</i> <i>שְׁלוֹם</i>	80
	2.1 <i>Introduction</i>	80
	2.2 <i>The diversity of meaning of שְׁלוֹם</i>	86
	2.3 <i>The concept of שְׁלוֹם in the creation stories and the Garden of Eden</i>	89
	2.3.1 <i>שְׁלוֹם in the Priestly source</i>	90
	2.3.1.1 <i>שְׁלוֹם among the beasts</i>	92
	2.3.1.2 <i>The completion of creation</i>	93
	2.3.2 <i>Indications of Edenic שְׁלוֹם in the Yahwist source</i>	95
	2.3.2.1 <i>The goodness of creation</i>	95
	2.3.2.2 <i>Remedying the loneliness of man, creating wholeness</i>	96
	2.3.2.3 <i>peace and delight without shame and the consequence of sin</i>	98
	2.4 <i>The Sabbath consecrated to celebrate שְׁלוֹם and the promise of its re-establishment</i>	99
	2.4.1 <i>Exorcisms: the defeat of evil reversing the rupture of שְׁלוֹם in Eden</i>	101
	2.5 <i>The mythical association of Eden and the Temple</i>	102
	2.5.1 <i>Further evidence of the mythical interpretation of the Eden sanctuary in</i> <i>wider cultic aspects of Genesis.</i>	110
	2.5.2 <i>שְׁלוֹם in the Temple</i>	111
	2.6 <i>שְׁלוֹם the fruit of salvation</i>	112
	2.6.1 <i>Salvation and שְׁלוֹם in Luke</i>	113
	2.7 <i>Conclusions</i>	115
3	<i>Chapter Three: The Day of Atonement - The prayer of the parabolic tax-collector, an</i> <i>allusion to the day of atonement</i>	116
	3.1 <i>Introduction</i>	116
	3.2 <i>The Temple in Luke</i>	117

3.3	<i>The parable of the Pharisee and the tax collector</i>	121
3.3.1	<i>The penitential Psalms</i>	122
3.3.2	<i>The prayer of Manasseh</i>	125
3.3.3	<i>Yom Kippur</i>	127
4	<i>Conclusion</i>	132
5	<i>Bibliography</i>	137
5.1	<i>Ancient Sources</i>	137
5.2	<i>Modern Sources</i>	138

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 salvation in the death of Jesus in Luke. Thus for instance Marshall (1970) and Pilgrim (1971) 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 ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν 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 *δίκαιος* 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')² 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.³ Its cultic dimension was manifest in its being announced by a ram's horn (יִבְלֵ) 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-economic 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*)⁴ 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.

(Lev 25. 8-12). Chapter Two of this thesis argues that in Second Temple⁵ 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*⁶

Perhaps one of the most important concepts that emerges to unite the diverse literature of the OT,⁷ and appears to have been apparent to Luke,⁸ is that the Lord saves. This is expressed in several word groups. $\eta\gamma\eta$, '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 $\eta\gamma\eta$ 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) σῶζω: 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 σῶζω); 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 σῶζω 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 וְיִתֵּן לְךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֶת־חַיֵּיכֶם וְיִתֵּן לְךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֶת־חַיֵּיכֶם וְיִתֵּן לְךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֶת־חַיֵּיכֶם; Lot is saved from Sodom by God's showing the greatness of his kindness וְיִתֵּן לְךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֶת־חַיֵּיכֶם וְיִתֵּן לְךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֶת־חַיֵּיכֶם וְיִתֵּן לְךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֶת־חַיֵּיכֶם, saving his life וְיִתֵּן לְךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֶת־חַיֵּיכֶם וְיִתֵּן לְךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֶת־חַיֵּיכֶם וְיִתֵּן לְךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֶת־חַיֵּיכֶם (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 יָשַׁע (hiphil) or σώωμαι, is the collective deliverance of Israel from slavery: וְיִתֵּן לְךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֶת־חַיֵּיכֶם וְיִתֵּן לְךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֶת־חַיֵּיכֶם וְיִתֵּן לְךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֶת־חַיֵּיכֶם και ἐρρύσατο κύριος τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἐκ χειρὸς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων (Ex 14.30)⁹ which became the historic paradigm of salvation. Despite the undeserving and rebellious people, God displayed his וְיִתֵּן לְךָ יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֶת־חַיֵּיכֶם 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.¹⁰ 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)¹¹ ‘Yet God my King is from of old, working salvation (יְשִׁיעַ) 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.

פִּשׁׁ 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: אֲנֹכִי אֶנְכִּי יְהוָה וְאֵין מִבְּלַעֲדִי (Is 43.11).¹² *ἐγὼ ὁ θεός καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος ἰσχυρῶν* (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 לָאַל, ‘to redeem’, ‘ransom’ or ‘deliver’, and its participle לְאַל (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 בְּרֹעַ אֶתְכֶם בְּרֹעַ נְטוּיָהּ וְאֶל לִטְרוֹסוֹמַי וְיִמָּצֵא עֵן

¹² I, I am the Lord and there is not a saviour except me.

βραχίονι ὑψηλῶ; Psalm 77.14, 15; Jer 50.34).¹³ 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 רָדָה to redeem. The notion of the redeemer God לֹאֵלִים is closely connected with the creator God אֱלֹהֵי 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 (אֵינֶנּוּ כְּעֵבֶד) (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 רָדָה (Ex 15.13)¹⁴ 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 קָדַם 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 (קָדַם) with a lamb, or if you will not redeem (קָדַם) it you shall break its neck. Every first-born of man among your sons you shall redeem (קָדַם)’ (Ex 13.13)

Here קָדַם 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 קָדַם 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.¹⁵ The Lord redeemed (הִתְּפָּח לַטְּרוֹמָה) his people because he loved them, but it was with a mighty hand (הִתְּפָּח בְּיָד חֲזָקָה) 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 (הִתְּפָּח אֶפְרָיִם) 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 (הִתְּפָּח) to redeem (הִתְּפָּח לַטְּרוֹמָה) 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 כֶּפֶר, 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, כֶּפֶר is the price of exchange (ἀλλαγμα): God, the one who saves (יְיָ מוֹשִׁיעַ הַצָּדִיקִים), offers Cyrus Egypt as a כֶּפֶר ἀλλαγμα, and Ethiopia and Seba instead of (תַּחֲתָיִם) 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 (הַמְצִיט אֶת־הָאָרֶץ וְהָעָם אֲשֶׁר־בָּהּ מִכָּל־בְּמִזְמֵר וְהָעָם אֲשֶׁר־בָּהּ מִכָּל־בְּמִזְמֵר וְהָעָם אֲשֶׁר־בָּהּ מִכָּל־בְּמִזְמֵר) (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 (ἀνομία ἡν) 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 ψ̄) (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 (ἐξ)ιλάσκειν 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,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 *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 [*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 (*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 (*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 (*Antiquities* 1.231). However, Josephus 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 (*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

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.

¹² 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 (ὕπὲρ 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 sources¹⁷ 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 (ὕπερ) 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 through 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 led 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 $\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\acute{o}\omega$ (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 $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\tau\rho\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma/\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\acute{o}\omega$ 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 (λυτρώω) 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 flow 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; the concepts associated with shalom and Jesus' healings are repeated through 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),¹⁸ has been described as ‘programmatically’ 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.¹⁹ 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 ἀπαγγείλατε Ἰωάννη ἃ εἶδετε καὶ ἠκούσατε· τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν, χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν, νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται, πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται (7.22).²⁰ 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, ἄφεσις (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 (ἄφεσις 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

²¹ A theory rejected by Wolter, M (2008) **Das Lukasevangelium**, HNT5, Tübingen: Mohr, cited in Smit (2013, p. 45). For recent research on the wider question of the Jesus –John relationship see Dapaah (2005).

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' αὐτὸν ἵνα πιστεύσωσιν, τοῦτ' ἔστιν εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν (Acts 19.4).

²²Thus 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 ²³

Luke 4.18-19	Isaiah 61.1-2; 58.6	Matthew 11.5/Luke 7.22
<p>¹⁸ πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ’ ἐμέ οὗ εἶνεκεν ἔχρισέν με εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς, ἀπέσταλκέν με, κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεςιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν, ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει,</p> <p>¹⁹ κηρύξαι ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτόν.</p>	<p>πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ’ ἐμέ οὗ εἶνεκεν ἔχρισέν με εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς ἀπέσταλκέν με ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τῆ καρδία κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις (כַּיְבֻשׁ captives) ἄφεςιν καὶ τυφλοῖς (כַּיְרִוּסָּ prisoners (MT, 1QIsa^a)) ἀνάβλεψιν (פִּתְּחֵן opening of eyesight)</p> <p>² καλέσαι ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτόν καὶ ἡμέραν ἀνταποδόσεως (reward (כֶּרֶךְ vengeance (MT, 1QIsa^a)) παρακαλέσαι πάντας τοὺς πενθοῦντας</p> <p>58.6b ἀπόστελλε (פְּלֹטֵי to free (MT, 1QIsa^a)) τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει</p>	<p>τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν καὶ χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν, καὶ νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται καὶ πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται.</p>

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 τῆ καρδία and follows the MT כַּיְבֻשׁ כַּיְרִוּסָּ פִּתְּחֵן of Is 58.6 using the infinitive ἀποστεῖλαι rather than the imperative of the LXX ἀπόστελλε τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει.²⁴ The LXX differs slightly from the MT and 1QIsa^a where prisoners (כַּיְרִוּסָּ)

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 (נקָמָה), 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 *hapharah* (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 and Mt

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 (αὐτῷ) 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 θυμοῦ 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.

(4.28),²⁷ 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)²⁸ recalls the aphorism: λόγοι στόματος σοφοῦ χάρις καὶ χεῖλη ἄφρονος καταποντιοῦσιν αὐτόν (Ecclesiastes 10.12);²⁹ and also Jesus' response to the first temptation, completing Satan's (Lk 4.4) reference to Deut 8.3 ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι 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),³⁰ 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).³¹ 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.

³⁰ Leaney, A.R.C. (1976) *The Gospel according to Luke*, London. p.52 cited in O'Fearghail (1984, p. 60).

Hill (1971, p.169) suggests Jesus' mission to those beyond his home was the cause of offence (*non visum*).

³¹ Jeremias, J. (1956) *Jesu Verheißung für die Völker*, **SBT** 24, Stuttgart, 37-39 (= Jesus' promise to the nations, tr. by S.M. Hooke, London 1958, 44-46. cited in O'Fearghail (1984, p.61). Jeremias developed his theory from Bornäuser, K, (1921) **Das Wirken des Christus durch Taten und Worte**, Gütersloh, p.59 cited in O'Fearghail p.61.

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 αὐτῷ);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 παρακαλέσαι 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 υἱὸς ἐστὶν Ἰωσήφ 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 υἱὸς ἔστιν Ἰωσήφ 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);³⁶ 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 ὅσα ἠκούσαμεν γενόμενα εἰς τὴν Καφαρναοὺμ ποιήσον καὶ ὧδε ἐν τῇ πατρίδι σου,³⁷ 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.³⁸

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 Capernaum 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 ὠσὶν ὑμῶν (v. 21)³⁹ 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.⁴⁰ 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.⁴¹

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)⁴²

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 (κραταιόω/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 (ἰσχύς), 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 (μεγαλωσύνη)’; 1Enoch 3.8—wisdom (σοφία) is given by God to the elect; Philo *Legum allegoriarum* 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 θεῖον).

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 πνεύματι τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ εἶπεν· ἐξομολογοῦμαι σοι, πάτερ, κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἀπέκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις· ναὶ ὁ πατήρ, ὅτι οὕτως εὐδοκία ἐγένετο ἔμπροσθέν 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 annunciation of his birth, 'The Holy Spirit will come upon

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 ὕλικός (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 [*didomai*] you authority [*exousia*] to tread [*patein*] upon serpents [*opheis*] and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy; and nothing shall hurt you. Nevertheless do not rejoice in this; that the spirits [*pneumata*] 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 [*didonai*] 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 [*exousia*] to his children to tread [*patein*] on evil spirits [*pneumata*].”

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” (*opheis*) 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).⁴⁶ 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.⁴⁷ 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. Stuhlmüller (1969, p.366)

⁴⁷ cf. Stuhlmüller (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.⁴⁸ The principle of *peshar* exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls takes the words of Scripture as mysteries (מִסְתֵּרִים) 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 με 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 ἕνεκεν ἔχρισέν με*

Luke follows the LXX usage applying ἀλείφω to human anointing⁴⁹ (Lk 7.38, 46), and χρίω to being anointed by God for a sacred purpose, thus priests,⁵⁰ sacrifices⁵¹ and everything connected with the cult,⁵² and kings⁵³ 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 (ἡ ψῆχὴ 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

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 משיחַי 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 משיחַ need not necessarily be interpreted as Messiah and in some instances simply ‘anointed one’ might be more appropriate (as in the case of the משיחַ of 1Qs). He challenges those who interpret the Damascus Document as prophesying two Messiahs in four key texts: ‘when the משיחַ comes from Aaron and Israel’ (CD 9b.10); ‘the משיחַ from Aaron and from Israel’ (CD 9b.29); ‘until there arises the משיחַ of Aaron and Israel’ (‘the משיחַ of Aaron and from Israel’ (CD 15.4); and

‘the משיח of Aaron and Israel’ (CD 18.7). He asserts that the singular משיח implies only one ‘anointed one’.⁵⁴ Considering the משיח of Aaron and Israel Abegg (1995, pp.130-131) argues the משיח is the singular construct and agrees with ‘and he will atone (יוכפר)’ (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;⁵⁵ 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 (כפר) 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 εἵνεκεν ἔχρισέν με⁵⁶ might be taken as Luke’s Jesus seeing himself in a

⁵⁴ However here Hurst may be imposing an anachronistic distinction derived from translation.

⁵⁵ cf. e.g. Becker (1980); Grollenberg (1988, pp.52-56) for extensive research on the subject

⁵⁶ who for this anointed me

priestly role. In Leviticus it was the priests who announced the Jubilee by blowing the ram's horn יִבְּל specifically reserved for them (Lev 25.10; Numbers 36.4; Joshua 6.4). Indeed the יִבְּל was so special it became synonymous with the Jubilee and the Day of Atonement on which it started (Numbers 36.4 לְשָׁרְצָא לְבָנֵי יִבְּלָהּ is rendered ἐὰν δὲ γένηται ἡ ἄφεσις τῶν υἰῶν Ἰσραὴλ in the LXX).⁵⁷ 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 (*Ib.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 ἄφεσις 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 ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα (Lk 3.22).⁵⁸ His favour before God, like
 Samuel's (1Sam 2.26 καὶ τὸ παιδάριον Σαμουηλ ἐπορεύετο καὶ ἐμεγαλύνετο (ἧτῃ) καὶ ἀγαθὸν
 (בט) καὶ μετὰ κυρίου καὶ μετὰ ἀνθρώπων)⁵⁹ might also be expressed in Καὶ Ἰησοῦς
 προέκοπτεν [ἐν τῇ] σοφία καὶ ἡλικία καὶ χάριτι παρὰ θεῶ καὶ ἀνθρώποις (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 (רפף, ἀπαλείφω LXX,
 ἐξιλάσκομαι TH) for iniquity, to bring in everlasting righteousness, to seal both vision
 and prophet, and to anoint (משח, 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 (משח χριστός TH – 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 רַב־צָר (‘poor,’ ‘needy’ Deut 15.4; ‘oppressed’ Amos 4.1;
 ‘the needy one who relies on God’ Psalm 40.18) and נָצַר (‘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 *עֲנָוִים*, those who understand themselves to be lowly or humble before God (such as Moses Numbers 12.3, rendered *πραύς* LXX, or the Psalmist 10.17, *πένης* LXX). In Leviticus (25.25-28) though, it is the impoverished (*אֲנִי מְעַנְיָהוּ*) who await the redemption in the Year of Jubilee.

The *πτωχοί* in Luke are never explicitly the object of *σώζω*. 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 (1 Timothy 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 *πτωχός* 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 ἀνὴρ 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 (χήραι; 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)⁶² to ἀλλ' ἐπὶ παντὶ ῥήματι τῷ ἐκπορευομένῳ διὰ στόματος θεοῦ ζήσεται ὁ ἄνθρωπος (Deut 8.3)⁶³ and argues the words of grace were the message of salvation,⁶⁴ 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 με 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

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 ἡμῶν τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν, (11.4) rather than the Matthean ἄφες ἡμῶν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν (6.12), and the life-giving (χαρίζομαι)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 רִירוּ emancipation, is repeated fifteen times in describing the year of Jubilee in Lev 25. In Deut 15.1f ἄφεσις translates הַטְּוֹשׁ release.

⁶⁷ The life-giving sense of χαρίζομαι (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.

⁶⁸ Yadin, Jonge and van der Woude, Fitzmyer, Strobel, Hill cited in Nolland, 1998, p.193

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[chi]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 δανιεῖς ἀπὸ τῷ (a slightly unusual rendering of the infinitive absolute תַּעֲבֹדְתָּ תַּעֲבֹדְתָּ)⁷⁰ and Deut 15.10

⁷⁰ you shall certainly lend

διδούς δώσεις αὐτῷ καὶ δάνειον δανιεῖς αὐτῷ⁷¹ (expanding the MT יִלְיָהּ יִלְיָהּ). 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 αἰτοῦντί 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 ψῆ) it of his neighbour, his brother, because the LORD’s release has been proclaimed. Of a foreigner you may exact (ἀπαιτέω ψῆ) it; but whatever of yours is with your brother your hand shall release.’ (Deut 15.2, 3).

In Isaiah the πτωχοὶ are named (61.1; Lk 6.20), and the συντετριμμένους τῆ καρδία (Is 61:1)⁷⁵ could describe those set apart (ἀφορίζω) 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 κλαύσετε (Lk 6.25).⁷⁸ The consoling (anointing) joy promised in Isaiah ἄλειμμα εὐφροσύνης (Is 61.3)⁷⁹ is matched by Luke’s χάριτε 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).⁸⁰ With this analysis I suggest Jesus' command Γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες καθὼς [καὶ] ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν (Lk 6.36)⁸¹ summarises the theology of the Jubilee.

The petition of the Lord's prayer: καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἀφίομεν παντὶ ὀφείλοντι ἡμῖν (Lk 11.4)⁸² is also highly suggestive of a reference to the Jubilee injunction: ἀφήσεις πᾶν χρέος ἴδιον ὃ ὀφείλει σοι ὁ πλησίον (Deut 15.2).⁸³ Although the Lucan text is similar to Matthew particularly in respect of the key words ἀφήμι and ὀφείλω: καὶ ἄφες ἡμῖν τὰ ὀφειλήματα ἡμῶν, ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ἡμῶν (Mt 6.12),⁸⁴ 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 ἀφίομεν ὀφείλοντι 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' programmatic 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 αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ μέλλων λυτροῦσθαι 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 ἄφεσις 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:

¹⁹ τὰ περὶ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ Ναζαρηνοῦ, ὃς ἐγένετο ἀνὴρ προφήτης δυνατὸς ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ, ²⁰ ὅπως τε παρέδωκαν αὐτὸν οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες ἡμῶν εἰς κρίμα θανάτου καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν. ²¹ ἡμεῖς δὲ ἠλπίζομεν ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ μέλλων λυτροῦσθαι τὸν Ἰσραὴλ· ἀλλὰ γε καὶ σὺν πᾶσιν τούτοις τρίτην ταύτην ἡμέραν ἄγει ἀφ' οὗ ταῦτα ἐγένετο. ²² ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναῖκες τινες ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐξέστησαν ἡμᾶς, γενόμενα ὀρθρῖναι ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον, ²³ καὶ μὴ εὑροῦσαι τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ἦλθον λέγουσαι καὶ ὀπτασίαν ἀγγέλων ἑωρακέναι, οἱ λέγουσιν αὐτὸν ζῆν. ²⁴ καὶ ἀπῆλθόν τινες τῶν σὺν ἡμῖν ἐπὶ τὸ μνημεῖον καὶ εὔρον οὕτως καθὼς καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες εἶπον, αὐτὸν δὲ οὐκ εἶδον. (Lk 24.19-24)⁸⁶

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).⁸⁷ They had expected Jesus would be the one who was about to redeem (λυτρόω) 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 prediction⁸⁸*

Luke 9.20-22

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

²¹ ὁ δὲ ἐπιτιμήσας αὐτοῖς παρήγγειλεν μηδενὶ λέγειν τοῦτο

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

²³ Ἔλεγεν δὲ πρὸς πάντας· εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἔρχεσθαι, ἀρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καθ' ἡμέραν καὶ ἀκολουθεῖτω μοι.

Mark 8.29-34

²⁹ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπηρώτα αὐτούς· ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι; ἀποκριθεὶς ὁ Πέτρος λέγει αὐτῷ· σὺ εἶ ὁ χριστός.

³⁰ καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ λέγωσι περὶ αὐτοῦ

³¹ Καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς ὅτι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστῆναι.

³² καὶ παρρησίᾳ τὸν λόγον ἐλάλει. καὶ προσλαβόμενος ὁ Πέτρος αὐτὸν ἤρξατο ἐπιτιμᾶν αὐτῷ.

³³ ὁ δὲ ἐπιστραφεὶς καὶ ἰδὼν τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ ἐπετίμησεν Πέτρῳ καὶ λέγει· ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, σατανᾶ, ὅτι οὐ φρονεῖς τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀλλὰ τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

³⁴ Καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος τὸν ὄχλον σὺν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἀκολουθεῖν, ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖτω 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 χριστός (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 ἡμέρας ἀναστῆναι (Mk 8.31 /Lk 9.22).⁸⁹ In Mark Peter subsequently remonstrates with Jesus (8.32) who then commands Peter ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου, σατανα (8.33).⁹⁰ 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.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 remonstrance, 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 (εἰρηνοποιέω—to make *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 (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 ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστὸς [ὁ] Ἰησοῦς ὃν ἐγὼ καταγγέλλω ὑμῖν (Act 17.3):⁹² in the Corinthian synagogue every

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 *confessing* him in persecution.

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 ἔθνεσιν (Acts 26.22-23).⁹³ 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 ἕξαστράπτων Lk 9.29, λινούς (7ῃ) 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.⁹⁴ This subject of their conversation is unique to Luke. Although the language of typology is 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 dérober 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).

texte. Pour les uns et les autres le Livre sacré devient un texte hermétique dont il s'agit, avant tout, de saisir la signification profonde.'⁹⁵

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).⁹⁶ 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; from 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.

1b.2.1.2 The second prediction of the passion

In the second prediction, with greater force than Mark 9.31, θέσθε ὑμεῖς εἰς τὰ ὄψα ὑμῶν τοὺς λόγους τούτους (Lk 9.44),⁹⁷ 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 ἀνάλημψις 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.⁹⁸ 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 מִשְׁרָיִם. 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 τελεσθήσεται 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 συνέχομαι ἕως ὅτου τελεσθῆ.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 κακοῦργοι 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 ἢ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη*.¹⁰² It would be impossible to do justice to the vast and complex subject of the suffering servant here,¹⁰³ 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*,¹⁰⁴ would indicate that his death would be vicarious on behalf of sinners. The last phrase is stronger in its soteriological import than the MT *וַיִּגְדַּל עַל־פְּשָׁעֵינוּ* (he interceded on behalf of transgressions (participle m, pl., abs)). The LXX makes it clear that the servant is delivered up (*παραδίδωμι*) for the sake of, or because of, (*διὰ*) the sins of the lawless (*ἄνομος*, MT: *עֲשֵׂב* 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

¹⁰³ cf. Janowski and Stuhlmacher (eds.) (2004) and Bock (2012)

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 μέλλον 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.¹⁰⁵ 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.¹⁰⁶ 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).¹⁰⁷ Thus, although the disciples on the road are ironically ignorant, the reader understands that λυτρώω 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 (χρίω 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 b[ent] [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). Evans (2000, p.

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 (ἄγω) not delivered (παραδίδωμι 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 ἀνομίας ἡμῶν καὶ μεμαλάκισται διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν* מְפָשְׁעוּנוּ מִדָּבָר מְעֹנֵנֵינוּ וְהוּא מְחַלָּל, ¹⁰⁸ however there is no sense in Isaiah that this wounded person would be healed; 61.1 *ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τῆ καρδία* לְנִשְׁבְּרֵי יֵלֶבֶת ¹⁰⁹ 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* וְהָיוּ מִתִּיבֵי קְבֻרָתָם וְהָיוּ מְבִרְיִין וְהָיוּ מְבִרְיִין, ¹¹⁰ and bringing good news to the poor (*πτωχός* עָנִו) to 61.1 *εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς* לְבָשָׂר עָנָוִים. 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. בָּשָׂר bear tidings, good or bad

Ib.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 ἐστὶν 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 ᾔδεισαν τὸν χριστὸν 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 trial¹¹³ 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).¹¹⁴

In Acts, Peter speaks of God making Jesus the Χριστός foreseen by David (2.29-36), and preaches repentance and baptism ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι 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 χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐκλεκτός (23.35);¹¹⁵ on his cross one of the κακοῦργοι mocks Jesus: if he is the χριστός he could save himself and them by coming down from the cross (23.39). The other κακοῦργος¹¹⁶ upbraids him and gives a different sense of σῶζω: σήμερον μετ' ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ (v.43);¹¹⁷ thus the ultimate end of salvation is now to join Jesus in paradise.

¹¹⁵ the Christ, the chosen one of God

¹¹⁶ criminal/evildoer

¹¹⁷ today you will be with me in paradise

1b.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.¹¹⁸ Whilst in the Emmaus pericope we are only given the general statement: καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν διερμήνευσεν αὐτοῖς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς τὰ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ (Lk 24.27),¹¹⁹ with Philip and the eunuch we are given the text of the prophet Isaiah (53.7-8) he was reading. Some¹²⁰ 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 servant¹²¹ 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 ἐλογίσθη (Lk 22.37).¹²² 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.¹²³ 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 the Temple had not yet been destroyed.

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 ἡμέρα χαρᾶς αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ σωτηρία 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).¹²⁴ The healing of the ten lepers is completed with the irony that only the one who is excluded from Temple worship, ἀλλογενῆς¹²⁵ οὔτος (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:

ὅμοιοί εἰσιν παιδίσι τοῖς ἐν ἀγορᾷ καθημένοις καὶ προσφωνοῦσιν ἀλλήλοις ἃ λέγει·
ἠυλόσαμεν ὑμῖν καὶ οὐκ ὠρχήσασθε, ἐθρηνήσαμεν καὶ οὐκ ἐκλαύσατε¹²⁶

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).

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

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'

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:¹²⁷ 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)¹²⁸ 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;¹²⁹ 13.33) stresses the irony of Lk 24.21; yes he is the prophet ὁ μέλλων λυτροῦσθαι τὸν Ἰσραήλ but the manner of redemption was not what they expected (24.25-27).

Ib.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 ἐῖρωνεία '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 ὄσιος ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ (the Lord is faithful in his words and righteous in all his deeds) and ἐν ἔργῳ 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 שלום

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 שלום 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 שלום 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 שלום 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 שלום. With the loss of this original state of שלום as a consequence of sin, the prophetic promise of the return of שלום and the announcement of the beginning of the re-establishment of שלום 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 שלום. The expectation and fulfilment of salvation as the re-establishment of שלום 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 שלום in fulfilment of the prophetic sense of the Temple cult's שלום, 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).¹³⁰ 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

¹³⁰ for the Son of Man is Lord of the Sabbath

synagogue who declares Jesus to be ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ (v.23)¹³¹ and immediately afterwards Jesus heals Peter’s mother-in-law (Mk 1.29-31 // Lk 4.38-39). In Mark the disciples tell (λέγω) 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).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 //

¹³¹ the holy one of God

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 שְׁלוֹמִים, thus Jesus' explanation for healing on the Sabbath was the appropriateness of unbinding chaos (disability) to recreate order (שְׁלוֹמִים) (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 שְׁלוֹמִים that God had achieved. By the time of the Second Temple, during which a multiplicity of laws concerning Sabbath observance evolved,¹³³ the former would seem to be applicable, and implied in the Deuteronomic 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)

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 (שְׁלוֹמִים 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 שְׁלוֹמִים. The cult becomes a vision of eschatological hope for salvation (2.6) as the promise of future שְׁלוֹמִים. 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 שְׁלוֹמִים according to its Eden-based model. The sick did not have שְׁלוֹמִים. 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 שלום 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 שלום, 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 שלום of Eden (Psalm 34.15).

2.2 *The diversity of meaning of שלום*

The absence of the root שלם 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 שלום ‘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

שְׁלוֹמִים in the piel שְׁלוֹמִים consistently means ‘to pay or repay’ (ἀποτίνω), especially in the covenantal code demanding restitution (שְׁלוֹמִים) 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 (שְׁלוֹמִים); 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 (שְׁלוֹמִים) you with good (ἀνταποτείσει 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 שְׁלוֹמִים. Occasionally the related verbal adjective שְׁלוֹמִים indicates the satisfaction of all one’s needs (Gen 33.18 ‘And Jacob came safely¹³⁵ (שְׁלוֹמִים) to the city of Shechem’) or the ready suitability of unwrought, or complete, stones (הַבְּרִיָּה שְׁלוֹמִים) (ἀκρότομος cut off sharp, abrupt) for the Temple (1 Kg 6.7). The sense of sufficiency in שְׁלוֹמִים can be both internal (desire, joy, pleasure) and external (not lacking in means), and develops into a greeting; are you satisfied? - how are you? שְׁלוֹמִים לְיִשְׂרָאֵל (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 שְׁלוֹמִים is a covenant or agreement; לִי יַעֲשֶׂה שְׁלוֹמִים לִי (ποιήσωμεν εἰρήνην)¹³⁷(Is 27.5) and שְׁלוֹמִים as its consequence is peace (Gerleman, 1997 vol. 3, p.1344). If the meaning of שְׁלוֹמִים is derived from paying or repaying then further research may suggest that there may be a sense of its

¹³⁴ v.19 in the RSV

¹³⁵ Here the LXX just has ἔρχομαι

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 שְׁלוֹמ also covers to be complete, to be finished (Harris, 1980, p.1080; Brown-Driver-Briggs, 2010, p.1022). As a noun שְׁלוֹמ 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 שְׁלוֹמ caused by sin (e.g. Isaiah 48.22 and 57.21 ‘there is no joy (שְׁלוֹמ χαίρω) for the wicked’; Jeremiah 8.11 εἰρήνη in ks Q^{mg} (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 שְׁלוֹמ 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 שְׁלוֹמ 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 *šālôm*, “peace.”’

The cultic aspect of שְׁלוֹם will be developed in (2.6) and its connection with life, in particular the loss of שְׁלוֹם and the deprivation of access to the tree of life will be relevant in (2.3.2.3).

2.3 *The concept of שְׁלוֹם in the creation stories and the Garden of Eden*

Although the Hebrew root שלם is not present in the stories of creation and of Eden in Genesis,¹³⁸ a close examination of the text and corresponding later Jewish reflections on creation suggest the concept שְׁלוֹם 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 שְׁלוֹם 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:

יִצְרָר אֹר וּבֹרָא חֹשֶׁךְ עָשָׂה שְׁלוֹם וּבֹרָא רַע אֲנִי יְהוָה עָשָׂה כָּל־אֱלֹהִים¹³⁹

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

שְׁלוֹם, at least for Deutero-Isaiah, was as much a fundamental part of God's creativity as light and darkness and all that exists including what is bad. Psalm 104 celebrates the order God established as his creation overcame the powers of chaos. Although the word שְׁלוֹם 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 שלם is witnessed in the paraphrase of Genesis found in 4Q422 I (Vermes, 2011, p.478), however, although שלם does not appear out of place, the manuscript is too fragmentary to offer a particular reading of the establishment of שלם in the work of creation.

¹³⁹ I formed light and created darkness, making peace and creating evil, I the Lord made all these

where peace (εἰρήνη), ease (εὐπάθεια) and joy (χαρά) abide (*Legum Allegoriarum* 1.45)¹⁴⁰; the place of perfect happiness (τέλεια εὐδαιμονία)¹⁴¹ leading to virtue (*De plantatione* 1.37-38);¹⁴² and Nod, the opposite of Eden as the place of turmoil (κλόνος) (*De posteritate caini* 1.32).¹⁴³ This state of עוֹלָם 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). עוֹלָם 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 עוֹלָם in the Priestly source

The Priestly account of creation in Genesis 1.1-2.2 emphasises the goodness (טוב - καλός) of creation (1.4, 10, 12, 18, 21, 25, 31) transforming chaos (וְהָיָה תוֹהוּ וָבֵהוֹם formless and empty - ἀόρατος καὶ ἀκατασκευάστος unseen and unformed, Gen 1.2) to order. According to von Rad (1972, p.52) טוב ‘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 טוב is not found in the psalm

¹⁴⁰ τοῦτο [Ἐδέμ] δέ ἐστι τρυφή· ἀρετῆ δὲ ἀρμόττον εἰρήνη καὶ εὐπάθεια καὶ χαρά, ἐν οἷς τὸ τρυφᾶν ὡς ἀληθῶς ἐστι (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 Ναὶδ, τὸν κλόνον, εἰς ὃν ἡ ψυχὴ μετῴκισατο, ἀπέναντι Ἐδέμ. (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 טוב is associated with the state of שְׁלוֹם for instance: Abram is promised he shall rest in שְׁלוֹם after reaching a good (טוב) age (Gen 15.15); Isaac made his covenant with Abimelech stressing he had only done good (טוב) to the latter and sent him and his men away in שְׁלוֹם (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 שְׁלוֹם ; when Pharaoh asked Joseph to interpret his dream, Joseph replied אֶל־הַיְמִים יַעֲנֶה אֶת־שְׁלוֹם (Gen 41:16)–God would answer him with favour/good (שְׁלוֹם). (The LXX gives a double negative answer to Pharaoh interpreting שְׁלוֹם as salvation: ἄνευ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἀποκριθήσεται τὸ σωτήριον Φαραῶ: without God Pharaoh will not be answered with salvation.) Jeremiah (14.19) makes peace and goodness synonymous, he prayed for שְׁלוֹם 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 prae loquatur 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 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 םלֹשׁ 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 םלֹשׁ no longer reigned was that the man and woman became carnivorous (Gen 9.3). Other indications of the demise of the state of םלֹשׁ 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’ *τροφή* 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 םלֹשׁ *εἰρήνη* in the eschatological age (Is 11.6-8 and 65.25 (in both the future peaceful co-existence of animals is prophesied though םלֹשׁ *εἰρήνη* is not used); also Ezekiel 34.25; Job 5.23 *εἰρηνεύω*). םלֹשׁ *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 םלֹשׁ *χαίρω* (Isaiah 48.22; 57.21). The sinful nation is deprived of םלֹשׁ *εἰρήνη* even when they try to fool themselves that they have God’s םלֹשׁ (Jeremiah 8.11) and the proud will not find םלֹשׁ (Ezekiel 7.25).

2.3.1.2 *The completion of creation*

The P source concludes:

וַיְכַלֵּהוּ הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהָאָרֶץ וְכָל־צָבָאָם:

¹⁴⁵(Gen 2.1,2) וַיְכַלֵּהוּ אֱלֹהִים בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי מְלַאכְתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה: וַיִּשְׁבַּת בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי מִכָּל־מְלַאכְתּוֹ אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה:

καὶ συνετελέσθησαν ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ ἡ γῆ καὶ πᾶς ὁ κόσμος αὐτῶν

καὶ συνετέλεσεν ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἕκτῃ¹⁴⁶ τὰ ἔργα αὐτοῦ ἃ ἐποίησεν καὶ κατέπαυσεν τῇ

ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ ὧν ἐποίησεν

Here we have two occurrences of the root כָּלַף (finish). In verse 1 it is in the pual וַיְכַלֵּהוּ,¹⁴⁷ and in verse 2 in the piel וַיְכַלֵּהוּ.¹⁴⁸ 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 כִּסָּה piel e.g. Ex 26.13–the curtains completely cover the tabernacle). With the repetition of כָּלַף 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 שְׁבִיעִי (Gen 2.1-2 is not witnessed in the Qumran scrolls) as *ἕκτος* (in all LXX manuscripts) is notable but not relevant to this discussion.

¹⁴⁷ This is the only occurrence of the pual of כָּלַף 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 (שְׁלוֹם) and quiet (שְׁקֵט).¹⁴⁹ The connection here between כָּלָה and שְׁלוֹם is suggested in the use of שָׁלַם 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 שָׁבַת had its etymological origins in שָׁבַת; 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 (שָׁבַת 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)

¹⁴⁹ trans. Freedman, 1983, p.78. Hebrew: שאנן ונחת שלוה והשקט from http://www.sefaria.org/Bereishit_Rabbah (20/11/2015)

2.3.2 *Indications of Edenic עֲלֹם 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 עֲלֹם 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 עֲלֹם due to their sin.

2.3.2.1 *The goodness of creation*

As God created the garden of Eden (גֶּן, παράδεισος in the LXX, κήπος in Josephus *Antiquities* 1.45) he made it desirable¹⁵⁰ or beautiful (¹⁵¹מְדַמֵּן - ὠραῖος¹⁵² Gen 2.9). The same idea is related to the Sabbath by Isaiah (58.13) albeit with synonymous vocabulary: עֲנָג¹⁵³ τρυφερός.¹⁵⁴ 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 (חַיֵּי הָאָרֶץ - πᾶσαν ψυχὴν ζῶον) 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 niph'al participle of דָּמָה 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 Remedying the loneliness of man, creating wholeness

However God saw Adam’s loneliness and said:

155 (Gen 2.18): לֹא־טוֹב הָיְוָה הָאָדָם לְבַדּוֹ אֶעֱשֶׂה־לּוֹ עֵזֶר כְּנֶגְדּוֹ:

οὐ καλὸν εἶναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον μόνον ποιήσωμεν αὐτῷ βοηθὸν κατ’ αὐτόν

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 מָאֵד וְהִנֵּה־טוֹב מְאֹד (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 (οὐ - לא־טוֹב) 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 (אף אינו אדם שלם) - ‘although not a whole person’ (XVII. 2).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.

¹⁵⁶ trans. Freedman, 1983 vol.1, pp.132-133. Hebrew text: http://www.sefaria.org/Bereishit_Rabbah (20/11/2015)

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 (עֲזָרָה - βοηθός) whom God would create for Adam was to be fit for him (כְּנִגְדּוֹ - κατ’ αὐτόν). The word נִגְדָה suggests the woman was not simply fit for him, but with the preposition ע she would be ‘a help corresponding to him i.e. equal and adequate to himself’ (Brown-Driver-Briggs, 2010, p.617). Richardson (1973, p.66) suggests exegetically ‘a help answering to him,’ that is, ‘one with whom the self can enter into *responsible* relations’. In the LXX ע is rendered κατ’ αὐτόν; κατὰ 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 incompleteness 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) זאת הִפַּעַם עָצָם מֵעֲצָמֵי וּבָשָׂר מִבָּשָׂרִי

τοῦτο νῦν ὀστοῦν ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων μου καὶ σὰρξ ἐκ τῆς σαρκός μου

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, םצָּ, 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 םלׁוּם and delight that characterised their shared life in Eden (Gen 2.25). However, in consequence of their sin, this םלׁוּם 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 םלׁוּם 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 (םצָּ םלׁוּם םצָּ as the ‘bones’ of heaven is rendered ὡσπερ εἶδος στερεώματος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ as the foundation of heaven); Proverbs 15.30; 16.24 (pleasant words are ... health to the body, םצָּ לְ מַרְפֵּא - ἰασις ψυχῆς; Is 66.14. cf Brown, Driver, Briggs, 2010, p.782

¹⁶¹ Trans. Whiston, 1998: βίον εὐδαίμονα καὶ κακοῦ παντὸς ἀπαθῆ βιώσετε μηδεμιᾶ ξαινόμενοι τὴν ψυχὴν φροντίδι. The concept appears similar to the Stoic *apatheia* and Aristotelian *Eudaimonia*.

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 שְׁלוֹמִים 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 שְׁלוֹמִים (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 שְׁלוֹמִים, 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))¹⁶² and there find peace because the Lord lives there (Is 2.2-4); the eschatological peace would be marked by the animals and human race dwelling together without being threatened by each other (Is

¹⁶² Where Psalm 76.3 equates Salem with Zion יְהוָה בְּשָׁלֶם סָבוּ וּמְעוֹנָתוֹ בְּצִיּוֹן (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 Σιών (his place was in peace and his dwelling in Zion) (Ps 75.3).

11.1-9). The future Davidic child-messiah would be שֶׁר־שָׁלוֹם¹⁶³ 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 (יִשׁוּעַ)¹⁶⁴ of Judah and the security (בְּטָחָה)¹⁶⁵ 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 prophecy (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 (דַּם־בְּרִיתִי - 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 ἄξω εἰρήνην ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας [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 נִשְׂתַּיֵּם niph'al she will be saved - σωθήσεται

¹⁶⁵ LXX κατασκηνώσει 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)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 םלֹוֹשׁ 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 םלֹוֹשׁ on the Sabbath was a sign the re-establishment of Edenic םלֹוֹשׁ; 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 םלֹוֹשׁ in Eden*

Genesis identifies the serpent as the initial cause of sin in Eden which resulted in the rupture of the state of םלֹוֹשׁ. 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*

¹⁶⁶ trans. Swete, 1899

opificio mundi 1:157). The Sibylline 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 through the devil’s envy. Revelation (20.2) identifies Satan as a serpent: ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος, ὃς ἐστὶν Διάβολος καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς.¹⁶⁷

Luke’s Jesus explicitly states that the Sabbath day was the appropriate day on which the crippled woman, a daughter of Abraham, should (δεῖ) be loosed from the bonds with which 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 ׀לִוֶּשׁ. In defeating the demons he was reversing the work of the demon-possessed serpent and making the eschatological sign of bringing ׀לִוֶּשׁ 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

¹⁶⁷ the ancient serpent who is the Devil and Satan

Edenic שְׁלוֹם, we shall now consider the question of the mythical connection between Edenic שְׁלוֹם 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 thrived. The garden temple expressed the divine order that was the model of creation, here the state of שְׁלוֹם 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,¹⁶⁹ 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.

table 1

Ex 28.17-20; 36.17-20 (39.10-13 LXX); Ez 28.13		Ez 28.13 MT (not in Dead Sea Scrolls)	Ex 28.17-20; 36.17-20
σάρδιον	sardius/carmelian	אֲדָם	אֲדָם
τοπάζιον	topaz	פְּטָדָה	פְּטָדָה
σμάραγδος	emerald	יְהֵלֵם	בְּרָקֶת
ἄνθραξ	coal/diamond	תְּרֻשֵׁיִשׁ	נֶפֶךְ
σάπφειρος	sapphire	שֹׁהַם	סַפִּיר
ἵασπις	jasper	יִשְׁפָּה	יְהֵלֵם
λιγύριον	liguria/jacinth	לְשֵׁם	לְשֵׁם
ἀγάτης	agate	נֶשֶׁב	נֶשֶׁב
ἀμέθυστος	amethyst	אַחְלָמָה	אַחְלָמָה
χρυσόλιθος	chrysolite/ beryl	סַפִּיר	תְּרֻשֵׁיִשׁ
βηρύλλιον	beryl/onyx	נֶפֶךְ	שֹׁהַם
ὄνυχιον	onyx/jasper	בְּרָקֶת	יִשְׁפָּה

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).¹⁷⁰ The Miscellaneous Rules¹⁷¹(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

¹⁷⁰ trans. Wintermute, 1985, p.73

¹⁷¹ 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.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, κιννάμωμον¹⁷³) 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 (הלך) 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

¹⁷² trans. Isaac, 1983, p.26

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 (ἱματιοφύλαξ 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 (שָׁבַע hiphil) Adam and Eve in tunics (כְּתָנִים) (Gen 3.21) and Moses clothing (שָׁבַע hiphil) Aaron and his sons at their ordination as priests in tunics (כְּתָנִים) (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 20.26¹⁷⁴; 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 כְּדִלְהָהּ, 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).

¹⁷⁴ Wenham, 1994 p.402 incorrectly cites Ex 20.23.

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 שֶׁמֶן מִשְׁחַת־קֹדֶשׁ (Ex 30.25)–the same roots occur in Psalm 89.21 בְּשֶׁמֶן קֹדֶשׁי מִשְׁחָתִיו '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 שֶׁמֶלֶח (onycha from the mollusk strombus) for making incense.
- (6) The dominion/supervision (הִרְדָּה) 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 שלום in the Temple

Having argued above for the understanding that God established שלום 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 שלום. 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’.¹⁷⁵ Haggai (2.9), prophesied the Lord παντοκράτωρ would make the latter Temple more glorious than the former and would make it a place of peace: שלום יהיה איתן ובהמקום הזה – ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ δώσω εἰρήνην.¹⁷⁶ And Philo (*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 ἀνθρώποις).’

¹⁷⁵ trans. Charles, 1908

¹⁷⁶ and in this place I will give peace

2.6 םלִוֶּשׁ *the fruit of salvation*

In the OT we find various indications of a connection between an expectation of salvation and םלִוֶּשׁ. In Psalm 55, attributed to David who pleaded for deliverance from his enemies who threatened his life, the psalmist prayed that the Lord ׁלִוֶּשׁ ׁלִוֶּשׁ ׁלִוֶּשׁ - λυτρώσεται ἐν εἰρήνῃ τὴν ψυχὴν μου (v.19).¹⁷⁷ Isaiah (52.7) spoke in prophecy of the beauty of the feet of the one who would come announcing peace (םלִוֶּשׁ מִמְּשִׁיעַ - εὐαγγελιζομένου ἀκοὴν εἰρήνης)¹⁷⁸ and announcing salvation (מְשִׁיעַ יְשׁוּעָה - ἀκουστέην ποιήσω τὴν σωτηρίαν).¹⁷⁹ The prophetic suffering servant would be the one who by his suffering would make us whole (רַחֵם יְהוָה אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל וְיִלְוֶה אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל - παιδεία εἰρήνης ἡμῶν ἐπ’ αὐτόν)¹⁸⁰ (53:5). Odes 11.1.3 makes peace the fruit of salvation (ἐγένετό μοι εἰς σωτηρίαν ἢ περαιομένη αὐτοῦ, ἐδέδραμον ὁδὸν ἀληθείας ἐν εἰρήνῃ)¹⁸¹ and 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.’ (1QH 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 $\epsilon\lambda\omega\psi$ 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:

$\delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha \epsilon\acute{\nu} \upsilon\psi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma \theta\epsilon\acute{\omega} \kappa\alpha\iota \epsilon\pi\acute{\iota} \gamma\eta\varsigma \epsilon\acute{\iota}\rho\eta\acute{\nu}\eta \epsilon\acute{\nu} \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\rho\acute{\omega}\pi\omicron\iota\varsigma \epsilon\upsilon\delta\omicron\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma$ (Lk 2.14)¹⁸²

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 $\pi\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\iota} \delta\epsilon \tilde{\omega} \epsilon\delta\acute{o}\theta\eta \pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\upsilon}, \pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\upsilon} \zeta\eta\tau\eta\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota \pi\alpha\rho' \acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omicron\upsilon, \kappa\alpha\iota \tilde{\omega} \pi\alpha\rho\acute{\epsilon}\theta\epsilon\tau\omicron \pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\upsilon}, \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\sigma\acute{s}\omicron\tau\epsilon\rho\omicron\nu \alpha\acute{\iota}\tau\eta\sigma\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu \acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omicron\nu$ (Lk 12.48);¹⁸³ 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 $\epsilon\lambda\omega\psi$ in the individual the characteristic of his healing ministry. Luke's Peter spoke of the work of Jesus as spreading

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 שלום: 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 שלום 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 manuscripts¹⁸⁴ 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 שלום 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: ἰδοὺ 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 אָדָם הָאֵלֹהִים ἰδοὺ Ἀδὰμ (Gen 3.22) who was to be

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 שְׁלוֹמִים (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 שְׁלוֹמִים as salvation for the individual, and, as the Sabbath was understood to have been consecrated in part because of the original establishment of שְׁלוֹמִים in creation, the Sabbath was an appropriate day for this salvation. Further this salvation as the re-establishment of שְׁלוֹמִים 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 שְׁלוֹמִים 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, ἰλάσθητί 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 ἰλάσκομαι 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

21.5-36). 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).¹⁸⁶

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 ὃ ἠτοίμασας κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν λαῶν, φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν καὶ δόξαν λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ (Lk 2.31-32),¹⁸⁷ but prophesied that he would also be the sign that would be rejected.

¹⁸⁶ and they were continually in the temple praising God

¹⁸⁷ which you have prepared before the face of all the people, a light of revelation to the nations and glory of your people Israel

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 ἤδαιτε ὅτι ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου δεῖ εἶναι με; (Lk 2.49)¹⁸⁸ 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)¹⁸⁹ 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 ἤμελλεν πληροῦν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ (Lk 9.31).¹⁹⁰ 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,¹⁹¹ 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 ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν (Lk 24.47)¹⁹² 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

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 εἰσὶν δίκαιοι καὶ ἐξουθενοῦντας τοὺς λοιποὺς* (Lk 18.9);¹⁹³ possibly the priests and Pharisees. The drama is enacted in the Temple precincts, the *ιερόν*, 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 *ἰλάσθητι μοι*¹⁹⁴ 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

¹⁹⁴ The Nestle Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 1991, Stuttgart, notes no textual variants in the early manuscripts.

ἡμῖν'), or οἰκτίρμων as in the command of Jesus: Γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες καθὼς [καὶ] ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν. (Lk 6.36)¹⁹⁵

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,¹⁹⁶ 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 ἔλεός σου καὶ κατὰ τὸ πλήθος τῶν οἰκτιρμῶν σου ἐξάλειψον τὸ ἀνόμημά μου.¹⁹⁷

קַח אֱלֹהִים רַחֲמֶיךָ כְּרַב רַחֲמֶיךָ מִחַהּ פְּשָׁעֵי

From the point of view of vocabulary, this bears no resemblance to ὁ θεός, ἰλάσθητί μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ, although in its usual English translation ‘God, be merciful to me a sinner!’¹⁹⁸ it bears a striking similarity. Luke exhibits a meticulous choice in selecting his vocabulary, particularly when alluding to the LXX (e.g. Psalm 16.8-11 MT is accurately cited in Acts 2.25-28). If he had wanted to allude to Psalm 51 surely he would have used the same vocabulary, or at least words suggesting the same ideas within the same context. As I shall

¹⁹⁵ be merciful as your Father is merciful

¹⁹⁶ Ps 6.3; 9.13; 25.16; 26.11; 27.7; 30.10; 31.9; 41.4,10; 51.1; 56.1; 57.1; 86.3, 16 all use ἐλεέω, Ps 119.29, 58, 132 and Ps 123.3 also use ἐλεέω but are not attributed to any author.

¹⁹⁷ have mercy on me God according to your great mercy and according to the fulness of your merciful love wipe out my transgression

¹⁹⁸ 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, ἰλάσθητί 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 *ἐλέεω* in the psalms, all of which translate the *qal* of *נָחַם* only 26.8 makes a reference to the Temple:

κύριε ἠγάπησα εὐπρέπειαν οἴκου σου καὶ τόπον σκηνώματος δόξης σου ¹⁹⁹
 יְהוָה אֶהְבֵּתִי מֵעוֹן בֵּיתְךָ וּמִקוֹם מְשַׁכְּנֶךָ בְּבוֹדְךָ

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

εἰς τὸ τέλος ψαλμὸς ᾠδῆς τοῦ ἐγκαινισμοῦ τοῦ οἴκου τῷ Δαυιδ ²⁰⁰
 מִזְמוֹר שִׁיר־הַנְּחִנּוּת בְּבֵית לְדָוִד ²⁰¹

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 *ἐλέεω* all are found in psalms attributed to David except the two anonymous psalms 118 and 122.

ἰλάσκομαι is found in Psalm 79.9, translating the *piel* imperative *כָּפַר* (atone, be propitious, forgive):

καὶ ἰλάσθητι ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν ἕνεκα τοῦ ὀνόματός σου ²⁰³
 וְכַפֵּר עַל־חַטֹּאתֵינוּ לְמַעַן שְׁמֶךָ

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 *ἰλάσκειν* to refer to the forgiveness of sins in Psalm 78.38:

αὐτὸς δὲ ἐστὶν οἰκτίρμων καὶ ἰλάσεται ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις αὐτῶν²⁰⁴

וְהוּא רַחֵם יְכַפֵּר עֲוֹן

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)²⁰⁵ 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)

Twice ἰλάσκομαι 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 ἰλάση, it translates the adjective סָלַח:²⁰⁶ ready to forgive / forgiving.²⁰⁷ In Psalm 65.4, again as ἰλάση, it translates כָּפַר²⁰⁸ in the context of forgiveness granted by the Lord to those he chooses to dwell in his holy Temple. So the only example of ἰλάσκομαι/כָּפַר 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 וְסָלַחְתָּ qal waw consecutive perfect 2nd person masculine singular

²⁰⁷ The only two other occurrences of סָלַח in the MT Psalms are 86.5 (ἐπιεικής (adj. gentle, kind, tolerant) in the LXX and used as a synonym for חָנּוּן) and 103.3 (εὐλατεύοντα (present participle acc. of εὐλατεύω to be merciful to i.e. 'being merciful towards') only used elsewhere in Dt 29.19 where it also translates סָלַח and Jdt 16.15 LXX only)

²⁰⁸ תְּכַפֵּרם 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)²⁰⁹ 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 apocryphal²¹⁰ 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 συναπολέσης με ταῖς ἀνομίαις μου μηδὲ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα μηνίσας τηρήσης τὰ κακά μοι μηδὲ καταδικάσης με ἐν τοῖς κατωτάτοις τῆς γῆς ὅτι σὺ εἶ κύριε ὁ θεὸς τῶν μετανοούντων.²¹¹

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 ἀνίημι²¹² 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 ἄνεξ μοι translates the MT יִנָּחֵם עַשְׂרִי;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; ἄνεξ 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 *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 (*m.Yoma* 1.4-7) is at variance with Josephus (*Antiquitates* 17:165-166) (Stökl ben

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

²¹³ ‘Look away from me’ the imperative hiphil of נָחַם means literally be made blind.

Ezra, 2002, p22). 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 sanctuary²¹⁴ 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:

אָנָּא הַשֵּׁם, ... הִטָּאתִי לְפָנֶיךָ אֲנִי וּבֵיתִי²¹⁵ וְלִקְהָלָאִים ... וְלִקְהָלָאִים ... פָּפַר נָּא

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

δέομαι τὸ ὄνομα (ὁ θεός) ... ἡμάρτον πρὸ προσώπου σου ἐγὼ 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.

²¹⁵ *mYoma* 3.8 excerpted from 'The Mishnah: A New Integrated Translation and Commentary'" viewed on www.Mishnah.com 2008. 'O Lord, I have ... sinned before you, I and my house. O Lord, forgive the ...sins, which I have done by committing ... sin before you, I and my house' Neusner, J. (1988, p. 269)

τὸ ὄνομα (ὁ θεός), ἰλάσθητι²¹⁶ μοι ... τὰ ἀμάρτηματα ἃ ἤμαρτον 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 (כפר) (*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 ἰλάσκομαι 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 כַּפֵּר, or כָּפַר in the MT, is rendered ἰλάσθητι aorist passive imperative 2ps (Ps 78.9 / 79.9), ἴλεως γενοῦ (Dt 21.8) and the aorist middle imperative 2ps ἐξίλασαι (Lv 9.7; Nm 17.11). Although the vowel shortening כָּפַר to כַּפֵּר is not witnessed in the MT, it is exhibited in other words e.g. כָּפַר (Gen 24.33) and כָּפַר (Is 36.11). The cognate ἐξιλάσθητι would also serve here, of the 92 occurrences of כָּפַר (piel) 81 render it as ἐξιλάσκομαι, 3 as ἰλάσκομαι (Ps 65.4; 78.38; 79.9), and one each as ἀγιάζω consecrate (ἀγιάζειν present infinitive and ἀγιάσαι aorist infinitive both in Ex 29.36), ἀθώω let go unpunished (ἀθώωσης subjunctive aorist 2ps Jer 18.23), ἀπαλείφω wipe off (ἀπαλείψαι aorist infinitive Dan 9.24), ἐκκαθαρίζω clear away (ἐκκαθαριεῖ indicative future 3ps Dt 32.43), καθαρίζω purify (καθαριεῖς indicative future 2ps Ex 29.37), καθαρὸς γίνομαι become clean (καθαρὰ nom fem γενέσθαι inifinitive aorist middle Is 47.11) and ἴλεως γίνομαι become propitious (ἴλεως γενοῦ aorist imperative Dt 21.8). Leviticus and Numbers, in describing the Day of Atonement, only have ἐξιλάσκομαι. 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 כָּפַר.

chiastic structure focusing on the parable of the two debtors, and the repeated use of ἀφίημι,²¹⁷ 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 make 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),²¹⁸ but at another level it may be Jesus’ announcement that the Temple and its 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 programmatic 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

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)²¹⁹ 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),²²⁰ 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 published 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 pronouncement 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

²²¹ cf. <http://www.bnts.org.uk/groups/synoptic-gospels/2014-synoptic-gospels>

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

Bibliography

5.1 *Ancient Sources*

Dead Sea Scrolls

1QH VII

1QM

1QpHab

1Qs

1QSa

1Qsb

4Q161

4Q163

4Q164

4Q175

4Q265

4Q285

4Q471b

4Q491

4Q521

CD The Damasus Document

Aristobulus of Paneas, *Commentaries on the writings of Moses*

Augustine, *Confessions*

Eusebius, *Praeparatio*

Josephus, *Antiquities*

Philo *De Cerubim*

Philo *De Decalogo*

Philo *De Opificio Mundi*

Philo *De Posteritate Caini*

Philo *De Vita Mosis*

Philo *Legatio ad Gaium*

Philo *Legum Allegoriarum*

Philo *Quaestiones in Genesim*

Philo *Quod Deus Sit Immutabilis*

Pseudo-Philo *Biblical Antiquities*

Midrash Rabbah Genesis

The Mishnah

The Jerusalem Targum, Genesis

1Enoch

2Enoch

Joseph and Aseneth

The Apocalypse of Baruch

The Apocalypse of Moses

The Book of Jubilees

The History of the Rechabites

The Lives of the Prophets

The Sibylline Oracle

The Testament of Abraham

The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs

5.2 *Modern Sources*

Abegg, M.G. (1995) The Messiah at Qumran: are we still seeing double? **Dead Sea Discoveries**, 2, 2, pp. 125-144

Alexander, L. (1986) Luke's preface in the context of Greek preface-writing, **Novum Testamentum**, 28, 1, pp.48-74

Allison, D. (2010) **Constructing Jesus, memory, imagination, and history**, London: SPCK

Alter, R. (2011) **The art of biblical narrative**, Revised and Unupdated, New York: Basic Books

Amann, É. (1950) "Type" in Vacant, A., Mangenot, E. and Amann, É. (eds.) **Dictionnaire de théologie Catholique contenant l'exposé des doctrines de la théologie Catholique leurs preuves et leurs histoire**, Vol. 15, part 2, Paris: Libraire Letouzey et Ané pp. 1935-1945

Anderson, F.I. (1983) "2 (Slavonic Apocalypse of) Enoch" in Charlesworth, J.H. (ed.) **The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Vol. 1 Apocalyptic literature & testaments**, New York: Doubleday pp.91-223

Anderson, H. (1964) Broadening horizons: the rejection at Nazareth pericope of Lk 4:16-30 in the light of recent critical trends, **Interpretation** 18, pp. 259-275

Atkinson, J.C. (2006) "The Revelation of Love in the Song of Songs" in Melina, L. & Anderson, C. (eds.) **The Way of Love: Reflections on Pope Benedict XVI's Encyclical, Deus Caritas Est**, San Francisco: Ignatius Press

Averbeck, R.E. (1997) "כפר" in Van Gemeron, W.A. (ed.) **The new international dictionary of Old Testament theology and exegesis, Vol.2**, Carlisle: Paternoster, pp.689-710

Bammel, E. (1968) "πτωχός" in Kittel, G. and Friedrich, G. (trans. Bromiley, G.) **Theological Dictionary of the New Testament**, Vol. 6, Michigan: Eerdmans pp.885-915

Bammel, E. (1970) **The trial of Jesus**, London; SCM

- Barker, M. (2003) **The great high priest: the temple roots of Christian liturgy**, London, New York: T&T Clark
- Barker, M. (2004) **Temple theology: an introduction**, London: MPG Books
- Barker, M. (2007) **The hidden tradition of the Kingdom of God**, London: SPCK
- Barr, J. (1978) **The semantics of Biblical language**, Oxford: OUP
- Barrett, C.K. (1970) **The Holy Spirit and the Gospel tradition**, London: SPCK
- Bauckham, R. (2006) **Jesus and the Eyewitnesses: the Gospels as eyewitness testimony**, Grand Rapids, Cambridge: Eerdmans
- Bauckham, R. (2008) In Response to My Respondents: Jesus and the Eyewitnesses in Review. **Journal For The Study Of The Historical Jesus**, 6(2), pp. 225-253.
- Beal, T. K. (1992) "Ideology and intertextuality" *in* Fewell, D. N. (ed.) **Reading between texts: Intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible**, Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press
- Beardslee, W. (1969) **Literary criticism of the New Testament**, GBS, Philadelphia: Fortress Press
- Beasley-Murray, G.R. (1947) The two Messiahs in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, **JTS**, 48, pp.1f. (*non visum*) cited *in* Bruce (1960)
- Becker, J. (trans. Green, D.E.) (1980) **Messianic expectation in the Old Testament**, Edinburgh: T&T Clark
- Bednarz, T. (2013) Status Disputes and Disparate Dicta: Humor Rhetoric in Luke 16:14-18. **Biblical Interpretation**, 21(3), pp.377-415.
- Berger, Y. (2009) Ruth and the David-Bathsheba Story: Allusions and Contrasts , **Journal for the study of the Old Testament**, 33(4), pp. 433-452
- Bergsma, J. S. (2007) **The Jubilee from Leviticus to Qumran: a history of interpretation**, supplement to *Vetus Testamentum* 115, Leiden, Boston: Brill
- Bock, D.L. (2012) **The Gospel According to Isaiah 53: encountering the Suffering Servant in Jewish and Christian theology**, Grand Rapids: Kregel
- Booth, W. (1961) **The rhetoric of fiction**, Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Borgen, P. (1996) "In accordance with the scriptures" *in* Barclay, J. & Sweet, J. (eds.) **Early Christian thought in its Jewish context**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Bornkamm, G., Barth, G. & Held, H. J. (1963) **Tradition and interpretation in Matthew**, London: SCM
- Brown, F., Driver, S., Briggs, C. (2010) **Hebrew and English Lexicon**, Massachusetts: Hendrickson
- Brown, M. L. (2012) "Jewish interpretations of Isaiah 53" *in* Bock, D.L. and Glaser, M. (eds.) **The Gospel according to Isaiah 53**, Grand Rapids: Kregel, pp. 61-83
- Brown, R. E. (1968) "Apocrypha; Dead Sea scrolls; other Jewish literature" *in* Brown, R., Fitzmyer, J., Murphy, R. (ed.) **The Jerome Biblical commentary**. Vol. 2, London: Chapman, pp. 535-560
- Brown, R. E. (1977) **The birth of the Messiah : a commentary on the infancy narratives in Matthew and Luke**, London: Chapman
- Browning, W. R. F. (1960) **The Gospel according to Luke**, The torch Bible Commentaries, London: SCM
- Bruce, F. F. (1960) **Biblical exegesis in the Qumran texts**, London: Tyndale

- Bultmann, R. (1963, German original 1921) **The history of the synoptic tradition**, Oxford: Blackwell
- Burkett, D. (2004) **Rethinking the Gospel sources: from Proto-Mark to Mark**, London: T&T Clark
- Burrows, M. (1952) The Messiahs of Aaron and Israel, **Anglican Theological Review**, 34 (4), pp. 202-206
- Caird, G.B. (1963) **Saint Luke**, Pelican Gospel Commentaries, London: Penguin
- Carroll, J. (January 2003) Welcoming grace, costly commitment: an approach to the Gospel of Luke. **Interpretation**, 57(1), pp.16-23.
- Cassuto, (1974) **A commentary on the book of Exodus**, Jerusalem: Central Press
- Charles, R. H. (1908) **The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs**, Oxford: Clarendon
- Chilton, B. D. (1992) **The temple of Jesus: his sacrificial program within the cultural history of sacrifice**, University Park PA: Pennsylvania State University Press
- Clements, R. E. (1965) **God and Temple: the idea of the Divine Presence in ancient Israel**, Oxford: Blackwell
- Coggins, R. J. & Houlden, J. L. (eds.) (1990) **A dictionary of biblical interpretation**, London: SCM
- Collins, J. J. and Harlow, D. C. (eds.) (2012) **Early Judaism: a comprehensive overview**, Grand Rapids, Cambridge: Eerdmans
- Collins, J. J. (1995) **The Sceptre and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and other ancient literature**, New York: Doubleday
- Collins, N. L. (2014) **Jesus, the sabbath and the Jewish debate: healing on the sabbath in the first and second centuries CE**, London, New York: Bloomsbury, T&T Clark
- Conzelmann, H. (1969). **The theology of St. Luke**, 2nd ed. London: Faber and Faber Limited.
- Cross, F. M. (1973) **Canaanite myth and Hebrew epic: essays in the history of the religion of Israel**, Cambridge, Massachusetts & London: Harvard
- Crossan, J. D. (1973) **In parables**, New York: Harper & Row
- Crossan, J. D. (1991). **The Historical Jesus: the life of a Mediterranean Jewish peasant**, San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco.
- Culpepper, R. A. (1987) **Anatomy of the Fourth Gospel, a study in literary design**, Philadelphia: Fortress
- Dapaah, D.S. (2005) **The relationship between John the Baptist and Jesus of Nazareth: a critical study**, Lanham: University of America Press
- Dawsey, J. (1989). The literary unity of Luke-Acts: questions of style – a task for literary critics. **New Testament Studies**, 35, pp. 48-66
- Dawsey, J. M. (1986) **The Lukan voice: confusion and irony in the Gospel of Luke**, Macon: Mercer University Press
- Del Agua, A. (1993) The Narrative of the Transfiguration as a derashic scenification of a faith confession (Mark 9.2–8 Par). **New Testament Studies**, 39, pp. 340-354
- Denaux, A., Corstjens, R. & Mardega, H. (2009) **The vocabulary of Luke: an alphabetical presentation and a survey of characteristic and noteworthy words and word groups in Luke's Gospel**, Leuven: Peeters
- Dibelius, M. (German original 1919, 1934) **From tradition to Gospel**, Cambridge: James Clarke

- Doble, P. (1996) **The paradox of salvation**, Society for the New Testament Studies *Monograph Series* 87, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Doherty, D. S., Matthews, K. A. & Sloan, R. B. (eds.)(1994) **Foundations for Biblical interpretation**, Nashville: Broadman & Holman
- Doty, D. (2011) **Eden's bridge: the marketplace in creation and mission**, Eugene: Wipf and Stock
- Douglas, J. D. et al. (eds.) (1984) **New Bible dictionary**, Wheaton, Illinois: Tynedale House Publishers, Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press
- Downing, F. (January 1992) The ambiguity of "the Pharisee and the toll-collector" (Luke 18:9-14) in the Greco-Roman world of late antiquity. **Catholic Biblical Quarterly**, 54(1) pp. 80-99
- Drury, J. (1973) **Luke**, J.B. Phillip's Commentaries, London, Glasgow: Fontana
- Edelman, D. (1986) An appraisal of Robert Alter's approach, **Biblical Research** 31, pp.19-25
- Evans, C. A. (1994) "The Pharisee and the publican: Luke 18.9-14 and Deuteronomy 26" *in* Evans, C. A. & Sanders, J. A. (eds.) **Studies in Scripture in early Judaism and Christianity 3**, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 104, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press
- Evans, C. A. (2000) "Messianic Apocalypse (4Q521)" *in* Evans, C. A. & Porter, S. E. (eds.) **Dictionary of New Testament background**, Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, pp. 695-698
- Evans, C. A. (2001) "Jesus and the Spirit: on the origin and ministry of the second Son of God" *in* Evans, C. A. and Sanders, J. A. (eds.) **Luke and Scripture: the function of sacred tradition in Luke-Acts**, Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock
- Evans, C. F. (1957) "The central section of St. Luke's Gospel" *in* Nineham, D. E. (ed.) **Studies in the Gospels: essays in memory of R.H. Lightfoot**, Oxford: Blackwell
- Feuillet, A. (1973) Témoins oculaires et serviteurs de la parole, **Novum Testamentum**, 15 (4), pp. 241-259
- Fewell, D. N. (1992) "Introduction: writing, reading and relating" *in* Fewell, D. N. (ed.) **Reading between texts: intertextuality and the Hebrew Bible**, Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press
- Fishbane, M. (1985) **Biblical interpretation in ancient Israel**, Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Fitzmyer, J. (1978) review of an unknown Jewish sect, **Journal of Biblical literature**, 97(1), pp. 154-155
- Fitzmyer, J. A. (1981). **The Gospel according to Luke I-IX**, 7th ed. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Fitzmyer, J. A. (1985). **The Gospel according to Luke X-XXIV**, 7th ed. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Fletcher-Louis, C. (2000) "Jesus inspects his priestly war party (Luke 14.25-35)" *in* Moyise, S. (ed.) (2000) **The Old Testament in the New Testament: essays in honour of J. L. North**, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 189, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, pp.126-143
- Fletcher-Louis, C. (2006) Jesus as the High Priestly Messiah: Part 1, **Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus**, Vol.4(2), pp.155-175
- Fletcher-Louis, C. (2007) Jesus as the High Priestly Messiah: Part 2, **Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus**, Vol.5(1), pp.57-79
- France RT (1982) **Jesus and the OT**, London: Tynedale

- Freedman, H. (trans.) (1983) **Midrash Rabbah, Genesis** Vol. 1, London, New York: Soncino Press
- Freedman, H. & Simon, M. (trans.) **Midrash Rabbah**, London: soncino press accessed online: <http://archive.org/stream/RabbaGenesis/midrashrabbahgen027557mbp#page/n7/mode/2up>
- Friedrichsen T. (March 2005) The temple, a Pharisee, a tax collector, and the kingdom of God: rereading a Jesus parable (Luke 18:10-14a). **Journal Of Biblical Literature**, 124(1), pp. 89-119
- Funk, W. (1966) **Language, hermeneutic, and the Word of God**, New York: Harper & Row
- Gathercole, S. (2015) **Defending substitution: an essay on atonement in Paul**, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic
- Gerleman, G. (1997) “מִלֵּךְ to have enough” in Jenni, E. & Westermann, C. (eds.) **Theological lexicon of the Old Testament**, vol 3, pp. 1337-1348, Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson
- Gifford, E.H. (trans.) (1903) **Eusebius of Caesarea: Praeparatio Evangelica (preparation for the Gospel)** https://docs.google.com/file/d/0Bw9DD8Hgvs_HNDY0OTExM2UtZWU3Yy00MTg3LTg2NjYtNzZiNWMyMzhNTIx/edit?ddrp=1&hl=en_GB
- Gils, F. (1957) **Jésus prophète d’après les évangiles synoptiques**, Louvain: Publications Universitaires
- Ginzberg, L. (trans. Szold, H.) (1968) **The legends of the Jews**, 7 Vols. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America
- Ginzberg, L. (1922) **An unknown Jewish sect**, cited in Abegg (1995) (*non visum*)
- Goldhill, S. (2005) **The Temple of Jerusalem**, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press
- Goodacre, M. (2001) **The synoptic problem: a way through the maze**, London: Sheffield Academic Press
- Goodspeed, E. (January 1912) The vocabulary of Luke and Acts. **Journal Of Biblical Literature**, 31(2), pp. 92-94
- Gorman, M. J. (2014) **The death of the Messiah and the birth of the new covenant: a (not so) new model of atonement**, Eugene, Oregon: Cascade
- Goulder, M. D. (1994) **Luke a new paradigm**, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 20, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press
- Green, E. M. B. (1965) **The meaning of salvation**, London: Hodder and Stoughton
- Green, J. (2013) **New Testament theology: the theology of the Gospel of Luke**, Cambridge: CUP
- Green, J. (2002) Scripture and theology: failed experiments, fresh perspectives. **Interpretation**, 56(1), pp. 5-20.
- Green, J. B. (1997) **The Gospel of Luke**. Grand Rapids, Mich.: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co,
- Green, L. (1972) Justification in Luther’s preaching on Luke 18:9-14. **Concordia Theological Monthly**, 43(11), pp. 732-747.
- Grollenberg, L. (trans. Bowden, J.) (1988) **Unexpected Messiah: or how the Bible can be misleading**, London: SCM
- Grundmann, Hesse, de Jonge and van der Woude (1981) “χρίω, χριστός, ἀντιχριστος, χρῖσμα, χριστιανός” in Friedric, G (ed.) **Theological dictionary of the New Testament, Vol IX**, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer Verlag, pp.493-580
- Gunn, D. M. & Fewell, D. N. (1996) **Narrative in the Hebrew Bible**, Oxford: OUP

- Hanson, A. T. (1983) **The living utterances of God. The New Testament exegesis of the Old**, London: DLT
- Hare, D. R. A. (1985) "The lives of the prophets" *in* Charlesworth, J.H. (ed.) **The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Vol. 2 Expansions of the "Old Testament" and legends, Wisdom and philosophical literature, prayers, psalms, and odes, fragments of lost Judeo-Hellenistic works**, New York: Doubleday pp.91-223
- Harrington, H. K. (2001) **Holiness, Rabbinic Judaism and the Graeco-Roman world**, London: Routledge
- Harris, D. J. (1970) **The biblical concept of peace: shalom**, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Book House
- Harris, R., Archer, G.L. and Waltke, B.K. (eds.) **Theological wordbook of the Old Testament**, Chicago: Moody Press
- Harrison, S. (2005) The case of the Pharisee and the tax collector: justification and social location in Luke's Gospel. **Currents In Theology And Mission**, 32(2), pp. 99-111
- Hartsock, C. (2013) The Healing of the man with dropsy (Luke 14:1-6) and the Lukan Landscape. **Biblical Interpretation**, 21(3), pp. 341-354.
- Hays, R. B. (1989) **Echoes of Scripture in the letters of Paul**, New Haven, London: Yale University Press
- Hayward, C. T. R. (1996) **The Jewish Temple: a non-Biblical sourcebook**, London and New York: Routledge
- Head, P. (2004) "the Temple in Luke's Gospel" *in* Alexander, T.D. and Gathercole, S. (eds.) **Heaven on earth: the Temple in Biblical theology**, Carlisle, Waynesboro, GA: Paternoster, pp. 101-119
- Hengel, M. (1981) **The atonement: A study of the origins of the doctrine in the New Testament**, London: SCM
- Hengel, M. with the collaboration of Bailey, D.P. (2004) "The effective history of Isaiah 53 in the pre-Christian period" *in* Janowski, B. and Stuhlmacher, P. (eds.) **The suffering servant Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian sources**, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Cambridge: Eerdmans
- Henrich, S. (2006) Embedded in the first century, alive for our own: recent research on Luke's Gospel. **Currents In Theology And Mission**, 33(6), pp. 481-486
- Hill, D. (1967) **Greek words and Hebrew meanings: studies in the semantics of soteriological terms**, Society for the New Testament Studies *monograph series* 5, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Hill, D. (1971) The rejection of Jesus at Nazareth (Luke iv 16-30), **Novum Testamentum** 13, pp. 161-180
- Holmgren, F. (1994) The Pharisee and the Tax Collector : Luke 18:9-14 and Deuteronomy 26:1-15. **Interpretation**, 48(3), pp. 252-261
- Hurst, L. D. (1999) Did Qumran expect two Messiahs? **Bulletin for Biblical Research**, 9, pp.157-180
- Hurtado, L. (2013) Resurrection-Faith and the 'Historical' Jesus. **Journal For The Study Of The Historical Jesus**, 11(1), pp. 35-52
- Isaac, E. (1983) "1 (Ethiopic Apocalypse of) Enoch" *in* Charlesworth, J. H. (ed.) **The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Vol. 1 Apocalyptic literature & testaments**, New York: Doubleday pp. 5-89

- Iser, W. (1974) **The implied reader: patterns of communication in prose fiction from Bunyan to Beckett**, Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press
- Jacobs, L. (1995) **The Jewish religion: a companion**, Oxford: OUP
- Jaffee, Martin S. (2001) Torah in the Mouth: Writing and Oral Tradition in Palestinian Judaism 200 BCE-400 CE. **Oxford Scholarship Online**. Available from: <<http://www.myilibrary.com?ID=53113>>
- Janowski, B. and Stuhlmacher, P. (eds.) (2004) **The suffering servant Isaiah 53 in Jewish and Christian sources**, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Cambridge: Eerdmans
- Jeremias, J. (1963) **The parables of Jesus**, 6th ed., London: SCM
- Jeremias, J. (1964) "Adam" in Kittel, G. and Friedrich, G. (trans. Bromiley, G.) **Theological Dictionary of the New Testament**, Michigan: Eerdmans Vol. 1 pp.141-143
- Johnson, L. T. (1996). **The real Jesus: the misguided quest for the historical Jesus and the truth of the traditional Gospels**, San Francisco: Harper San Francisco
- Josephus, F. (trans. Whiston, W.) (1998). **The complete works**, Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson.
- Käsemann, E. (1964, German original 1954) **The problem of the historical Jesus**, London: SCM
- Kearney, P. J. (1977) "Creation and liturgy: the P redaction of Ex 25-40" in **Zeitschrift Für Die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft**, 89, 3, pp. 375-387
- Kee, H. C. (trans.) (1983) "Testaments of the twelve patriarchs" in Charlesworth, J.H. (ed.) **The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Vol 1 Apocalyptic literature and testaments**, New York, London, Toronto, Sydney, Auckland: Doubleday
- Kimball, C.A. (1994) **Jesus' exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel**, Journal for the study of the New Testament supplement series 94, Sheffield: JSOT Press
- Klausner, J. (1956) **The messianic idea in Israel from its beginning to the completion of the Mishnah**, London: George Allen and Unwin Ltd
- Knust, J. (2014) The Biblical Odes and the Text of the Christian Bible: A Reconsideration of the Impact of Liturgical Singing on the Transmission of the Gospel of Luke. **Journal Of Biblical Literature**, 133(2), pp. 341-365
- Koehler, L and Baumgartner, W. et al. (eds.) (1999) **The Hebrew and Aramaic lexicon of the Old Testament**, Leiden, Boston, Köln: Brill
- Kuhn, K. (2013) Deaf or defiant? The literary, cultural, and affective-rhetorical keys to the naming of John (Luke 1:57-80). **Catholic Biblical Quarterly**, 75(3), pp. 486-503
- Lanfer, P. T. (2009) "Allusions to and expansion of the tree of life and garden of Eden in Biblical and pseudepigraphical literature" in Evans, C. A. & Zacharias, H.D. (eds.) **Early Christian literature and intertextuality, Vol. 1 Thematic studies**, Library of New Testament Studies, London: T&T Clarke
- Leaney, A. R. C. (1971) **A commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke**, London: Adam & Charles Black
- Liddell, H. G. & Scott, R. (1883) **A Greek-English lexicon** 7th ed., Oxford: Clarendon
- Lieu, J. (1997) **The Gospel of Luke (Epworth Commentary)**, London: Epworth Press
- Lohmeyer, E. (1961) **Lord of the Temple: a study of the relation between cult and Gospel**, Edinburgh, London: Oliver and Boyd
- Longenecker, R. N. (1999) **Biblical exegesis in the apostolic period**, 2nd ed., Cambridge: Eerdmans

- Luck, U. (1960) Kerygma, Tradition und Geschichte bei Lukas, **ZKT**, 57, pp.51-66, cited in Marshall (1992) (*non visum*)
- Marincola, J. (2010) **A companion to Greek and Roman historiography**, Chichester: Wiley (ebook)
- Marshall, I. H. (1992) **Luke: historian and theologian**, (3rd ed.) Guernsey: Paternoster
- Marshall, I. L. (1979) **The Gospel of Luke: a commentary on the Greek Text**, Exeter: Paternoster Press
- Martin Kähler (1896 trans. Braaten, C.E. 1964) **The so-called historical Jesus and the historic biblical Christ**, Philadelphia: Fortress Press
- Marxen, W. (1969) **Mark the evangelist**, Nashville: Abingdon
- Milik, J. T. (1959) **Ten Years of discovery in the wilderness of Judea**, London: SCM
- Modahl, B. (2010) Living by the Word. **Christian Century**, 127(21), pp. 20-21
- Moles, J. (2011) Luke's Preface: the Greek Decree, Classical Historiography, and Christian Redefinitions. **New Testament Studies**, 57(4), pp. 461-482. (http://eprint.ncl.ac.uk/file_store/production/170511/86C0C68E-0A17-4DB4-894F-30263A470422.pdf)
- Morris, L. (1964) **The New Testament and the Jewish lectionaries**, London: Tyndale Press (http://biblicalstudies.org.uk/pdf/lectionaries_morris.pdf)
- Morris, L. (2008). **Luke: an introduction and commentary**, Nottingham: Inter-Varsity.
- Moyise, S. (2000) **The Old Testament in the New Testament: essays in honour of J. L. North**, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 189, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Moyise, S. (2001) **The Old Testament in the New: an introduction**, Continuum Biblical Studies Series, London, New York: Continuum
- Murphy, F. J. (1993) **Pseudo-Philo : rewriting the Bible**, New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Neusner, J. et al. (eds.)(1987) **Judaisms and their messiahs at the turn of the Christian era**, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Neusner, J. (trans.) (1988) **The Mishnah, a new translation**, New York: Hamilton
- Neusner, J. (2012) **A rabbi talks with Jesus**, Montreal & Kingston, London, Ithaca: McGill-Queen's University Press
- Neyrey, J. H. (1985) **The Passion according to Luke: a redaction study of Luke's soteriology**, New York: Paulist
- Neyrey, J. H. (1991) **The social world of Luke-Acts: models for interpretation**, Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Nickelsburg, G. W. E. (1981) **Jewish literature between the Bible and the Mishnah; a historical and literary introduction**, London: SCM
- Nolland, J. (1989) **Word Biblical commentary, Vol 35A: Luke 1-9:20**, Dallas: Word Books
- North, C. R. (1964) **The Second Isaiah: introduction, translation and commentary to chapters XL-LV**, Oxford: Clarendon
- North, R. (1968) "The Chronicler: 1-2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah" in Brown, R., Fitzmyer, J. & Murphy, R. (eds.) **The Jerome Biblical commentary, vol. 1**, London: Chapman. pp. 402-438
- O'Fearghail, F. (1984) Rejection in Nazareth: Lk 4 22, **Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft**, 75(1), pp. 60-72

- Okorie, A. M. (1997), The implied reader of Luke's gospel, **Religion & Theology**, 4(3), pp. 220-228
- Padilla, O. (2009). Hellenistic παιδεία and Luke's education: a critique of recent approaches, **New Testament Studies**, 55, pp. 416-437
- Petersen, N. R. (1980) "Literary criticism in Biblical studies" in Spencer, R. A. (ed.) **Orientation by disorientation: studies in literary criticism and biblical literary criticism, presented in honor of Willaim A. Beardslee**, 3-24. PTMS 35. Pittsburgh: Pickwick
- Powell, M. (1993) **What is narrative criticism? a new approach to the Bible**, London: SPCK
- Procksch (1967) "λόγος the word group in the Old Testament" in Kittel, G. Friedrich, G. (eds.) Bromily, G.W. (trans.) **Theological Dictionary of the New Testament**, vol 4, Michigan: Cushing Malloy
- Quentin J. Schultze, Q. J (2004) **Habits of the high-tech heart: living virtuously in the information age**, Grand Rapids: Baker Academic
- Ravens, D. A. S. (1988) The setting of Luke's account of the anointing: Luke 7.2-8.3 **New Testament Studies**, 34, April, pp.282-292
- Rea, J. (1990) **The Holy Spirit in the Bible: all the major passages about the spirit, a commentary**, Lake Mary, Florida: Creation House
- Reardon, T. W. (2013) Recent trajectories and themes in Lukan Soteriology, **Currents in Biblical Research**, 12 (October), pp. 77-95
- Reumann, J. P. (1977) History of lectionaries: from the synagogue at Nazareth to post-Vatican II, **Interpretation**, 31(2), pp. 116-130
- Rhoads, D. (2004) **Reading Mark, engaging the Gospel**, Minneapolis: Fortress
- Richardson, A. (1973) **Genesis 1-11**, London: SCM
- Roth, S. J. (1997) **The blind, the lame, and the poor: character types in Luke-Acts**, Journal for the Study of the New Testament supplement series 144, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press
- Rowley, H. H. (1952) **The Zadokite fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls**, Oxford: Blackwell
- Sanders, E. P. (1985) **Jesus and Judaism**, London: SCM Press
- Sanders, J. A. (1982) Isaiah in Luke, **Interpretation**, 36(2), pp. 144-155
- Sawyer, J. F. A. (1972) **Semantics in Biblical research: new methods of defining Hebrew words for salvation**, Studies in Biblical Theology, Second Series 24, London: SCM Press
- Schneider, J. (1979) "στρατός" in Kittel, G. & Friedrich, G. (eds.) **Theological dictionary of the New Testament**, Vol 7, Michigan: Cushing - Malloy, pp.572-584
- Shellard, B (2002) **New light on Luke: its purpose, sources and literary context**, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 215, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press
- Shelton (2000) **Mighty in word and deed: the role of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts**, Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock
- Shuchat, W. (2006) **The Garden of Eden & the struggle to be human: according to the Midrash Rabbah**, Jerusalem: Devora Publishing
- Siegel, D. (1989) **Where heaven and earth touch**, Northvale, New Jersey, London: Jason Aronson
- Simon, U. E. (1953) **A theology of salvation: a commentary on Isaiah 40-55**, London: SPCK
- Sloan, R. B. (1977) **The favorable year of the Lord: a study of the jubiliary theology in the Gospel of Luke**, A dissertation presented to the faculty of theology of the University of Basel, Switzerland, for the degree of Doctor of Theology, Austin, Texas: Schola Press

- Smit, J. (2013) The function of the two quotations from Isaiah in Luke 3-4 *in* Koet, B. J., Moyise, S. and Verheyden, J. (eds.) **The Scriptures of Israel in Jewish and Christian tradition, essays in honour of Maarten J. J. Menken**, Supplements to Novum Testamentum 148, Leiden, Boston: Brill
- Soggin, J. A. (1993) "Sabbath" *in* Metzger, B.M. & Coogan, M.D. (eds.) **The Oxford companion to the Bible**, New York, Oxford: OUP, pp. 665-666
- Stackhouse, J. G. (1998) **Can God be trusted? Faith and the challenge of evil**, Oxford, New York: OUP
- Stager, L. E. (1999) Jerusalem and the garden of Eden, **Eretz Israel**, 26, pp. 183-194
- Stamps, D. L. (2006) "Introduction: the use of the Old Testament in the New Testament" *in* Porter, S. E. (ed.) **Hearing the Old Testament in the New Testament**, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, pp. 9-37
- Stegman T. (2007) Reading Luke 12:13-34 as an elaboration of a chreia: how Hermogenes of Tarsus sheds light on Luke's Gospel. **Novum Testamentum**, 49(4), pp. 328-352.
- Stendebach (2006) "שְׁלוֹמֵי שָׁלוֹם" *in* Anderson et al. (eds.) **Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament** vol 15, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, pp.13-49
- Stökl Ben Ezra, D. (2003), **The impact of Yom Kippur on early Christianity**; Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 163, Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck)
- Stolz, F. (1997) "יְרוּשָׁלַיִם Zion" *in* Jenni, E. & Westermann, C. **Theological lexicon of the Old Testament**, vol 2, Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, pp.1071-1076
- Stuhlmüller, C. (1968) "Deutero-Isaiah" *in* Brown, R. et al. (eds.) **The Jerome Biblical commentary**, Vol 1, London: Chapman, pp. 366-386
- Sweeney, M. A. (1998) "The Latter Prophets" *in* McKenzie, S. L. & Graham, M. P. (eds.) **The Hebrew Bible today: an introduction to critical issues**, Westminster: John Knox Press, pp. 69-94
- Talbert, C. H. (1980) "Prophecies of future greatness: the contribution of Greco-Roman biographies to an understanding of Luke 1:5-4:15" *in* Crenshaw, J. L. & Sandmel, S. (eds.) **The Divine helmsman: studies on God's control of human events presented to Lou H. Silberman**, New York: Ktav
- Tan, B. (2000) The parable of the Pharisee and the tax-collector in Luke 18:9-14: a study on the practice of prayer, **Asia Journal of Theology**, 14(2), p. 290
- Tannehill, R. C. (1975) **The sword of his mouth**, Semia supplements 1, Philadelphia: Fortress
- Tannehill, R. C. (1985) Israel in Luke-Acts: a tragic story, **Journal Of Biblical Literature**, 104(1), pp. 69-85
- Tannehill, R. C. (1986) **The narrative unity of Luke-Acts: a literary interpretation. Vol 1: the Gospel according to Luke**, Philadelphia: Fortress
- Tate, W. R. (2000) **Biblical interpretation: an integrated approach**. 2nd ed. Peabody: Hendrickson
- Tiegreen, C. (2011) **The one year experiencing God's presence devotional: 365 daily encounters to bring you closer to him**, Carol Stream: Illinois
- Townsend, J. T. (trans.) (1989) **Midrash Tanhuma: translated into English with introduction, indices and brief notes, Vol 1 Genesis**, Hoboken, N. J.: Ktav
- Tyson, J. B. (1986) **The death of Jesus in Luke-Acts**, Columbia South Carolina: South Carolina University Press
- Ulrich, E. (ed.) (2013) **The Biblical Qumran scrolls: Transcriptions and textual variants, Vol.1: Genesis-Kings**, Leiden, Boston: Brill

- Ulrich, E. (ed.) (2013) **The Biblical Qumran scrolls: Transcriptions and textual variants, Vol.2: Isaiah-Twelve minor prophets**, Leiden, Boston: Brill
- Van Til, K. (2006) Three anointings and one offering: the sinful woman in Luke 7.36-50. **Journal Of Pentecostal Theology**, 15(1), pp. 73-82
- Vermes, G. (trans.)(2011) **The complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English**, London: Penguin
- Via, D. (1969) **The parables: their literary and existential dimension**, Philadelphia: Fortress Press
- Vinson, R. (2008) The Minas touch: anti-kingship rhetoric in the Gospel of Luke. **Perspectives In Religious Studies**, 35(1), pp. 69-86.
- Volgger, A. (2006) The day of atonement according to the temple scroll, **Biblica**, 87, pp. 251-260
- von Rad, G. (Marks, J.H. trans.) (1972) **Genesis: a commentary**, revised edition, London: SCM
- Walker, P. (1996) **Jesus and the Holy City: New Testament perspectives on Jerusalem**, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans
- Watts, J. D. W. (1985) **Isaiah 1-33 Word Biblical commentary 24**, Waco, Texas: Word Books
- Watts, J. D. W. (1987) **Isaiah 34-66 Word Biblical commentary 25**, Waco, Texas: Word Books
- Weinert, F. (1982) Luke, the Temple and Jesus' saying about Jerusalem's abandoned house (Luke 13:34-35). **Catholic Biblical Quarterly**, 44(1), pp. 68-76
- Weinfeld, M. (1981) "Sabbath, temple and the enthronement of the Lord—the problem of the Sitz im Leben of Gen 1:1-2:3" **in Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de H. Cazelles**, Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag
- Wenham, G. J. (1987) **Genesis 1-15: Word Biblical Commentary 1**, Dallas, Texas: Word Inc.
- Wenham, G. J. (1994) "Sanctuary symbolism in the garden of Eden story" **in** Hess, R. S. & Tsumura, D. T. (eds.) **I studied inscriptions from before the flood: ancient Near Eastern, literary, and linguistic approaches to Genesis 1-11**, Sources for Biblical and theological study vol 4, Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, pp. 399-404
- Westerholm, S. and Evans, C. A. (2000) "Sabbath" **in** Evans, C.A. and Porter, S.E. (eds.) **Dictionary of New Testament backgrounds**, Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, pp.1031-1035
- Westermann, C. (1969) **Isaiah 40-66: a commenatry**, London: SCM
- Williams, J.J. (2010) **Maccabean Martyr Traditions in Paul's Theology of Atonement: did martyr theology shape Paul's conception of the Jesus' death?** Eugene: Wipf and Stock
- Winter, P. (1974) **On the trial of Jesus**, Berlin, New York: de Gruyter
- Wintermute, O. S. (1985) "Jubliees" **in** Charlesworth, J.H. (ed.) **The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Vol 2 expansions of the "Old Testament" and legends, wisdom and philosophical literature, prayers, psalms and odes, fragments of lost Judeo-Hellenistic works**, New York: Doubleday
- Wright, N. T. (1996) **Jesus and the victory of God**, London: SPCK
- Wright, N. T. (2000) **The challenge of Jesus**, London: SPCK
- Young, F. M. (1975) **Sacrifice and the death of Christ**, London: SPCK
- Young, F. M. (1979) **The use of sacrificial ideas in Greek Christian writers from the New Testament to John Chrysostom**, Patristic Monograph Series, No.5, Cambridge, Massachusetts: The Philadelphia Patristic Foundation