

# Durham E-Theses

---

## *Luke's use of the Old Testament in Luke 22-23*

William J. Larkin

---

### How to cite:

Larkin, William J. (1974) Luke's use of the Old Testament in Luke 22-23. Doctoral thesis, Durham University.

---

### Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a <https://etheses.durham.ac.uk/id/eprint/3003/> is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

LUKE'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN LUKE 22-23

William J. Larkin, Jr.

Ph.D. Thesis

Durham, November, 1974.

ABSTRACT

While Luke understands Jesus' suffering and death as the fulfilment of OT prophecy, he does not use many OT quotations or allusions to express this fact in his passion narrative. The question arises: How does Luke use the OT in his passion narrative, especially to show prophetic fulfilment?

This study seeks to answer this question through an identification and analysis of the OT quotations, allusions, ideas, and stylistic elements in Luke 22-23. The criteria for identification and critical analysis are gathered from studying the history of scholarship on the subject from the Reformation to 1972.

Our findings are that Luke presents the fulfilment of the key OT prophecy in his passion narrative, Is. 53:12/Lk. 22:37, through a thematic development of various aspects of its message. Other OT quotes, allusions, ideas, and stylistic elements contribute to the development of this theme. Luke's approach to the OT is Christocentric both in the sense that all the quotations and most of the allusions occur in the reported words of Jesus, and in the sense that most of Luke's OT material refers to the OT promises of a suffering and glorified Messiah. OT ideas also occur mainly in the reported words of Jesus and the OT stylistic elements are best understood as examples of LXX style imitation.

We found that Luke's lack of allusions and quotations was probably due to his desire to have his readers relive the fulfilment events of the Passion as they unfold in the narrative without being distracted by editorial fulfilment proof-texts. Yet, at the same time Luke, the Christian theologian to the Gentiles, did make extensive use of the OT. With a Christocentric interpretational approach to understanding OT prophecy and theological content within a salvation history framework, Luke shows how the OT was important to Gentile Christians.

**LUKE'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN LUKE 22-23**

**VOLUME I**

**by**

**William J. Larkin, Jr.**

**Ph.D. Thesis**

**Submitted to the Faculty of Divinity**

**University of Durham**

**November 1974**

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author.  
No quotation from it should be published without  
his prior written consent and information derived  
from it should be acknowledged.

## PREFACE

One spring afternoon in 1969 G. N. Stanton now of the University of London raised this question. If Luke can place such emphasis in Luke 24 on the fulfilment of OT Scripture in Jesus' suffering and death, why does he not include many more fulfilment proof-texts in his account of Jesus' passion? This puzzle gave impetus to my study of Luke's use of the OT in his passion narrative. I chose this subject for a senior research paper at Princeton Theological Seminary. This I wrote under the guidance of Prof. B. M. Metzger in 1970. With this paper I successfully competed for the Senior Class Fellowship in NT Studies. Through this fellowship and the aid of the Higgins Scholarship Fund of the Presbytery of Chicago I was able to begin my study at the University of Durham in 1971 and continue to do research into the question of Luke's use of the OT. Under the wise guidance of my supervisor Prof. C. K. Barrett, I was introduced to the intricacies of research into this topic on the post-graduate level. After a year of my own exegetical study and a year of investigating the contribution of other scholars to this subject area I wrote the substance of my research and findings in the following paper.

I wish to thank my mentors, particularly Prof. Barrett, whose counsel and aid have been invaluable. The cheerful and thoroughly competent service of Durham University Library's reference section staff in obtaining volumes on Inter-library loan has been a great aid to my study. Finally I want to thank my wife Edna for her selfless devotion and constant encouragement throughout this project.

This work aims at reflecting what I have perceived in the example of my mentors: a true love for Christ and his Word which makes one zealous for excellence in the right interpretation of the Scriptures.

Durham  
Autumn 1974.



TABLE OF CONTENTSVOLUME I

|                                 | Page |
|---------------------------------|------|
| PREFACE                         | iii  |
| LIST OF TEXTS AND ABBREVIATIONS | vi   |
| INTRODUCTION                    | 1    |

PART I. SURVEY OF THE HISTORY OF  
THE STUDY OF LUKE'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN  
LUKE 22-23, 1500-1972

|                                   |    |
|-----------------------------------|----|
| INTRODUCTION                      | 5  |
| Chapter                           |    |
| I. THE PERIOD FROM 1500 To 1800   | 8  |
| II. THE PERIOD FROM 1801 To 1910  | 13 |
| III. THE PERIOD FROM 1911 To 1945 | 34 |
| IV. THE PERIOD FROM 1946 To 1972  | 60 |
| V. THE TASK                       | 95 |

PART II. AN EXEGETICAL STUDY OF  
LUKE'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN LUKE 22-23

|                                                                                               |     |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| I. LUKE 22:1-14: PLOT AND PREPARATION                                                         | 105 |
| II. LUKE 22:15-38: THE LAST SUPPER AND THE FAREWELL DISCOURSE; SOME PRELIMINARY OBSERVATIONS. | 133 |
| III. LUKE 22:15-20: THE LAST SUPPER                                                           | 137 |
| IV. LUKE 22:21-23: JESUS FORETELLS HIS BETRAYAL                                               | 190 |
| V. LUKE 22:24-30: PLACES IN THE KINGDOM                                                       | 212 |
| VI. LUKE 22:31-34: THE EXHORTATION TO PETER                                                   | 237 |
| VII. LUKE 22:35-38: PREPARATION FOR CONFLICT                                                  | 254 |
| VIII. LUKE 22:39-46: DECISION IN THE GARDEN                                                   | 307 |
| IX. LUKE 22:47-53: THE ARREST                                                                 | 335 |
| X. LUKE 22:54-62: PETER'S DENIAL                                                              | 360 |

VOLUME II

|                                                  |     |
|--------------------------------------------------|-----|
| XI. LUKE 22:63-65: ABUSE AT THE HANDS OF ENEMIES | 374 |
| XII. LUKE 22:66-71: THE SANHEDRIN TRIAL          | 386 |
| XIII. LUKE 23:1-5: THE TRIAL BEFORE PILATE       | 435 |
| XIV. LUKE 23:6-12: JESUS BEFORE HEROD            | 450 |

|                           |                                                                            |     |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| XV.                       | LUKE 23:13-25: THE TRIAL BEFORE PILATE COMPLETED                           | 461 |
| XVI.                      | LUKE 23:26-32: THE WAY TO THE CROSS                                        | 479 |
| XVII.                     | LUKE 23:33-38: THE CRUCIFIXION                                             | 504 |
| XVIII.                    | LUKE 23:39-43: THE PENITENT CRIMINAL                                       | 547 |
| XIX.                      | LUKE 23:44-49: THE DEATH OF JESUS                                          | 569 |
| XX.                       | LUKE 23:50-56: THE BURIAL                                                  | 619 |
| PART III. THE CONCLUSIONS |                                                                            |     |
| INTRODUCTION              |                                                                            | 636 |
| I.                        | THE RESULTS                                                                | 637 |
| II.                       | LUKE'S USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT                                            | 657 |
| III.                      | THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR<br>LUKE THE CHRISTIAN THEOLOGIAN | 694 |
| INDEX                     |                                                                            | 700 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY              |                                                                            | 703 |

## TEXTS AND ABBREVIATIONS

We have constantly consulted these editions of the various ancient works which were relevant to our study.

## Old Testament

Biblia Hebraica, ed. R. Kittel, 7th ed.; Stuttgart, 1962.

Septuaginta, ed. A. Rahlfs, 8th ed.; Stuttgart, 1965; 2 Vols.

## New Testament

The Greek NT, ed. K. Aland et al., 2nd ed.; Stuttgart, 1968.

Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum, ed. K. Aland, 4th ed.; Stuttgart, 1967

## English Bible

The Revised Standard Version, 1952.

## Jewish Literature

The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the OT, ed. R. Charles; Oxford, 1913; 2 Vols.

SBK<sup>1</sup>

Die Texte aus Qumran, ed. E. Lohse; Darmstadt, 1964.

Quotations from extra-Biblical non-Jewish literature were checked whenever possible by referring to the appropriate volumes in the Loeb Classical Library series.

The abbreviations for books of the Bible were taken from BAG.<sup>2</sup> We are using the LXX as our basic text for citing OT chapter and verse. When the LXX differs from the MT, we have placed the MT reference in parentheses. The symbols for various mss of the OT and NT text tradition are taken from our editions.

References to Jewish literature are abbreviated according to the lists in BAG; K. G. Kuhn, Konkordanz zu den Qumrantexten, Göttingen, 1960; and H. L. Strack, Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash, N.Y., 1959. References to other ancient works are made according to BAG and Liddell and Scott's<sup>3</sup> abbreviations.

<sup>1</sup>See the following list of abbreviations.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

Following is a list of abbreviations for journals and monograph series. We give those which differ from or are not included in W. G. Kummel's (Introduction to the NT, translated from the 14th German ed. by A. J. Mattill, Jr.; Nashville, 1966) list. Also included are some general abbreviations.

|                         |                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|-------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <u>ATR</u>              | <u>Anglican Theological Review</u>                                                                                                                                              |
| <u>BAG</u>              | W. Bauer, <u>A Greek-English Lexicon of the NT and Other Early Christian Literature</u> , translated from the 4th German ed. by W. F. Arndt and F. W. Gingrich (Chicago, 1957). |
| <u>BDF</u>              | F. Blass and A. Debrunner, <u>A Greek Grammar of and Other Early Christian Literature</u> , translated from the 9th-10th German ed. by R. W. Funk (Chicago, 1967).              |
| <u>BZNW</u>             | Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche                                                                                |
| <u>CJT</u>              | <u>Canadian Journal of Theology</u>                                                                                                                                             |
| DSS                     | The Dead Sea Scrolls                                                                                                                                                            |
| <u>Eph. Theol. Lov.</u> | <u>Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses</u>                                                                                                                                      |
| <u>HTR</u>              | <u>Harvard Theological Review</u>                                                                                                                                               |
| <u>JSJ</u>              | <u>Journal for the Study of Judaism</u>                                                                                                                                         |
| <u>JTS</u>              | <u>Journal of Theological Studies</u>                                                                                                                                           |
| <u>KEKNT</u>            | Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar<br>über das Neue Testament                                                                                                                      |
| Liddell and Scott       | H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, <u>A Greek-English Lexicon</u> , ed. H. S. Jones and R. McKenzie; 9th ed. (Oxford, 1940), and Supplement (1968).                                    |
| MT                      | The Masoretic Text, the Hebrew OT.                                                                                                                                              |
| <u>Ned TT</u>           | <u>Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift</u>                                                                                                                                       |
| <u>NTS</u>              | <u>New Testament Studies</u>                                                                                                                                                    |
| <u>RB</u>               | <u>Revue biblique</u>                                                                                                                                                           |
| <u>RSR</u>              | <u>Recherches de Science Religieuse</u>                                                                                                                                         |
| <u>RSV</u>              | <u>The Revised Standard Version of the Bible</u>                                                                                                                                |
| <u>SBK</u>              | H. L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, <u>Kommentar zum NT aus Talmud und Midrasch</u> , 4 Vols. (Munich, 1922-28).                                                                    |
| SBT                     | Studies in Biblical Theology                                                                                                                                                    |
| <u>Sci. Eccl.</u>       | <u>Sciences Ecclésiastiques</u>                                                                                                                                                 |

|                         |                                                                                                                                              |
|-------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <u>SJT</u>              | <u>Scottish Journal of Theology</u>                                                                                                          |
| <u>SNTS Bull.</u>       | <u>Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas Bulletin</u>                                                                                           |
| <u>Stud. Theol.</u>     | <u>Studia Theologica</u>                                                                                                                     |
| Stud.                   | Studien                                                                                                                                      |
| Studien z. Umwelt d. NT | Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments                                                                                                      |
| <u>TDNT</u>             | G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, <u>Theological Dictionary of the NT</u> , trans. and ed. G. W. Bromiley; 9 Vols. (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1964-74). |
| <u>Theol. Stud.</u>     | <u>Theological Studies</u>                                                                                                                   |
| <u>ThStuKr</u>          | <u>Theologische Studien und Kritiken</u>                                                                                                     |
| <u>Tyn. Bull.</u>       | <u>Tyndale Bulletin</u>                                                                                                                      |
| <u>VT</u>               | <u>Vetus Testamentum</u>                                                                                                                     |
| X                       | times                                                                                                                                        |
| zANT                    | zum Alten und Neuen Testament                                                                                                                |
| zNT                     | zum Neuen Testament                                                                                                                          |
| <u>ZTK</u>              | <u>Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche</u>                                                                                                  |

## INTRODUCTION

Luke emphasizes in his two resurrection appearances narratives the fact that all OT Scripture prophesies the death and resurrection of Jesus the Messiah (Lk. 24:25-27, 44-48). A cursory examination of Luke 22-23 will show, however, that unlike Matthew and John, Luke does not often quote from the OT to show that certain OT prophecies have been fulfilled in the events of the Passion. The obvious ways in which a NT writer might show that an event is a fulfilment of the OT, then, are missing from Luke. The question arises: How is Luke's understanding of OT fulfilment in the event of Christ's death expressed in the way he wrote his passion narrative? How does Luke use the OT in chapters 22-23?

There are at least four ways in which Luke uses the OT in the writing of his gospel. He quotes from it. He alludes to certain OT passages. He employs OT ideas as the foundations for various theological themes in his work. He imitates the style of the OT in its Greek version through his choice of vocabulary and use of certain grammatical constructions.

These four ways: quotation, allusion, idea, and style, vary in the degree to which the writer indicates to his readers his specific intention of recalling the OT. A quotation is more explicit than an allusion. Both of these are more obviously references to the OT than the OT thought content of the writer's theological themes or the semitic element in his style. The distinctive contribution of OT thought to the meaning of a word, as Luke uses it, is not always easily identifiable. The OT in Greek owes much of its characteristic style to the fact that it is a translation from a semitic source. That a semitic element in Luke's style is an example of intentional imitation of LXX style, and not evidence that the gospel itself is based on semitic sources, is a conclusion which must be drawn with much care.

Another respect in which these ways of using the OT vary is the range of OT material to which they refer. The quotation refers to one specific

passage or combination of passages. The allusion, while normally pointing to one identifiable passage, may, because of the lack of unique wording, point to a number of similar passages. An OT idea is still broader in scope, taking its basic content from whatever parts of the OT may give evidence. The same is true of OT style. Thus, the categories of OT usage in Luke define themselves, not only by the degree of explicitness with which the writer makes his intention to refer to the OT clear to the reader, but also by the range of OT material to which they refer. Of course, the formal and functional differences between quotation, allusion, idea, and stylistic element, as they appear in the text, also aid in distinguishing one from another.

To understand the way Luke uses the OT in these four forms we must ask about materials, sources, and methods. We must discover what OT material is present in the gospel. What OT quotations, allusions, ideas, and stylistic elements does Luke use? Each form will have its own rules for identifying what part of the Lukan text is an expression of it. These rules will be embodied in a basic definition that will be proposed at the end of Part One.

We need to ask about the source of this OT material. Since this thesis focuses on Luke's use of the OT in Luke 22-23, the answer to this question will develop within prescribed limits. Others have asked about Jesus' use; the early church's use as it handed on the tradition; Luke's literary sources' use.<sup>1</sup> These come into our consideration as the proper background to Luke's use, yet they can only be employed as they help us to understand our writer's own work.

We should also inquire about the interpretational methods which govern Luke's use of the OT. Luke's hermeneutical point of view and

---

<sup>1</sup>See below, pp. 65, 34, 51.

his purpose in writing will determine the kinds of interpretational methods employed in his various ways of using the OT.

Part One of this thesis will trace the history of scholarship devoted to the question of Luke's use of the OT from the Reformation to the present day. This will place our study in historical perspective. We also hope to discover the various methods, observations, analyses, and theories which have come from a study of the use of the OT in the New, in general, and in Luke, in particular. At the conclusion of this descriptive and sometimes critical essay, we shall state the nature of our task, if we are to learn how Luke uses the OT in Luke: 22-23.

Part Two will consist of an identification and analysis of the evidence for OT quotation, allusion, idea, and style in Luke: 22-23. Part Three, the conclusions, will attempt to discern patterns of usage, so that on the basis of our identification and analysis we may theorize concerning the methods of interpretation which Luke used. In this way we hope to answer satisfactorily the question: How did Luke use the OT in Luke. 22-23?



PART I. SURVEY OF THE HISTORY OF THE STUDY OF LUKE'S USE OF THE  
OLD TESTAMENT IN LUKE. 22-23, 1500-1972

## INTRODUCTION

Scholarship in this field appears to pass through three stages: collection, hypothesis, and analysis.<sup>1</sup> Scholars identify, collect, and classify all the relevant evidence. Having discerned the basic shape of the evidence, the investigator proceeds to the hypothesis stage. He seeks a general theory, which will explain as much of the evidence as possible through a single or at the most a few causes.<sup>2</sup> The next stage, analysis, tests the theory by asking whether the individual pieces of evidence are, indeed, examples of the theory. As a result of analysis, the theory may be further refined or modified. It may even be discarded and a new hypothesis offered in its place.

Throughout the history of scholarship in this field, this process has not progressed smoothly and at the same rate in all areas of the study of OT usage. Several factors have either hastened or retarded investigation.

A close examination of the evidence for one kind of OT use may yield results which are at variance with what the researcher may have expected to find. The desire to understand, test, and explore the implications of these new findings gives added impetus to research into this particular kind of OT use. The new findings and the resulting discrepancy between old expectations and new understanding may occur when a theory is being tested by analysis. It may arise when the theory is in the form of a doctrinal assertion about Scripture. The formulation of the assertion is found to be at variance with the evidence of Scripture itself. For example, as we shall see,<sup>3</sup> the doctrine of the divine authorship of a perfect Scripture and the difference

---

<sup>1</sup>D. F. Payne, "The Semitisms in Acts," Apostolic History and the Gospel, ed. W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin (Exeter, 1970), p. 137.

<sup>2</sup>e.g. see below, p. 34.

<sup>3</sup>See below, p. 9f.

in text-form between OT quotations in the NT and their original MT and LXX text-form produced a discrepancy, which demanded an explanation.

Another source of discrepancy is the importation of methods of investigation into the discipline of Biblical studies which were developed in disciplines which had presuppositions foreign to it. For instance, the scientific historical critical method with its naturalistic presuppositions is at variance with the Bible, which makes claims based on supernaturalistic presuppositions. When this method was introduced into Biblical studies in the nineteenth century, it created a discrepancy between the interpretation on naturalistic grounds of the proper meaning of an OT passage in its original historical context and the NT interpretation of an OT passage as prophecy whose proper meaning is discovered in its fulfilment within the mission of Jesus.<sup>1</sup> Much of the history of Biblical scholarship is a description of discrepancies discovered, followed by explanatory hypotheses, which, in turn, must yield to further analysis. The goal, but not always the result, was greater precision of definition and clarity in understanding the evidence.

Just as discrepancies spurred students to greater interest and activity in the investigation of an area of OT use, so lack of interest or lack of information impeded study. The question of Luke's role in the way the OT is used in his gospel lay largely unexplored until redaction criticism followed from criticism after the Second World War. In the wake of H. Conzelmann's work on the theology of Luke, many studies have considered the theological themes in Luke and their OT background,<sup>2</sup> thus giving attention to a neglected area, Luke's use of OT ideas.

The lack of evidence for the contemporary language milieu of NT Greek, the non-literary Greek of the Hellenistic period, prevented scholars from

---

<sup>1</sup>See below, p. 18f.

<sup>2</sup>See below, p. 88.

assessing ~~correctly~~ the nature of NT Greek. With the archaeological discoveries of the latter part of the nineteenth century that background became available. With this standard of comparison, it was now possible to ask what ~~and~~ characteristics in NT style may be due to the influence of the OT.<sup>1</sup>

Because the use of the OT in the New was not "systematically discussed until after the Reformation,"<sup>2</sup> we choose to begin our survey of the history of this part of Biblical scholarship with the sixteenth century. We seek to understand through the scholarship of others all that is involved in investigating the materials, sources, and methods of the NT use of OT quotations, allusions, ideas, and stylistic elements.

By studying historically the experience of others we shall be able to understand the limitations as well as the positive significance of their findings. For, we shall see not only their particular emphases, ~~but also~~ the areas they ignored; ~~but~~ we shall also discover the limitations which ~~resulted~~ from either the myopic focus of a discrepancy debate or ~~from~~ a lack of information placed on their findings.

We will seek to avoid repetition and only mention new contributions which a given writer makes. We will restrict ourselves to material that aids us in our specific goal, understanding Luke's use of the OT in Luke. 22-23.<sup>3</sup> At the conclusion of this survey we shall try to define more precisely what is our task in each area of Luke's use of the OT.

---

<sup>1</sup>See below, p. 26f.

<sup>2</sup>H. Gough, The NT Quotations... (London, 1855), p. iii.

<sup>3</sup>For other surveys of the history of scholarship in this area and for bibliography see our bibliography under A. Clemen; E. E. Ellis, Paul's Use...; L. Goppelt, Typos; C. H. Toy; For an account of more recent research see under M. P. Miller; M. Rese, Alttestamentliche Motive...; D. M. Smith, Jr.; cf. below, p. 700, for an index of page references to places in Part Two, the exegesis section, where the various writers cited in Part One analyze OT elements in Luke. 22-23 according to the perspectives, methods, and theories which they have contributed to this area of Biblical scholarship.

## CHAPTER I

## THE PERIOD FROM 1500 TO 1800

## Introduction

These centuries, standing as they do at the beginning of modern Biblical scholarship, were a period of collection and classification in the areas of quotation, idea, and style. The discrepancy issue which dominated the period was the conflict between the belief in a divinely inspired, perfect Scripture and the evidently less than perfect way in which the text of the OT was reproduced in NT quotations. To use discrepancy in another sense, the question was how to explain the discrepancy between the text-form of an OT quotation, as it appears in the NT, and its text-form, as it appears originally in the MT and LXX.

## The Sixteenth Century

In the introduction to his commentary on a harmony of the Gospels, John Calvin described the relationship between the OT and the NT, as follows: The evangelists "point the finger to show how Christ is to be sought therein, from His tokens in Law and Prophets. We come to a useful and fruitful study of the Gospel when in fact we learn to combine it with the former words of promise."<sup>1</sup> The method of interpretation which Calvin suggests we use to discover what is ascribed to Christ by the prophets is "the simple and sincere approach we frequently find throughout the prophets, who were extremely apt interpreters of the Law."<sup>2</sup> This is evidently the grammatical-historical method. From the plain grammatical sense of a prophet's writings, viewed in the light of the historical context in which

---

<sup>1</sup>J. Calvin, A Harmony of the Gospels Matthew, Mark and Luke, trans. A. W. Morrison (Calvin's Commentaries; Edinburgh, 1972), Vol. I, p. xii.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., III, p. 236.

they were written, this method seeks indications of the prophet's intention to "point with the finger to Christ." Calvin used the method under the conviction that Scripture was the inspired Word of God and hence consistent in all its parts. The use of the grammatical-historical method, however, uncovered a discrepancy between this conviction and the seeming inconsistency in meaning between OT material in its original context and its application in a NT context. Though Calvin harmonized the discrepancy away,<sup>1</sup> it is significant that he used the grammatical-historical method consistently enough to uncover the inconsistency and the resulting discrepancy. This NT use of OT material "out of context" continued to exercise scholars' skills in erecting a theory about the NT writers' method of interpretation, which would satisfactorily explain how and why they could seemingly go against the plain historical meaning of an OT passage when they quoted it in the NT.

#### The Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries

This period of Protestant Orthodoxy concerned itself with the text-form discrepancy issue. G. Surenhusius presented a polemic against contemporary Jewish detractors of Christianity. He collected much information about the types of introductory formulas used in the NT and rabbinic writings. He had 59 classifications in all. He noted the relationship between the introductory formula and the text quoted. For instance, Ac. 13:40 has the general statement "in the prophets" as part of its introductory formula because it is a combination quotation from two prophets.

Surenhusius also collected 25 different modes of quotation. These modes, which could be paralleled in rabbinic practice, explained text-form discrepancies as adjustments according to interpretational principles.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>See below, p. 589.

<sup>2</sup>G. Surenhusius, *ἡ ἐν ἡμῶν βίβλῳ καταλλὰ ἔχουσα* ... (Amsterdam, 1713), p. 398; e.g. subtractions and additions at Ac. 3:22/Dt. 18:15 were in order to emphasize that all would hear the prophet like Moses.

Since his purpose was polemical, to show that the Rabbis were no better in their quotation methods than the NT writers, it is only incidentally that we receive these helpful suggestions for explaining text-form discrepancies through contemporary rabbinic method. Unfortunately, Surenhusius was not careful to evaluate his rabbinic evidence according to date. He also divided the evidence into too many categories to make his classification a helpful tool for analysis.

T. Randolph and H. Owen offered several other reasons for text-form discrepancies. Randolph explained that the writer may not have viewed his OT reference as an exact quotation but merely as an allusion, reference, or illustration.<sup>1</sup> When he did quote, the quotation was not necessarily intended to be a literal translation. The extant NT manuscripts might be corrupt. They might not reflect the precision in quotation, which really did characterize NT writers. Owen recognized the need for the investigation of the text traditions of the MT and LXX, as well as, that of the NT. Small differences in wording between the NT and the LXX or MT might be due to the fact that the NT writers used a version of the Hebrew or Greek OT other than those which are extant.<sup>2</sup>

While these explanations may have been satisfactory for a great many discrepancies, they still left some which Randolph regarded as serious. These were in quotations which disagreed with the wording of both the LXX and the MT. Randolph presented this guideline for judging whether such quotations were so serious as to be unfair to the OT source. "Then

---

<sup>1</sup>T. Randolph, The Prophecies and other Texts Cited in the NT (Oxford, 1782), p. 47; T. H. Horne (An Introduction to the Critical Study and Knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, 8th ed. (London, 1839), Vol. II, Pt. 1, p. 337f.) also offered four categories of function, which would allow for various degrees of text-form discrepancy: a quote pointing to literal fulfilment, to spiritual fulfilment, an illustration, an allusion.

<sup>2</sup>H. Owen, The Modes of Quotation Used by the Evangelical Writers... (London, 1789), p. 93; Owen accounts for the large differences in text-form as the result of textual corruptions created by anti-Christian Jewish scribes, whose tendentiousness controlled their transcription of the LXX and MT. He gives no evidence, however.

only are Citations unfair, when Art is used to disguise the Sense, when anything is left out, or added, or altered, which shall give a different Meaning to the Words."<sup>1</sup>

With regard to OT idea and style, this period was also a time of collection and classification. The scholars' historical consciousness made them ask questions about the first century thought and language background of NT writings. J. Lightfoot's collection of rabbinic references in the form of a commentary on the NT was an attempt to explain its more obscure parts by enquiring "how and in what sense those phrases and manners of speech were understood according to the vulgar and common dialect and opinions of that Nation (the Jews); and how they took them, by whom they were spoken, and by whom they were heard."<sup>2</sup>

J. A. Bengel used the LXX, the expression in Greek of the "Jews' style, idiom, form and rule of speaking," to explain the peculiar idiom of the language of the NT.

It is beyond question, that the Apostles and Evangelists were accustomed to speak and write in such a style as was especially suited to the Hellenizing Jews resident in Asia and elsewhere, who had introduced the spirit of the Hebrew language into their ordinary Greek discourse, and to whom the Greek translation of the OT (which Hebraizes to a very great degree), was evidently familiar—that translation, which acted in subservience to the Divine design of making the Greek language the vehicle of the Divine word.<sup>3</sup>

The Septuagint, then, because it had been produced according to the will of God was a proper model for NT language and style. This was his

---

<sup>1</sup>Randolph, p. 47.

<sup>2</sup>J. Lightfoot, "Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae... S. Lucae," The Works of J. Lightfoot, ed. J. Strype (London, 1684), Vol. II, p. 94.

<sup>3</sup>J. A. Bengel, Gnomon of the NT, trans. J. Bandinell and A. R. Fausset (Edinburgh, 1873), Vol. I, p. 45f.; cf. W. H. Guillemard (Hebraisms in the Greek Testament (Cambridge, 1879), p. viii), who observes, "their language and ways of expression, especially upon religious topics, were insensibly affected and coloured by their familiar acquaintance with the diction and style of the Book (LXX) which they prized and loved beyond all others."



basic argument against those who claimed that there was a discrepancy between the doctrinal claim that the NT Scriptures were inspired by a perfect God and the less than perfect Greek in which they were written. But dogmatic considerations were not the only reason why Bengel chose the LXX as a point of reference for NT thought and style. He assumed that it represented a peculiar idiom of the "Hellenizing Jews," which was the idiom of the NT writers and their audiences. The effect of this view on his methods was that he normally analyzed OT quotations in the New on the basis of the LXX. Only when a text-form discrepancy between the LXX and the MT had been made the basis of the quotation's use in the New, did he refer to the MT.

Although much useful collection of OT background material for NT thought and style took place during this period, since the purpose of the collection was to present material which would explain passages obscure to those with only a knowledge of classical Greek, the material was not systematically gathered for the whole of the NT. Also, no distinction was made between the unconscious influence of the OT on NT writers, as part of the background of their thought and style, and the conscious use of OT thought and style by NT writers.

## CHAPTER II

## THE PERIOD FROM 1801 TO 1910

## Introduction

The discussion of text-form discrepancies in NT quotations of the Old continued in this period. There was greater precision in the classification of quotations according to text-form. Some general hypotheses emerged to account for the discrepancies. A discrepancy in the area of interpretational method provoked much discussion. It was the discrepancy between the proper meaning of an OT passage in its original historical context as determined by practitioners of the scientific historical critical method and the meaning which the NT writers understood and present when they apply the OT passage to a NT context.

Those who studied NT allusions to the Old became involved with the relation of the historicity of a NT event, which fulfilled OT prophecy, to the possible formative power of the OT prophetic content. Was the OT the only source for some of the historical details in the gospel narrative? With new archaeological finds the view of the nature of NT Greek and its relation to the LXX changed dramatically. This affected the theories which explained the origin of the OT content in Luke's thought and the semitic element in his style.

## Old Testament Quotation

The classification of the text-form of OT quotations in the New settled into a basic pattern of four categories with a few variations:

- (1) NT agrees with the MT and the LXX; (2) NT agrees with LXX against MT; (3) NT agrees with MT against LXX; and (4) NT agrees with neither.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>C. H. Toy, Quotations in the New Testament (N.Y., 1884), p. ix.

D. M. Turpie originally divided the fourth category into two sub-divisions (4a) NT disagrees with LXX which disagrees with MT and (4b) NT disagrees with LXX which agrees with MT.<sup>1</sup> W. A. Dittmar applied the results of his studies of the LXX text traditions to his classification and added these subdivisions: (1a) NT agrees with the MT and a variant of the LXX; (2a) NT agrees with a variant of the LXX against MT.<sup>2</sup>

Along with the more precise classification of the text-form of OT quotations, this period saw the emergence of a more specific definition of the quotation category itself. H. B. Swete defined OT quotations as OT material either introduced by introductory formulas, or "which, though not announced by a formula, appear from the context to be intended quotations, or agree verbatim with some context in the Old Testament."<sup>3</sup>

There was also increasing concern with allusion material as a distinct category. J. Scott defined allusions in general as references to the sense and to the mere sound or form of Scripture. "They are a silent appropriation of the facts and forms of thought, and of the sentiments and sentences of the OT, and, even more than the different modes of citation, pervade the whole revelation."<sup>4</sup>

Westcott and Hort in their description of the words they chose to place in uncial type indicating that they came from the OT, said they included quotations expressly cited; sentences adopted from the OT though having no introductory formula; phrases "borrowed from some one passage or limited number of passages"; and a characteristic word found in a few OT passages.

---

<sup>1</sup>D. M. Turpie, The Old Testament in the New (London, 1868), p. xvi.

<sup>2</sup>W. A. Dittmar, Vetus Testamentum in Novo... (Göttingen, 1903), p. vii.

<sup>3</sup>H. B. Swete, An Introduction to the OT in Greek, ed. R. R. Ottley, 2nd rev. ed. (Cambridge, 1914), p. 382.

<sup>4</sup>J. Scott, Principles of NT Quotation, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh, 1877), p. 30.

Unlike Swete, Westcott and Hort base the identification of OT material, besides explicit quotations, totally on verbal agreement between OT and New. They based their identification on a comparison of the NT text with the LXX and the MT. They noted any NT quotations which agreed with one of these text-forms against the other. By relying totally on verbal agreement Westcott and Hort encountered a difficulty which would continue to call for scholarly attention. They could not draw a clear line between OT idea and OT allusion. They realized that they could multiply OT references to their "phrase" or "characteristic words" categories, though they tried to limit themselves. As a result, they were forced to conclude concerning some OT allusions, "...it has not been found possible to draw and maintain a clear line of distinction and determine from which particular passage the words or phrases were drawn."<sup>1</sup> So the question remained: when, on verbal grounds, does a word or phrase cease to be an OT idea and become an allusion; and when does it cease to be an allusion and become only an idea? More than verbal evidence seemed to be needed.

While some scholars were dissatisfied with the lack of precision in the definition of OT material without introductory formulas, others were compiling lists of every conceivable reference to the OT in the words and phrases of the New. E. Hühn made such a list.<sup>2</sup> Hühn observed that not only is the boundary between intentional quotation without introductory formula and simple allusion not firm, but it is based on subjective judgment. He also noted that it is not feasible to determine whether an allusion is intentional or unintentional.<sup>3</sup> The only classification of allusions, which

---

<sup>1</sup>The NT in the Original Greek, ed. B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort (Cambridge, 1881-82), Vol. II, Appendix, p. 174.

<sup>2</sup>E. Hühn, Die Alttestamentliche Citate und Reminiscenzen im NT (Tübingen, 1900); Dittmar uses Hühn's list as the basis for his text-form analysis.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. vi, 269.

he would make, was "messianic" and "non-messianic." He identified as "messianic" those quotations and allusions which the NT writers employed to show that Jesus was the Messiah. The rest were "non-messianic."

Focusing again on OT quotations in the New, we should note some of the general theories which were suggested as explanations for the text-form discrepancies in NT citations. They fall into two categories; theories about the OT materials which the NT writers had at their disposal and theories about the methods the NT writers used in their quotation of the Old.

C. H. Toy offered a theory in the first category. While text-form discrepancy classifications (1) and (2) probably represented quotations taken from the LXX, classes (3) and (4) contain quotations probably taken from a Jewish Aramaic Targum.<sup>1</sup> Swete further refined the view that the LXX was the source for many, if not the majority, of NT quotations by observing: "There is considerable weight of evidence in favour of the belief that the Evangelists employed a recension of the LXX which came nearer to the text of Cod. A than to that of our oldest uncial B."<sup>2</sup>

The theory most commonly put forward to explain text-form discrepancy in terms of the NT writers' method was that they used the literary methods of

---

<sup>1</sup>Toy, p. xviii; Toy depends on E. Böhle (Forschungen nach einer Volksbibel... (Vienna, 1873)) for this theory. However, he does not follow him to the extent that he would say that this Jewish Aramaic Targum is actually a translation of the LXX and therefore can explain classifications (1) and (2) as well; cf. M. Black ("The Problem of the OT Quotations in the Gospels," Journal of the Manchester University Egypt and Oriental Society, XXIII (1942), p. 4), who suggests an Aramaic Targum as the basis for OT quotations in the Gospels and cites the parallel text-form discrepancies in the Old Syriac Gospels as evidence.

<sup>2</sup>Swete, p. 395; A. Sperber ("The NT and the LXX," JBL, LIX (1940), pp. 193-293) presents a thorough analysis of the NT evidence, which confirms Swete's observations; M. Karmetzki (Die Alttestamentliche Zitate in der synoptischen Tradition (Diss.; Tübingen, 1955), p. 196), notes that both text traditions represented by Cod. A and B have probably been assimilated to the NT quotation text-form.

the Hellenistic period. For the sake of a uniformly highly polished style, the ancient historian would rework the wording of his quotation, while preserving its content. Text-form discrepancies naturally resulted for "truthful representation, and not verbal accuracy, was all that was required or sought."<sup>1</sup>

In applying these theories to Luke, scholars sought to give an account of the distinctive character of the text-form of his OT quotations. With regard to the OT materials which Luke used, C. H. Toy observed that Luke usually follows the LXX.<sup>2</sup> In some places, however, he "appears to be influenced by the Aramaic, guided, probably in such cases, by a traditional form of the quoted text."<sup>3</sup> This traditional form was contained in Palestinian sources for his gospel, which he translated from the Aramaic himself.<sup>4</sup> With respect to Luke's method of quotation, J. C. K. Döpke said that memory lapse was responsible for some text-form differences.<sup>5</sup> Toy recognized that Luke, being a historian who made a literary effort in his style, was more free in his citation than other NT writers.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Scott, p. 90.

<sup>2</sup>Toy, p. xxxiv; cf. J. C. K. Döpke, (Hermeneutik der neutestamentlichen Schriftsteller (Leipzig, 1829), p. 239.

<sup>3</sup>Toy, p. xxxiv.

<sup>4</sup>cf. T. Vogel, Zur Charakteristik des Lukas nach Sprach und Stil (Leipzig, 1897), p. 18; He claimed that the text-form in Luke showed that the quotation was either decisively taken from LXX or from some other source. Discrepancies were not the result of a free rendering of the LXX.

<sup>5</sup>Döpke, p. 240; cf. H. J. Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts (N.Y., 1927), p. 326; K. Stendahl (The School of St. Matthew and its Use of the OT, 2nd ed. (ASNU, XX; Lund, 1967), p. 158) shows a later emphasis on the importance of discrepancies for revealing the theology of NT writers and the early church. He says that the memory lapse explanation should not be resorted to automatically.

<sup>6</sup>Toy, p. xxxiv; cf. M. Krenkel (Josephus und Lucas (Leipzig, 1894), p. 16), who sees nothing distinctive about Luke's freedom in quotation. He is just following the practice of his time; cf. also Stendahl, pp. 157, 164.

Krenkel offered the explanation that where Luke's quotation differs decisively in content from the OT it might be due to his literary source and the fact that Luke's method was to reproduce it faithfully.<sup>1</sup>

J. C. K. Döpke, writing in the wake of the Enlightenment, said that the opinion of the times had changed concerning the value of the NT writers' interpretational method. Previously, Surenhusio could use the best of Jewish exegetical tradition to defend Christianity. Now that tradition was seen to err in many ways. Döpke undertook a fresh examination of the Jewish interpretational practices and in the light of that evaluated the NT writers' methods. He concluded that the NT writers' methods of interpretation were similar to their Jewish contemporaries'. They differed only in their primary focus and use. The NT writers employed a christologically centered typology to prove that Jesus was the Messiah. Another important factor in the NT method which kept it from making many more errors under the influence of Jewish exegetical method was the fact that the NT writers were unlearned men. They did not know and, hence, did not exercise the sophisticated exegetical methods of their Jewish contemporaries, which regrettably resulted in a subjective and arbitrary handling of the OT text. Although NT writers naturally shared some methodological deficiencies with their Jewish contemporaries, on average, they made much wiser use of the OT than the rest of the Jews.<sup>2</sup>

Döpke's approach was an attempt to move beyond the perspective of the "accommodation theory."<sup>3</sup> This theory was the main way in which scholars, who accepted the hegemony of rationalism during the Enlightenment, reconciled the ensuing conflict between their rational estimate of NT interpretational methods and their conviction that the Bible was divinely inspired.

---

<sup>1</sup>Krenkel, p. 16.

<sup>2</sup>Döpke, p. 188.

<sup>3</sup>L. Goppelt, Typus, Die typologische Deutung des AT im Neuen, 2nd unrev. ed. (BFTb, II:43; Gütersloh, 1966), p. 9.

They had claimed that God through Jesus and the apostles accommodated himself to man's level of understanding as he communicated his truth. Part of the accommodation was the use of interpretational methods which were current in the NT world. Döpke still labored under the conviction that the Jewish and NT methods of interpretation were somewhat inferior to what men of enlightenment would prefer. However, he did discover again some of the distinctive characteristics of the NT methods and was able to look at them in a positive light.

The major way in which NT exegetical methods were seen to err was their arbitrary application of literal details from the OT to a completely different NT situation. NT writers seemed to give no consideration either to the meaning of the words of an OT quotation as they existed in their original OT context, or to the intention of the original writer in his historical situation. Scientific historical criticism could more or less confidently reconstruct the original meaning and original historical context of an OT passage. If the NT interpretation of an OT passage did not coincide with this original meaning and purpose, then the NT interpretation must be seen as other than the true one. As a result, the difference in interpretation led, as in the case of text-form differences, to a discrepancy. On the one hand, there was the doctrinal affirmation that the Scriptures were inspired by God and therefore were true and authoritative in the interpretation which they gave of themselves. On the other hand, there was the evidence of the findings of scientific historical criticism, which showed that the NT Scriptures do not, according to the canons of that critical method, interpret the OT truly. Thus, the Scriptures hardly interpret themselves authoritatively as the inspired Word of God should.

The problem was most acute in the area of the NT application of OT texts to events in the life and ministry of Jesus. The NT writers claimed that the OT texts had been fulfilled and found their true meaning in the events of Jesus' life, death, and resurrection. In some instances, the



texts which the NT writers used were originally uttered as prophecies. The case could be made that the NT use did not violate the original historical intention of the OT writer. However, even in these cases the thoroughgoing scientific historical critic according to his philosophical presuppositions could not allow for either the supernatural inspiration of the OT prophet or the supernatural intervention and accomplishment of the fulfilment in NT events. He would emphasize the need for seeing in the prophet's contemporary situation some figure or event about which the prophecy was made. At best, the critic could allow for two fulfilments, immediate and future. But, the future fulfilment could be recognized in the OT text only after the supposed fulfilment event had happened and NT writers had used Jewish exegetical methods to arbitrarily apply the literal detail of the OT prophecy to the NT event.

In other instances, the intention of the original writer was clearly not prophetic. The fulfilment which NT writers saw in a non-prophetic OT passage could be shown by the scientific historical critical method to be the product of an interpretational method which disregarded the grammatical meaning in the original literary context and the purpose of the passage in the original historical context. Again, the truth and authority of such an interpretation and of the book in which it was contained could be called into question.

In the nineteenth century many hypotheses were constructed to explain this discrepancy in methods of interpretation.<sup>1</sup> Those who explained the difference with the intention of defending the authority and inspiration of Scripture often stressed the continuity in interpretational method between Jesus and the gospel writers.<sup>2</sup> This prevented them from focusing

---

<sup>1</sup> A. Clemen, Der Gebrauch des AT in den Neutestamentlichen Schriften (Gütersloh, 1895), pp. 10ff.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. E. Haupt [Die Alttestamentliche Citate in den Vier Evangelien erörtert (Colberg, 1871)] treats only Matthew and John individually; cf. Clemen, p. 250.

much attention on the distinctive contribution of the individual gospel writers. The purpose of such an emphasis on the continuity between Jesus and the gospel writers was to make legitimate the evangelists' methods by extending to them the authority of Jesus' interpretational practices.

The orthodox scholar Scott<sup>1</sup> offered a theological framework in which the NT methods of typology and direct prophetic fulfilment could be understood. The unifying theological framework within which both the OT and NT writers wrote was "progressive revelation." The divine author of Scripture was at work in all of the writers, progressively revealing his truth to mankind through them. This reality enabled the NT writers both to quote by analogy the great doctrinal and moral truths presented in one historical situation, and to find them appropriate to their own. The same basic economy of God's dealings with man obtained in both times. But since the revelation was progressive, the NT writer's understanding could properly advance beyond that of the OT writer. He would understandably present a more complete and, therefore, somewhat different interpretation to his own time.

Scott described typology as "founded on a system of divine ideas or intentions, whether embodied in a person, a place, an institution, or an event."<sup>2</sup> These embodiments or types recur in a discernible pattern throughout sacred history. A NT writer's identification of a NT event as a "typical" embodiment or fulfilment of an OT type is an appropriate use of the OT within the framework of "progressive revelation." Scott observed that it is often difficult to distinguish between OT material in the New which is intended to indicate fulfilled direct messianic prophecy and that

---

<sup>1</sup>Scott, p. 32f.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid, p. 46.

which is the fulfilment of "typical" prophecy. But, in each case, the hypothesis of "progressive revelation" and the logic of the typological and prophetic fulfilment methods of interpretation are intended to make legitimate the NT method of interpretation and neutralize the objections of the scientific historical critical method.<sup>1</sup>

Those who accepted the negative judgment of the scientific historical critical method on the NT interpretational method developed theories which enabled them to define positively the exact area in which the Scriptures or Christianity could still claim to be true and authoritative. They could appeal to the authority of Jesus and his method over against that of the NT writers. They emphasized not the continuity but the discontinuity between the interpretational methods of Jesus and the gospel writers. A. H. McNeile contended that Jesus spoke mainly in general terms about the fulfilment of OT prophecy in his life and work. The writers of Matthew and John dealt in detailed fulfilment.<sup>2</sup> To speak in general terms was acceptable and did not contradict the findings of the scientific historical critical method.

Another approach, while also admitting the "faulty exegesis" of the NT writers, claimed that even from this exegesis spiritual truth could be drawn. Toy concludes,

This (OT) fulfilment is brought in the NT though in most cases by, or in connection with, a method of interpretation that cannot be called legitimate. The natural, historical interpretation seemed to them not to yield satisfactory results, the NT writers spiritualize; but faulty exegesis is no great matter alongside of the power of their<sup>3</sup> theme, and the inspiration of their pure and strong spiritual thought.

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. Haupt (pp. 202ff.), who argues that Jesus did not use Scripture either from its literal sense in violation of the original context, or allegorically. Since he did not have a consistent method of interpretation we cannot follow it. He interpreted Scripture with a divine insight into the law of the development of God's salvation purposes.

<sup>2</sup>A. H. McNeile, "Our Lord's Use of the OT." Cambridge Biblical Essays, ed. H. B. Swete (London, 1909), p. 221; Huhn (p. 291) concludes that the majority of Jesus' quotations and allusions are not from messianic prophecies; cf. F. C. Burkitt, The Gospel History and its Transmission, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh, 1907), p. 202; J. P. Peters, "Christ's Treatment of the OT," JBL, XV (1896), p. 105.

<sup>3</sup>Toy, p. xxvi; cf. Clemen, p. 251.

Thus, those who accepted the negative judgment of scientific historical criticism against the NT methods of interpretation had to salvage what authority for Christianity they believed the Bible had, by either distinguishing between the interpretational methods of Jesus and his followers, or identifying scriptural authority in terms of spiritual truth, whose power was not diminished by illegitimate interpretational methods. One positive result of this negative criticism was that a historical sense continued to dominate the investigations. Although they often saw themselves as superior in insight and method to the NT writers of the first century, at least, nineteenth century scholars sought to distinguish between their own methods and NT methods. It left the way open for a continuing study of the NT methods based on its own evidence, although not yet judged totally on its own merits, or by its own standards.

There was little discussion of Luke's interpretational methods during this period, because the majority of quotations in Luke are made by Jesus and thus became evidence for Jesus' not the gospel writer's use of the OT. However, Döpke using a synoptic source theory which assumed Matthean priority undertook to explain "non-quotations," quotations which Luke did not take over from Matthew.<sup>1</sup>

Commentators were also beginning to notice, however, the particular characteristics of Luke's use of OT quotations in his gospel. He does not use very many quotations and when they do occur, they appear mostly in the sayings of Jesus and other persons. They do not appear as editorial comment in the narrative.<sup>2</sup> A. Plummer and others used this as part of their evidence that Luke was written by a Gentile for Gentiles.<sup>3</sup> Further, "very little is

---

<sup>1</sup>Döpke, p. 240.

<sup>2</sup>A. Plummer, The Gospel According to St. Luke, 3rd ed. (ICC; Edinburgh, 1900), p. xxxiv; cf. Toy, p. xxxiv.

<sup>3</sup>Plummer, p. xxxiv; cf. Clemen (p. 94), who further explains that the gospel material containing many OT quotations, which describes the conflict of Jesus with the Pharisees, was dispensed with by Luke in view of his Gentile audience; cf. F. W. Farrar, The Gospel According to St. Luke (Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools...; Cambridge, 1893), p. xxii, n. 3.

said about the fulfilment of prophecy, which would not greatly interest Gentile readers..."<sup>1</sup>

This explanation of the lack of quotations, especially fulfilment of prophecy proof-texts, however, tended to retard progress in the investigation of the positive use to which Luke did put his quotations. Scholars were released from having to ask the question: what understanding did Luke have of OT prophecy and its fulfilment in NT events? This explanation which appealed to Luke's Gentile background was based on the untested assumption that Gentiles by nature are less interested in or knowledgeable about the OT and prophetic fulfilment than Jews.<sup>2</sup>

#### Old Testament Allusion

The introduction of the scientific historical critical method into Biblical studies in the nineteenth century raised a different issue for the study of OT allusions in the New. Since the method excluded the possibility of real fulfilment of OT prophecy by NT historical events, the practitioners of the method had to find another way of explaining the origin of the NT historical details which NT writers claimed were fulfilment of OT prophecy.

D. F. Strauss contrasted the new approach with the orthodox one when he analyzed the origin of the parting of the garments incident (Lk. 23:34/Ps. 21

---

<sup>1</sup>Plummer, p. xxxiv; Of the five instances of fulfilment of prophecy proof-texts in Luke, all but the first occur in sayings of Jesus addressed to Jews; cf. Toy (p. xxxiv), who explains that Luke was "not a messianic commentator" like Matthew, but rather a gospel writer like Mark.

<sup>2</sup>cf. A. Harnack (Bible Reading in the Early Church, trans. J. R. Wilkinson (Crown Theological Library, XXXVI; N.Y., 1912), p. 34), who treats Luke as an exception to this rule about Gentile incompetence and lack of interest. "The Gentile Christian Luke shows in his work at all events a very respectable knowledge of the Bible, which cannot only have been acquired from what he had heard in public worship, but must have been based upon private study; indeed he imitates the style of the Septuagint with considerable skill. But in my opinion he was probably in close touch with Judaism, or at least with the disciples of the Baptist before he became a Christian, though we cannot conclusively prove this. Again the question of the existence and extent of private Bible reading ought not at any rate to be made to depend upon the case of one who was a literary man; the Bible knowledge of a man who took up pen to write books would naturally be far in advance of that of the great majority of his brethren."

(22):19). He wrote that orthodox expositors like Tholuck<sup>1</sup> say that under divine guidance "...in the moments of inspiration the OT writer chose such figurative expressions as had a literal fulfilment in Christ." But Strauss, himself, said that originally the OT writer

as a man of poetical imagination used those expressions as mere metaphors to denote total defeat; but the petty, prosaic spirit of Jewish interpretation, which the Evangelists shared without any fault of theirs, and from which orthodox theologians, by their own fault however, have not perfectly liberated themselves after the lapse of eighteen centuries, led to the belief that those words must be understood literally, and in this sense must be shown to be fulfilled in the Messiah.<sup>2</sup>

According to Strauss, the historicity of any detail in the passion narrative which is marked out as a fulfilment by a quotation, or is phrased in language which makes it an OT allusion, should be called into question. Its real origin is probably in the Jewish exegetical tradition which determined that certain passages in the OT were descriptions of the Messiah. The early church took over the tradition. It reasoned that if something was supposed to happen to the Messiah, since Jesus was the Messiah, then such details must have happened to him. Strauss' criterion for a historical event in the passion narrative is then twofold: historical probability and lack of harmony with messianic prophecy. Putting it negatively, Strauss says, "...where likewise the essential substance and groundwork is either inconceivable in itself, or is in striking harmony with some Messianic idea of the Jews of that age, then not the particular alleged course and mode of the transaction only, but the entire occurrence must be regarded as un-historical."<sup>3</sup>

Strauss wrote a life of Jesus that sought to distinguish between

---

<sup>1</sup>F. A. G. Tholuck, "The OT in the New," trans. C. A. Aitken, Bibliotheca Sacra, XI (1854), pp. 568-616.

<sup>2</sup>D. F. Strauss, The Life of Jesus critically examined, translated from the 4th German ed. by George Eliot (London, 1898), p. 684.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 91.

historical fact and the mythical fiction generated by, among other things, the conviction that Jesus was indeed the expected Messiah.

K. Weidel<sup>1</sup> took up the method of Strauss and his successors. He sought to determine what content, if any, in the gospel passion narratives had, as its only source, the OT. His analysis led him to conclude that Mark is the only source for the other gospel narratives and that any independent material is formed from the OT.<sup>2</sup>

He observed that Luke and Matthew, in contrast to Mark, revealed a later time in the history of the early church. The concern was no longer with answering Jewish polemic by plain, unembellished fulfilment proof-texts. The gospel writers took much more freedom in using phantasy and typology in the construction of their narratives. They consciously alluded to the OT through the details which they introduced into the narrative.

J. Weiss,<sup>3</sup> however, saw the process as an unconscious one. To get over the shock of Jesus' death, the early church sought comfort from the Scriptures in the assurance that all that had happened was planned. The OT Scriptures were viewed, not as containing prophetic promises, but as describing the sufferings of Jesus. Before they had the Gospels, the early church read the OT Scriptures as the story of the death of Jesus. This was done in the best of faith. In this way the OT promises and history provided a whole series of details which enriched the gospel history.

Whether by conscious or unconscious means, scholars concluded that the use of the OT through allusions had a decisive impact on the formation of the historical narrative of the Passion.

#### Old Testament Idea and Style

With the discovery of a mass of papyri, inscriptions, and ostraca from

---

<sup>1</sup>K. Weidel, "Studien über den Einfluss des Weissagungsbeweises," ThStuKr, LXXXIII (1910), pp. 83-109; 163-195; LXXXV (1912), pp. 167-286.

<sup>2</sup>Weidel, ThStuKr, LXXXV, p. 279f.

<sup>3</sup>J. Weiss, Die Drei Älteren Evangelien, 2nd ed. (Die Schriften des NT, I; Göttingen, 1907), p. 46.

the Hellenistic period, a serious gap in the knowledge of the non-literary Greek language of that period was filled. When examples of this non-literary or koiné language were compared with the NT, the parallels between them led scholars to conclude that they were of the same type, the colloquial Greek of the time. As a result, A. T. Robertson could observe,

The NT Greek is now seen to be not an abnormal excrescence, but a natural development in the Greek language; to be, in fact, a not unworthy part of the great stream of the mighty tongue. It was not outside of the world-language, but in the very heart of it and influenced considerably the future of the Greek tongue.<sup>1</sup>

This conclusion about the Greek of the NT was very important both for the theories about the causes of the semitic element in NT thought and style, and for the kinds of method to be used in detecting such influences. Until the koiné milieu was discovered and applied to NT studies, some scholars explained NT Greek as an example of the special language, Biblical or Jewish Greek, which was presumed to be a dialect spoken by the Jews of the Diaspora.<sup>2</sup> The chief example of this language was the LXX. Any similarity in vocabulary or grammar between the LXX and the NT was due to the common peculiar language in which these two works were written.

The work of G. A. Deissmann and J. H. Moulton,<sup>3</sup> among others, decisively challenged this theory. They said that the common link between LXX and NT should be seen as the koiné Greek of the Hellenistic period. Deissmann did allow for the possibility of LXX influence on NT thought, but he limited this to religious vocabulary. Even then, he continued to emphasize that the influence was mediated through the common koiné.<sup>4</sup> As far as the in-

---

<sup>1</sup>A. T. Robertson, A Grammar of the Greek NT in the Light of Historical Research (New York, 1914), p. 30.

<sup>2</sup>E. Hatch, Essays in Biblical Greek (Oxford, 1889), p. 2.

<sup>3</sup>G. A. Deissmann, Bible Studies, trans. A. Grieve; 2nd ed. (Edinburgh, 1903); J. H. Moulton, A Grammar of NT Greek (Edinburgh, 1906), Vol. I-Prolegomena

<sup>4</sup>Deissmann (p. 82) comments, "Such expressions [religious vocabulary] were known to any such Christian from his environment before ever he read the LXX and when he met them again in that book, he had no feeling of having his store of words enlarged, but believed himself to be walking on, so to speak, known ground."



fluence of the LXX on NT style was concerned, Deissmann used an inscription to illustrate the fact that in harmony with their contemporaries NT writers probably imitated the LXX in vocabulary, but not in grammar.<sup>1</sup>

The replacement of the Biblical Greek theory with the koiné theory was greeted in some quarters with caution. H. B. Swete's comment shows the importance which was still attached to the direct connection between LXX and the NT in the OT idea area: "...the student of the NT will make the LXX his starting-point in examining the sense of all words and phrases which, though they may have been used in classical Greek or by the  $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\acute{\eta}$  passed into Palestinian use through the Greek OT and in their passage received the impress of Semitic thought and life."<sup>2</sup>

The advance which this new knowledge made possible in the investigation of Luke's use of the OT was that scholars could now begin to distinguish between unconscious influence and conscious use of OT ideas and style by the author. As long as the NT and OT were bound together by this common, special language, Biblical Greek, all similarities could be explained as distinctive elements of the special language. Now that a third point of comparison, the koiné, was available, the a priori assumption of a direct, unconscious link of the LXX and NT could be discarded. An analysis which searched for the conscious link created by a NT writer, who used OT thought in his theological themes and OT style to color his narrative, might be undertaken.

Moulton classified the semitic element in the NT this way: (1) vocabulary expressions acceptable in Greek, which because of their frequency in the NT, point to translation of a Hebrew equivalent; (2) syntax which betrays

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 274ff.; A memorial stele at Necropolis of Adrumetrum, 2-3rd cent. A.D., contains an invocation to a god written with LXX vocabulary.

<sup>2</sup>Swete, p. 457.

semitic influence; (3) the influence of the translation Greek of the LXX.<sup>1</sup> Moulton viewed the semitic element as mainly evidence for semitic NT sources, and not as evidence of LXX style imitation by NT writers. His classification of the material, however, was a useful starting point for advocates of either approach. Most helpful was the introduction of the frequency test which advanced beyond the criterion that only what is peculiar to the LXX and the NT is evidence of LXX influence.

To account for the OT and semitic element in Luke's thought and style was especially difficult even in the time when the Biblical Greek theory was dominant. Godet put the puzzle this way. "There is one fact, especially, which still waits for explanation, namely, the Aramaisms of Luke. The Aramaisms are met with not only in passages which belong exclusively to this Hellenistic writer, but also in those which are common to him and the other writers, who were of Jewish origin, and in whose parallel passages nothing of a similar kind is to be found!"<sup>2</sup> Why would Luke, a Gentile, tolerate a semitic element in his sources and even introduce it into his own writing?<sup>3</sup> Two lines of explanation were that Luke was a Jew whose natural style was Hebrew-Greek (Biblical Greek), or that he was a Gentile who slavishly used Jewish Christian sources.<sup>4</sup> The first was either modified so that Luke was viewed as unconsciously influenced by LXX vocabulary or as consciously using LXX vocabulary and style. The chief argument from Luke's works was that this vocabulary occurred throughout Luke, not just

---

<sup>1</sup>Moulton, I, p. 11f.; cf. J. H. Moulton and W. F. Howard, A Grammar of NT Greek (Edinburgh, 1929), Vol. II-Accidence and Word Formation; "Appendix of Semitisms in the NT," pp. 412-85; (this is a most complete collection and discussion of the semitic element in the NT).

<sup>2</sup>F. Godet, A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke, translated from the 2nd French ed. by E. Shalders and M. Cusin; 4th ed. (Edinburgh, 1896), Vol. I, p. viii.

<sup>3</sup>cf. Robertson (p. 107), who says, "Curiously enough, though a Gentile and capable of writing almost classic Attic (Lk. 1:1-4), yet, Luke uses Semitisms not common elsewhere in the NT."

<sup>4</sup>A. B. Bruce, Expositor's Greek NT (London, 1905), Vol. I-The Synoptic Gospels, p. 25.

in passages having to do with religion, but also in passages having to do with secular matters.<sup>1</sup> Vogel based his observation on vocabulary which exists in the LXX and only in Luke-Acts, not in the rest of the NT.<sup>2</sup>

G. Dalman and M. Krenkel concluded that Luke consciously imitated the LXX style. Dalman collected those semitic elements which he called "Hebraisms" and observed that they occur exclusively in Luke, but only very seldom. Dalman classified the semitic element in the Gospels into three categories: Aramaisms, semitisms and Hebraisms. Aramaisms probably come from semitic sources which depend on the oral tradition preserved in the common language of Palestine, Aramaic. Semitisms may be either Hebraisms or Aramaisms. Hebraisms also may have stemmed from a semitic source.<sup>3</sup> However, if Hebraisms stemmed from an original Hebrew gospel which Luke used as a source,<sup>4</sup> we would expect them to be more frequent. "If then, in the case of that Synoptist who is most guilty of Hebraisms, these are due, in most cases, at least, to the author himself,... [They] should properly be called 'Septuagint-graecisms.'"<sup>5</sup> Krenkel claimed that Luke consciously depended on the LXX as well as upon Josephus for his vocabulary.<sup>6</sup>

The second line of explanation, that Luke the Gentile slavishly used Jewish Christian sources, came to be employed in the wake of the general acceptance of Markan priority as the best way to understand the literary relationship of the Synoptic Gospels. The semitic element in Luke became an added indicator of a third source, "L". At the beginning of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Vogel, p. 16; cf. Swete's statement (p. 453), "Even in the case of writers such as Luke..., the LXX has no doubt regulated the choice of words."

<sup>2</sup>cf. J. C. Hawkins, Horae Synopticae, 2nd ed. (Oxford, 1909), p. 201.

<sup>3</sup>cf. J. Wellhausen, Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien, 2nd ed. (Berlin, 1911), p. 7f.

<sup>4</sup>Weiss, p. 407.

<sup>5</sup>G. Dalman, The Words of Jesus, trans. D. M. Kay (Edinburgh, 1909), p. 41.

<sup>6</sup>Krenkel, p. 331.

development of a position which maintains itself in one form or another to the present,<sup>1</sup> B. S. Easton analyzed Dalman's evidence and turned the argument on its head. The lack of frequent use of Hebraisms in Luke had indicated to Dalman that no Hebrew source for the whole gospel was used. Easton analyzed the occurrences of Dalman's list of Lukan Hebraisms and found that six of the fourteen were certainly "L" phrases; three were so in part; three were irrelevant for various reasons; and only two were really Lukan.<sup>2</sup> The Hebraisms then became indicators of one of Luke's sources and were not part of his style.

Other commentators combined these two explanations for the semitic element in Luke's style and thought, but usually emphasized one over the other. A. Plummer commented, "No doubt it is true that, where he has used materials which directly or indirectly are Aramaic his style is Hebraistic, but it may also be true that he has there allowed his style to be Hebraistic, because he felt that such a style was appropriate to the subject matter."<sup>3</sup> While Plummer suggested the possible purpose of such Hebraistic style to be "appropriate to the subject matter," Zahn observed that "Luke uses a few Hebraisms, not only in the narratives probably, or certainly, taken from older sources, but in connective phrases and summaries, which are of his own composition."<sup>4</sup> He thus saw the significance of their placement as an indication of their origin from Luke himself.

---

<sup>1</sup>See V. Taylor (The Passion Narrative of St. Luke, ed. O. E. Evans (SNTS Monograph Series, XIX; Cambridge, 1972), pp. 3-30) for an account of those who hold this position.

<sup>2</sup>B. S. Easton, "Linguistic Evidence for the Lucan Source L," JBL, XXXIX (1910), p. 178.

<sup>3</sup>Plummer, p. xlv; cf. Hawkins (p. 198, n.1), who makes the LXX more immediately responsible.

<sup>4</sup>T. Zahn, Introduction to the NT, translated from 3rd German ed. by J. M. Trout et al (Edinburgh, 1909), Vol. III, p. 104; cf. Cadbury, p. 224, n. 18; S. E. Johnson, "The LXX and the NT," JBL, LVI (1937), p. 344; K. Grobel, "Idiosyncracies of the Synoptists in their Perikope Introductions," JBL, LIX (1940), pp. 405-410.

J. H. Moulton's Prolegomena to his grammar built on the koiné theory. As a result, he saw the semitisms in Luke as mainly "rough Greek translation from Aramaic [sources] left mainly as they reached him, [which] perhaps because of their very roughness seemed too clear to be refined away." In addition, there was "a very limited imitation of the LXX idiom... [especially] ...while the story moves in the Jewish world."<sup>1</sup> In this way Moulton was a little more precise than Plummer in his comment about appropriateness. He also offered an explanation of the concentration of LXXisms in the gospel and Acts 1-12, as opposed to the lack of semitisms in Acts 13ff. S. J. Case observed that the semitic element in the gospel narratives varies according to who is speaking. God speaks in the language of Scripture and "many of Jesus' most solemn and forceful pronouncements are reproductions of OT phrases." OT style seems to add the weight of authority to these pronouncements.<sup>2</sup>

The areas of OT thought and style, then, received new impetus for further investigation from the archaeological finds. One theory of the nature of NT language basically replaced another and in the process, the way was opened for greater precision in identifying conscious use of OT thought and style by a NT writer. Several avenues of explanation for the semitic element in Luke were opened. Yet, it is of some interest that

---

<sup>1</sup>Moulton, I, p. 18: E. Plümacher (Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller (Studien z. Umwelt d. NT, IX; Göttingen, 1972), p. 67, n. 178) analyzes the speeches in Acts in the light of a similar point made by H. F. D. Sparks ("The Semiticisms of St. Luke's Gospel," JTS, XLIV (1943), pp. 129-138). He discovers that Peter's speeches appear in LXX style which is singularly inappropriate for the speech of a Palestinian Jew. It is not a concern with historical coloring that makes Luke use the style. Rather it is the fact that these events belong to the central epoch of salvation history that demands language appropriate to it. It is an epoch which ends with the Gentile mission. Thus, after Acts 15 the LXX style is no longer so frequent.

<sup>2</sup>S. J. Case, "The NT Writers' Interpretation of the OT," Biblical World, XXXVIII (1911), p. 97.

those scholars, Deissmann and Moulton, who did much to provide the framework in which a fruitful study of the use of the OT by a NT writer could be undertaken, were now the most hesitant to ascribe to Luke any consistent imitation of LXX style. Besides arguing that the LXX was translation Greek and would not lend itself readily to imitation, their emphasis on the common language which the LXX and NT shared meant that they over-reacted against the explanation that NT writers consciously borrowed LXX thought and style. Their automatic preference, when encountering semitic elements in a NT writer, was the semitic source explanation. The balance was yet to be restored.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>See below, p. 55.

## CHAPTER III

## THE PERIOD FROM 1911 TO 1945

## Introduction

The period from 1911 to the end of the Second World War was marked by the presentation and analysis of the Testimony Book Hypothesis, which sought to explain the text-form of OT quotations in the New. The use of form criticism on the gospel material and the attempt to see the use of a midrashic method in the formation of the gospel tradition governed the understanding of the origins of OT allusions in the New. After a period of time under the influence of the History of Religions school, New Testament scholars rediscovered that the OT was the actual foundation for the thought of the NT. The theories concerning the nature and origin of semitic elements in Luke's style received careful scrutiny. Greater precision in the definition of semitism and LXXism, was the result.

## Old Testament Quotation

The text-form discrepancy problem received another solution in J. R. Harris' Testimony Book Hypothesis.<sup>1</sup> Through a collection and classification of the OT quotation in the NT and the early church fathers, Harris noted that the same text-form discrepancies recurred over and over again from writer to writer. Since these could not be traced to the LXX or its versions, Harris proposed that a list of OT texts for preaching and teaching must have circulated in the early church. The text-form discrepancies inherent in that list of testimonies were reproduced in the various NT writers and early church fathers. Harris proposed that Jesus himself was the originator of the list. Harris used Lk. 24:44 as evidence that, "In some form or another there must have been, from Luke's point of

---

<sup>1</sup>J. R. Harris, Testimonies, 2 Vols. (Cambridge, 1916-20); E. C. Selwyn, The Oracles in the NT (London, 1912), p. vii.

view, a pre-resurrection nucleus of Testimonies."<sup>1</sup> Here, then, was a theory that found the explanations for discrepancies in the material which the NT writer used.

Some other explanations of the text-form discrepancies came in the form of general theories about the NT writers' interpretational methods. T. W. Manson observed that the NT writers had an intense conviction that there was a unity between the text of Scripture and the true interpretation which flowed from it. When they quoted the OT, the NT writers viewed the communication of the interpretation of an OT passage as being more important than the exact reproduction of its wording. They had great confidence that they could discover and express the true interpretation. Thus, in practice, "Odd as it may seem to us, the freedom with which they handled the Biblical text is a direct result of the supreme importance which they attached to it."<sup>2</sup> When they wanted to show the "essential meaning and immediate application" of an OT text to a fulfilled NT situation, Manson contended that they adjusted the wording to make the point.

Another explanation which demands of the reader that he have a high view of Scripture was presented by W. H. Bates.<sup>3</sup> Since the Holy Spirit is the author of all Scripture, he has the right to change the wording in a quotation to suit his purpose. Bates coupled this theological argument with an analysis which tried to show that in a quote with text-

---

<sup>1</sup>J. R. Harris, "Did Jesus Use Testimonies?" ExpT, XXXVI (1924-25), p. 411; While G. H. Box ("The Value and Significance of the OT in Relation to the New," The People and the Book, ed. A. S. Peake (Oxford, 1925), p. 439) wholeheartedly agrees with this theory, T. W. Manson ("The Argument from Prophecy," JTS, XLVI (1945), p. 132) prefers to see the testimony book as an oral rather than written list; see below, pp. 63, 66f.

<sup>2</sup>Manson, JTS, XLVI, p. 136; cf. B. Lindars, NT Apologetic (London, 1961), p. 25.

<sup>3</sup>W. H. Bates, "Quotations in the NT from the OT," Bibliotheca Sacra, LXXVII (1920), pp. 424-428; cf. R. Nicole, "NT Use of the OT," Revelation and the Bible, ed. C. F. H. Henry (London, 1959), pp. 137-151.



form discrepancy, either the original sense was preserved or revelation was logically advanced by the change in wording.<sup>1</sup>

E. Clapton saw another discrepancy, between the historical Jesus who spoke Aramaic and the gospel narratives which present his OT quotations in LXX text-form. He suggested a theory which makes unnecessary the conclusion that such quotations are secondary and inauthentic. The evangelists, writing in Greek for Greeks, assimilated quotes to the LXX text-form "...so that their readers who were accustomed to the Greek version of the LXX, would be able to refer to them more readily."<sup>2</sup> Clapton admitted the possibility that NT writers could have put some OT quotations into the mouth of Jesus. Yet, even if they had, they believed them to be in accordance with his teaching. Their loyalty to Jesus and to the Scriptures was a twofold argument for the authenticity of most of Jesus' quotations.

During this period, the text-form of quotations in Luke served as a basis for the analysis of his literary method. H. F. D. Sparks related the general observation, that the LXX text-form predominates in Luke, to Luke's use of sources. When Luke is dependent on Mark or Q, and these have a text-form which diverges from the LXX, Luke does not adjust his sources to make them correspond with the LXX. In his gospel, when he is not dependent on Mk or Q, or when he is expanding one of their quotations, Luke approximates very closely to the LXX.<sup>3</sup> Hence, Sparks was able to explain both the LXX text-form and the non-LXX text-form on the basis of Luke's use of his sources.

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. L. Venard, "Citations de L'AT dans le Nt," Dictionnaire de la Bible, ed. L. Pirot (Paris, 1934), Supplément II, ¶ 23-51; he classifies quotations according to the degree to which they conform to the original sense of the quotation; see below, p. 70.

<sup>2</sup>E. Clapton, Our Lord's Quotations from the OT (London, 1922), p. 47.

<sup>3</sup>Sparks, JTS, XLVI, p. 133; cf. Karmetzki, pp. 246ff.

In this period, too, L. Goppelt gave a firm historical grounding to one of the NT interpretational methods, typology. After a thorough analysis of the basic ingredients in typological thinking as found in Intertestamental literature, Goppelt pointed out the unique features of NT thought which significantly modified the NT use of typology.<sup>1</sup> The Jewish approach was to see the creation and the Exodus as types of the redemption of the End-time. The NT approach was also eschatological, but its focus was Christological.<sup>2</sup> All types found their fulfilment in Jesus. In him Biblical history reached its goal, salvation for man. For Goppelt, typology was the way Jesus and the early church understood the fulfilment of OT Scriptures in the life and ministry of Jesus. The evidence in the NT, however, did not make possible the extraction of a method which could be applied to other OT texts, nor was the collection of a complete system of types possible. Instead, it was a spiritual way of looking at Biblical history and understanding it as salvation history, advancing toward fulfilment in Christ.<sup>3</sup> When a parallel to the OT was discovered in the Gospels, it should be treated as an authentic typological development. It was not just a history of religions parallel, but is part of a typological relationship in salvation history. The continuity was understood by the gospel writers as promise and fulfilment--an authentic typological connection.

This viewpoint enabled Goppelt to solve the discrepancy between interpretational methods of NT writers and those of the practitioners of

---

<sup>1</sup>Goppelt, p. 67; The Qumran finds have largely confirmed his analysis.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 69.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 242.

scientific historical criticism. Jesus and the NT writers did not understand promise and fulfilment as a matter of the details of prophetic promises being fulfilled in the details of Jesus' life, death, and resurrection. Thus, they did not need to take OT passages out of their original historical and literary context and apply them to a foreign NT context in order to prove that OT promises had been fulfilled in Jesus. Rather, the OT promises are rightly understood and reach their proper fulfilment in Jesus when they are treated typologically. It is by means of a typological correspondence between, not details, but the general pattern of thought in the OT and in Jesus' mission that the fulfilment may be shown. Goppelt was able in this way to avoid judging the NT methods of interpretation as being unhistorical and, at the same time, to preserve enough of the specifics in the pattern to make a correspondence between promise and fulfilment real and, because of the dynamic of salvation history, necessary.

Goppelt interpreted from a typological perspective all OT quotations in the New, which sought to prove that some detail of Jesus' mission had been promised before in the OT and now was fulfilled.<sup>1</sup> However, to maintain that typology was the proper way of understanding quotations which clearly indicate fulfilment in detail seems to be distorting the evidence. At best, this typological understanding of NT promise and fulfilment should be used with a great deal of caution and not imposed upon the evidence.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 124.

<sup>2</sup>cf. R. T. France (Jesus and the OT (London, 1971), p. 42), who does distinguish between fulfilment of prophecy interpretational schemes and typology. However, he maintains that there is a fulfilment element in the typological method. He, too, seems to use typology to overcome the discrepancy between first century and twentieth century methods of interpretation. The typological method is what NT writers used to discover Jesus pre-figured in OT passages whose original historical sense was not prophetic.

Without regard for either text-form discrepancy or discrepancy in interpretational method, Venard classified OT quotations according to their usage.<sup>1</sup> There was the literary use normally employing a quotation without an introductory formula. There was the use of a quotation as the basis of a formal argument. Mostly it was the argument from prophecy to prove that Jesus was the Messiah. Besides these two uses, OT quotations functioned in a variety of ways, e.g. as illustrations or as types.

Our present period, 1911-1945, saw an advance in the explanation of the relationship between Luke's use of OT quotations and his supposed Gentile background. F. K. Fleigel and H. J. Cadbury responded to the purely negative judgment that Gentile Luke lacked fulfilment quotes because of a lack of interest.<sup>2</sup> They pointed out that while the dearth of such quotations was real, it was more than compensated for by an abundance of general sayings about Jesus' mission as the fulfilment of Scripture. Cadbury offered this explanation, "In Luke the Scripture serves a more apologetic motive being applied to that which is hard to understand, like the general proposition that Christ must suffer, rather than to the specific details."<sup>3</sup>

K. H. Rengstorf saw the Gentile audience as the reason why the fulfilment sayings take the form of general statements. They did not take the form of the standard Jewish Christian fulfilment proof-texts but the form of statements presenting the certainty of the fulfilled way of God. In this Luke stands with Paul (Gal. 4:4; Eph. 1:10).<sup>4</sup>

V. T. Kirby continued to support the view that Luke's Gentile background

---

<sup>1</sup>Venard, Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplément, II, ¶ 39f.

<sup>2</sup>F. K. Fleigel, Der Einfluss des Weissagungsbeweises und anderer Motive auf die Leidensgeschichte (Tübingen, 1910), p. 27; Cadbury, p. 303.

<sup>3</sup>Cadbury, p. 304.

<sup>4</sup>K. H. Rengstorf, Das Evangelium nach Lukas, 9th ed. (NTD, III; Göttingen, 1962), p. 7.

explained the lack of Old Testament quotations in his gospel. He concluded that Luke did not know the OT at all.<sup>1</sup> J. H. Ropes, however, saw Luke's Gentile background as no obstacle to his knowledge of and interest in the OT. His explanation approached the problem by seeing Luke, the literateur, as no longer an exception, but as part of an identifiable body of Gentiles in the first century who knew and loved the Jewish Scriptures, as well as Jewish life and thought.<sup>2</sup>

At the same time Luke's profound reverence for the Jewish religion, his high esteem for Jewish piety, often expressed, and his intimate knowledge of the OT cannot be accounted for unless he was one of that large body of persons (so often mentioned in the Book of Acts) who, while not giving up their status as Gentiles or becoming Jewish proselytes in full communion, yet believed in and worshipped the God of Israel, habitually attended the services of the synagogue, and had adopted some of the practices of the Jewish religion.<sup>3</sup>

A. Ungern-Sternberg explained the lack of OT quotations in Luke by pointing to a situation within the development of Christianity. After arranging the NT gospel material and Acts in order, from that which shows the least developed use of OT quotations to that which shows the most developed use (Q; Mark; Matthew's special material; Luke's special material; Acts; John), he analyzed the characteristics of each gospel writer's use.<sup>4</sup> Although Luke liked the LXX style, he transformed polemical fulfilment proof-texts into the mysterious texts of Christian gnosis. Luke emphasized

---

<sup>1</sup>"Did St. Luke know the OT?" ExpT, XXXIII (1921-22), pp. 227-229.

<sup>2</sup>See above, p. 24, n. 2.

<sup>3</sup>J. H. Ropes, The Synoptic Gospels (Cambridge, Mass., 1934), p. 34; cf. Rengstorff (p. 7), who views Luke's circle of readers as containing Jew and Gentile. Both possessed and valued the OT as they received it either in their heritage or in the preaching of the Gentile mission.

<sup>4</sup>A. Ungern-Sternberg, Der traditionelle alttestamentliche Schriftbeweis 'de Christo' und 'de Evangelio' in der alten Kirche bis zur Zeit Eusebius von Caesarea (Halle, 1913), p. 275.

that only after the resurrection did the disciples understand through the mediation of the risen Lord the true interpretation of Scripture. Also, there was the fact that Luke wrote at a later time when the church had opportunity to reflect on the relationship between the OT prophecy and the life and mission of Jesus. This reflection acted as a restraining influence on the amount of OT material which Luke used.

G. H. Gilbert claimed that Luke's use of the OT transforms, or rather, distorts the picture of Jesus' use of Scripture. The accounts of Jesus, speaking on the authority of Scripture in Luke 24, are so out of character with the way Jesus normally spoke, with an interior spiritual authority, that they cannot be historical. Gilbert admitted that Jesus may have alluded briefly to the foreshadowing of his death in the OT. But the portrayal of a systematic appeal to the Scriptures as the authority for his teaching was "a very serious misrepresentation of the Master's view" by Luke.<sup>1</sup>

There was, then, a definite attempt in this period both to explain all the text-form discrepancies by one theory, the Testimony Book Hypothesis, and to solve the difference in interpretational method through the use of typology. Building on the observations about Luke noted previously, scholars attempted to find positive reasons for Luke's lack of quotations and a thoroughgoing promise and fulfilment scheme. Luke's disinterest in the OT because of his Gentile upbringing seemed an inadequate reason for this.

#### Old Testament Allusion

The issue which dominated the study of OT allusions during these first decades of the twentieth century was again the relationship of OT prophecy to NT history. While the collected evidence and theory of Weidel underwent analytical criticism, several other theories came forward. Luke's ability to allude to the OT was both attacked and defended.

---

<sup>1</sup>G. H. Gilbert, Jesus and His Bible (N.Y., 1926), p. 85.

E. C. Selwyn, along with his suggestions which were the basis for J. R. Harris' Testimony Book Hypothesis, proposed a theory about the origin of the gospel tradition. Jesus taught his disciples not only a list of testimonies concerning himself, but he also taught them an exegetical method comparable to that found in Jewish haggadic midrash. The gospel tradition originally developed by this method in the missionary preaching in the synagogue. The NT church used the OT as its source for the life of Christ. The midrashic method enabled the church to effectively present its argument from prophecy, proving that Jesus was indeed the Messiah promised in the OT. As a result, Selwyn suggested that the argument from prophecy "was perhaps more extensive and also more precise than we commonly suppose."<sup>1</sup> Luke's prologue (Lk. 1:3) might reveal the prominence of such a method and purpose in the development of gospel tradition. When compared with Justin (Trypho 331D), Selwyn claimed that what Luke had followed carefully of the things "accomplished among us," (Lk. 1:1-4) was OT prophecy.

Selwyn proposed the following method for discovering evidence of the use of the midrashic method by early Christians. Besides definite and indefinite citation, "if an expression in the NT resembles or repeats another in the Old this is a possibility, which may or may not finally be raised to a certainty, that the resemblance or repetition is deliberate."<sup>2</sup> Selwyn admitted that some imagination was necessary; but, if it was imagination guided by history, imagination that used first century midrashic methods, it could not go far wrong.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>E. C. Selwyn, First Christian Ideas (London, 1919), p. 231.

<sup>2</sup>Selwyn, The Oracles, p. xiii; cf. M. Dibelius' (From Tradition to Gospel, translated from the 2nd German ed. by B. L. Woolf (London, 1934), p. 186) definition of an allusion: "application of significant words from OT passages where the application gives the man who is aware of the facts the right connection even though 'scripture' has not been mentioned at all."

<sup>3</sup>cf. W. K. L. Clarke ("The Use of the Septuagint in Acts," The Beginnings of Christianity, ed. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake (London, 1922), Vol. II, p. 68), who says Selwyn's work "seems to suffer from an excess of ingenuity."

M. Dibelius offered a similar view to that of Selwyn's and placed the origin of the passion narrative literary form in the life situation of missionary preaching. Its original literary form was a sermon. The original form was still reflected in the gospel narratives, and was evident in the fact that there were not many direct OT quotations in them. This was because originally the fulfilment of Scripture was only part of the message proclaimed. The call to faith was grounded not in the detailed argument from Scripture, but in the witness to the resurrection. Detailed searching of the OT came later. Indeed, what motivated the further development of the passion narrative as a literary form independent of the missionary preaching context was not the desire to portray a heroic person or to describe a historical process with all its causal factors, but rather "...to make clear what in the Passion took place by God's will."<sup>1</sup> The OT, since it contained the revelation of God's will in the form of prophecies, thus had a central role to play in the formation of the passion narrative.

Aside from sketching in greater detail the various life situations, interests, and influences, which attended the passion narrative as it developed within the history of tradition, Dibelius spelled out one control the OT had over the tradition which had not yet been noted. The OT prophetic content controlled what details of the passion history were preserved in the tradition. "We may assume that even the earliest record told events from the Passion which only had significance because they were known to be announced by scripture."<sup>2</sup> Here Dibelius made an important advance beyond the Strauss-Weidel approach. Previously, the verbal parallelism between OT prophecy and NT description of events was taken

---

<sup>1</sup>Dibelius, p. 186.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 185; cf. K. H. Schelkle, Die Passion Jesu in der Verkündigung des NT (Heidelberg, 1949), pp. 85ff.



immediately as positive evidence for the fact that the OT was the source of the NT material.<sup>1</sup> By saying that the OT acted as a control over what details of the passion events were preserved, as well as being the source for some of the detail, Dibelius could avoid the conclusion that historical details in the passion narrative, which fulfill OT prophecy, must necessarily have their source in the OT and not in history. Other scholars tested Weidel's theory and found that other motives in addition to proof from prophecy were at work in the formation of the gospel tradition. According to their evaluation the proof from prophecy motive still played a part in the formation of the gospel tradition, but it was only one motive among many.<sup>2</sup>

Some scholars did not see the influence running in one direction only, that is, from the OT to the events of the Passion. C. C. Torrey saw the events of Jesus' life and the OT as two independent sources from which the NT writers interpreted Jesus' messiahship. "Sometimes the one of these two factors predominates, sometimes, the other."<sup>3</sup> The possible influence of the events on the selection of OT proof-texts was stressed by G. H. Box. Admittedly the early Christians "used their ingenuity to discover in this [Psalm 21(22)] and other psalms hints or details which might be regarded as pointing to the events of the Crucifixion." Yet "the citations were suggested by the fact."<sup>4</sup>

V. Taylor agreed with the form critical theories that the passion narrative form originated in the life situation of missionary preaching and apologetic. He observed, however, "arguments from OT prophecies were

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, p. 24f.

<sup>2</sup>cf. Fleigel; R. Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition, trans. J. Marsh (Oxford, 1963); J. Finegan, Die Überlieferung der Leidens- und Auferstehungsgeschichte Jesu (BZNW, XV; Giessen, 1934).

<sup>3</sup>C. C. Torrey, "The Influence of Second Isaiah in the Gospels and Acts," JBL, XLVIII (1929), p. 25.

<sup>4</sup>Box, The People and the Book, pp. 440, 439.

not enough to meet this difficulty [the objections of unbelievers to a suffering Messiah]; such arguments made it the more necessary to tell the story of the Cross and to tell it as a whole."<sup>1</sup> Missionary preaching and apologetic could only be successfully carried out if the argument from prophecy was based on historical fact as well as on scriptural warrant. This was the whole point of the argument from prophecy: that what had happened had been prophesied. To develop the apologetic by presenting as historical fact material details whose only source was OT prophecy would only defeat the argument.

T. W. Manson understood the need for the independent origin of the historical fact which fulfills and the OT prophecy which predicts, if the argument from prophecy were to work. The argument from prophecy was based on two disciplines, the study of God's purposes as revealed in Scripture and the study of God's purposes as revealed in the course of world history. These were undertaken side by side. "When Scripture rightly interpreted coincides with event rightly understood, then you had an argument from Prophecy."<sup>2</sup> To challenge the argument, one questioned either the correctness of scriptural exegesis or the justice of the interpretation of the events, or both. As mentioned above, Manson saw the influence running the other way, from fulfilment event to prophetic text.<sup>3</sup> The text-form discrepancies of fulfilment proof-texts were caused by the eagerness of NT writers or those who shared in the development of the tradition to make the OT text conform more precisely to the NT fulfilment event. Thus not only, as Torrey stated, did the NT events aid in the selection of appropriate OT proof-texts, but also they adjusted the text-form of those texts.

---

<sup>1</sup>V. Taylor, *The Formation of the Gospel Tradition* (London, 1933), p. 44; cf. G. Schille ("Das Leiden des Herrn: Die evangelische Passionstradition und ihr 'Sitz im Leben,'" *ZTK*, LII (1955), pp. 161-205), who says that remembrance of historical events existed before and alongside of the search for OT proof-texts.

<sup>2</sup>Manson, *JTS*, XLVI, p. 130.

<sup>3</sup>See above, p. 35.

In the general concern for the relationship between OT prophecy and its historical fulfilment, this period, then, saw a further refinement of Weidel's theory both through the introduction of other motives, which may have been active in the formation of the passion narrative tradition, and through the observation that the OT may have served as a control over, though not as a creator of, passion narrative details which were preserved in the tradition. The midrashic method theory provided a contemporary explanation for such OT influence. The results of the reaction against the Weidel-~~Strauss~~ approach were an emphasis on the independent origin of OT prophecy and NT fulfilment event and the influence of NT events on the selection and wording of the OT fulfilment proof-texts, which appeared in the NT.

Luke's use of OT allusion, according to some scholars, involved the formation of historical detail from OT prophecy. Dibelius observed that in Luke the influence of the OT was more extensive, showing a later development in the church's use of the OT.<sup>1</sup> Clarke contended that Luke's modifications of Mark may sometimes have been dictated by a desire to make it accord more closely with a well known incident in the LXX.<sup>2</sup>

Thus, although when they studied Luke's use of OT quotations scholars seemed hard pressed to explain the lack of OT quotations and the promise and fulfilment scheme, when they studied Luke's use of OT allusions with the aid of the "two document source hypothesis," scholars were able to find a goodly number of OT allusions used as proof from prophecy, which they assigned to Luke's editorial hand. It is true that they did not always claim that the allusions were positively set in a promise and fulfilment scheme, but they did say that the LXX influenced Luke's composition of his narrative.

---

<sup>1</sup>Dibelius, p. 199.

<sup>2</sup>Clarke, The Beginnings of Christianity, II, p. 104.

There were some dissenters. P. W. Hillmann approached Luke's passion narrative purely from the perspective of Luke's editing.<sup>1</sup> He was not concerned with the formation of the tradition before it reached Luke. Rather, he focused on Luke the writer as the explanation for the phenomena of his gospel. Hillmann was a precursor of the redaction critics. It is interesting to note that Hillmann actively contested the idea that the OT was formative for the material which is peculiar to Luke.<sup>2</sup> Kirby questioned whether Luke the Gentile could have even alluded to the OT. "It will remain probable that a knowledge of the OT, which would enable a writer to introduce allusions to it freshly and naturally even where no point of controversy, or none of the ordinary ones, was involved, was to the end of the first century and even later, rare among Gentile believers."<sup>3</sup>

With the general acceptance of the priority of Mark among the Synoptic Gospels, Mark became recognized as one of the sources for the OT material which Luke reproduced in his gospel. Scholars now had to explain the OT allusions which Luke did not take over from Mark. A. Loisy and M. J. Lagrange began this work.<sup>4</sup>

#### Old Testament Idea

No theories about the NT writers' use of the OT ideas received wide acceptance at the beginning of this period. The demise of the Biblical Greek theory, along with the concern of the scientific historical critics

---

<sup>1</sup>P. W. Hillmann, Aufbau und Deutung der synoptischen Leidensberichte (Freiburg, 1941).

<sup>2</sup>See below, p. 82f.

<sup>3</sup>Kirby, Expt, XXXIII, p. 229; Contrast Bultmann (p. 281), who says, "Without doubt proof from prophecy already figured in the Palestinian Church; and just as surely as it would have been used in the Hellenistic Church."

<sup>4</sup>A. Loisy, Les Évangiles Synoptiques, 2 Vols. (Ceffonds, 1907-1908); M. J. Lagrange, Évangile selon Saint Luc, 7th ed. (Études Bibliques; Paris, 1948).

to find parallels to NT thought within the immediate milieu of first century Judaism or Hellenism, pushed concern with OT ideas into the background. Direct OT influence on NT thought was restricted to typological figures within a promise and fulfilment scheme. Any OT thought which was considered had to be dealt with in the form in which it came to first century NT writers, namely, in the form of first century Jewish thought. Though this period of the early decades of the twentieth century saw the production of the standard reference work on rabbinic thought relevant to the NT, Strack and Billerbeck's commentary,<sup>1</sup> it also saw a revolt against this restricted historical perspective which would not take into account the possible direct influence of OT thought on the NT. As for Luke in particular, various theories were advanced for his use of OT ideas.

T. Haering strongly contended that for too long the OT had been confined in scholarly thinking to the role of a provider of prophecy which the NT would show to be fulfilled.<sup>2</sup> Hellenistic mystery religions had been seen to provide the proper background for NT thought. Haering called for the investigation of OT background of NT ideas such as "light," "righteousness," "kingdom," and "life." As a result, the NT would be found to present not only the proof of the fulfilment of OT prophecy, but also the proof of the religious truth of the OT, for the whole religious thought world of the OT had influenced the NT.

E. C. Hoskyns struck the same note in his article, "Jesus the Messiah." He wrote:

The purpose of this essay is to provide some ground for supposing no further progress in the understanding of primitive Christianity to be possible unless the ark of NT exegesis be recovered from its wanderings in the land of the Philistines [i.e. the interpretation of the NT in the

---

<sup>1</sup>H.L. Strack and P. Billerbeck, Kommentar zum NT aus Talmud und Midrasch, 4 Vols. (Munich, 1922-28).

<sup>2</sup>T. Haering, "Das AT im Neuen," ZNW, XVII (1916), pp. 213-227; cf. E. Grafe, Das Urchristentum und das AT (Tübingen, 1907), pp. lff.

light of Hellenistic religion and contemporary Judaism<sup>7</sup> and be led back not merely to Jerusalem, for that might mean to contemporary Judaism, but to its home in the midst of the classical OT Scriptures--to the Law and to the Prophets.<sup>1</sup>

Hoskyns and Davey made general observations about the OT influence on NT thought in their Riddle of the NT. NT writers made "...use of OT phrases in order to evoke their Jewish theological association, but also they were so completely impregnated by the OT Scriptures that they fell unconsciously into a Scripture turn of language."<sup>2</sup> The LXX was important to the NT writers because, like the LXX translators, they "were faced with the problem of giving expression in Greek to ideas which had first taken form in a Semitic idiom."<sup>3</sup> For the early church, the thought first expressed in semitic idiom was the teaching of Jesus, which needed to be heard "with ears ringing with the OT, as a whole."<sup>4</sup> Yet, the teaching of Jesus was itself normative for understanding OT thought. The new Christian understanding that flowed from it completely remolded the meaning it had borne in the OT. So substantial and unique was NT thought that it needed ~~to be~~ understood basically on its own terms. Hoskyns, in a sense, was reintroducing the Biblical Greek theory of the nature of NT language, but with a difference. The attention given to the transformation of OT language by the teaching of Jesus shifted the emphasis from the essential unity of the unique language of the Old and New Testament to the significance of Jesus as the molder of a unique NT language.

Box perceived the influence of the OT semitic idiom on the Greek terms which the LXX translators used. "There has been a transvaluation of

---

<sup>1</sup>E. C. Hoskyns, "Jesus the Messiah," Mysterium Christi, ed. G. K. A. Bell and D. A. Deissmann (London, 1937), p. 4.

<sup>2</sup>E. C. Hoskyns and N. Davey, The Riddle of the NT (London, 1931), p. 291.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.; cf. Bengel's observations, see above, p. 11.

<sup>4</sup>Hoskyns, Mysterium Christi, p. 87.

values throughout under the influence of the lofty conception of God, the ethical and strict monotheism, which was the Hebrew heritage of the pious Jews. All terms which have any connexion, either mediately or immediately, with the divine, reflect this influence."<sup>1</sup> Presumably the same kind of reshaping should be present in Luke's use of vocabulary if he let the OT influence it.

During this period the idea for a theological dictionary of the NT was conceived, and the dictionary began to be published. Its purpose was "to understand them [i.e. NT writers] ... [and] it is important that we know what the relevant word means in the Greek world, in the OT, in the LXX, in the Rabbis, in the NT and in the early church. This is the task of the Theological Dictionary."<sup>2</sup>

Although Haering and Hoskyns had raised the issue of the OT as the true source of NT thought, they dealt with it, only, either in terms of Jesus' thought or in terms of NT thought in general. Articles in the Theological Dictionary of the NT, however, were organized so that they dealt with the thought of Luke. The Theological Dictionary articles indicated the OT background of Luke's thought where it seemed relevant.

As for other comment which was made about Luke and OT ideas during this period, the concern was still with Luke's use of contemporary Jewish thought. Just as the presence of a semitic element in Gentile Luke's style needed to be explained, so the presence of Jewish ideas in his thought called for explanation. The fact that Luke did omit material from Mark, which would be of interest only to Jews, tended to confirm the opinion that Luke's presumed Gentile background and his Gentile audience did affect the amount of Jewish thought he included.<sup>3</sup> This made a theory to explain

---

<sup>1</sup>Box, The People and the Book, p. 438.

<sup>2</sup>G. Kittel and G. Friedrich, ed. Theological Dictionary of the NT, trans. and ed. G. W. Bromiley (Grand Rapids, 1964-1974), Vol. VII, p. vii.

<sup>3</sup>C. G. Montefiore, The Synoptic Gospels, 2nd ed. (London, 1927), Vol. I, p. lxxxvii; Lagrange, p. lxiii; B. S. Easton, The Gospel According to St. Luke (Edinburgh, 1926), p. xxx.

what Jewish material that remained all the more necessary.

One explanation was that this material came from his sources. Just as the semitic elements in Luke's style became evidence for Luke's special source, so Jewish thought was evidence for the theology of that source.<sup>1</sup> Luke's special material contained an outlook and theology of "a Jewish-Christian point of view, and is a valuable witness to Christianity in its original home."<sup>2</sup> In this way, the seeming discrepancy between Luke's lack of interest in Jewish things, evident from his redaction of Mark, could be reconciled with the "intensely Judaistic" outlook of his special material. The question still remained: why did Luke include such OT or Jewish material from this source? To what positive use did he put it?

As with the semitic element in his style, theories concerning Luke's purposeful use of OT ideas were also presented. Part of Luke's purpose in writing was to present an apologetic to Judaism that Christianity was its legitimate successor.<sup>3</sup> This meant that OT ideas, Jewish ideas and practice had to be presented in a sympathetic light. Luke had no real interest in Judaism. He only wanted to show the continuity of succession. In the end, his focus was on the perfection of God's plan of salvation in Christ and his church. Yet "...knowing that Christianity was the perfection of that which had been crude and tentative experiment,...Luke could catch and reproduce the tone [of Judaism] so perfectly."<sup>4</sup>

The assumption of Luke's Gentile background and audience also retarded the investigation of his use of OT ideas in another way. Scholars identi-

<sup>1</sup>e.g. A. M. Perry, The Sources of Luke's Passion Narrative (Chicago, 1920); Easton, Luke; V. Taylor, Behind the Third Gospel (Oxford, 1926); W. Manson, The Gospel of Luke (Moffatt's NT Commentary; London, 1930); A. Schlatter, Das Evangelium des Lukas (Stuttgart, 1931); E. Hirsch, Frühgeschichte des Evangeliums (Tübingen, 1941), Vol. II; cf. above, p. 29f.

<sup>2</sup>W. Manson, p. xx; V. Taylor (Behind the Third Gospel, p. 266f.) even went so far as to describe Proto-Luke's use of the OT.

<sup>3</sup>Cadbury, p. 306; W. Manson, p. xxi.

<sup>4</sup>S. C. Carpenter, Christianity according to St. Luke (London, 1919), p. 93; cf. M. Hinderlich, Lukas und das Judentum (Diss.; Leipzig, 1958).



fied elements of distinctly Lukan theology as those which corresponded with what one would expect of a Gentile Christian theological outlook. The OT element in his theology was then disregarded in the attempt to construct this distinctive theology.<sup>1</sup> The time had not yet come when scholars would recognize that a given writer's theological outlook included not only what was distinctive about him, but also the common opinions he shared with other gospel writers, who were his sources and whom he faithfully reproduced. At least, in this area of study during this period, the way had been opened again for the investigation of the direct influence from, and the conscious use of OT ideas in the thought of NT writers.

T. W. Manson interpreted Luke's apologetic motives with respect to Jews this way: Luke wants to show that Christianity should not be directly associated with contemporary Judaism. However, Luke is not, therefore, against the OT, for "he sets forth Jesus as the fulfilment of Divine promises."<sup>2</sup> The missionary motive of Luke's writing also had the Scriptures at its center. The mission of the church was "part and parcel of the Divine purpose foreshadowed in the Scriptures and brought to fulfilment in the Ministry of Jesus and his followers."<sup>3</sup>

One of the precursors of the approach to gospel studies which would seek to understand the gospel material in terms of the theological themes and motives of the gospel writer was R. H. Lightfoot with his work, Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels. Although he did not investigate the OT background of Luke's theology, or even ask what conscious use Luke

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. the analyses of Plummer (pp. xxxviff.); Carpenter (passim); Cadbury (pp. 272ff.); F. Hauck (Das Evangelium des Lukas (ThHK, III; Cologne, 1934), p. 10f.).

<sup>2</sup>T. W. Manson, "The Work of St. Luke," BJRL, XXVIII (1944), p. 397.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 394.

made of OT motifs, his observations about the role of Jerusalem in the Lukan writings reflect such thinking. "Jerusalem is the goal and the culminating scene of the Lord's activity. And once more this presentation rests not only on historical considerations, but on the doctrinal conception that Jesus is primarily the Messiah, the lawful king of Israel, who receives the throne of his father David, and will be king over the house of David forever."<sup>1</sup> Later scholars would analyze the various themes of the theology of Luke to see what OT elements were in them.

#### Old Testament Style

Encouraged by the views of Deissmann and Moulton<sup>2</sup> scholars during this period proposed a method for discovering semitic sources behind the Gospels and Acts.<sup>3</sup> They tried to account for as much of the semitic element in these writings as possible by viewing them as translations of semitic, principally Aramaic, sources. As these theories in turn came to be analyzed to see whether they adequately explained the facts, the definition of semitism achieved greater precision.

In addition to the categories, Aramaism, semitism, and Hebraism, De Zwaan<sup>4</sup> distinguished between primary and secondary semitisms. Primary semitisms were due to a writer with an imperfect knowledge of idiomatic Greek, either translating a semitic source into a semiticizing kind of Greek, or freely composing in such a style. Secondary semitisms were due to extraneous factors influencing a writer capable of writing idiomatic Greek. They might be semitic sources which he had to translate or a

---

<sup>1</sup>R. H. Lightfoot, Locality and Doctrine in the Gospels (London, 1938), p. 42.

<sup>2</sup>See above, p. 27.

<sup>3</sup>C. F. Burney, The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel (Oxford, 1922); C. C. Torrey, Our Translated Gospels (London, 1937).

<sup>4</sup>J. De Zwaan, "The Use of the Greek Language in Acts," The Beginnings of Christianity, ed. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake (London, 1922), Vol. II, pp. 53-54.

desire to write in a semitic style appropriate to the circumstances of his readers.<sup>1</sup> De Zwaan did not set up a criterion for determining the cause of the semitic elements in the writings of one capable of writing idiomatic Greek. He simply offered a five-point method by which those elements arising from semitic style could be eliminated and the remaining evidence could be confirmed as Greek translation of a semitic source.<sup>2</sup> The only sure knowledge gained from all the analysis of the semitic elements in the style of Luke's gospel and Acts was that a final decision about the origin of these elements could not be made based on the evidence arising from the phenomena themselves. It was the nature of the case that since the greater part of the evidence qualified both as Aramaism and Hebraism, there was no way of deciding whether the element was evidence of translation Greek, in the sense that a semitic (Aramaic) source stood behind it, or translation Greek, in the sense that the style of the LXX, which itself was a translation, was being imitated.

Further, even if a semitic element could be established as a Hebraism or Biblicism, there is still the possibility that this element is not the result of a conscious imitation of the LXX. M. Burrows commented, "'Biblicisms' may be due to the translation of language like that of the OT as well as to imitation of the Septuagint."<sup>3</sup> What was needed was a definition of Septuagintalism which would objectively dis-

---

<sup>1</sup>De Zwaan distinguished first of all between semitisms and semiticizing style. The latter developed in Jewish circles in the Intertestamental period and was used for writing religious works. He does not view it as strictly LXX style imitation, but as a "sacred prose" originating in the LXX and also found in the apocalyptic books.

<sup>2</sup>De Zwaan, The Beginnings of Christianity, II, p. 46.

<sup>3</sup>M. Burrows, "Principles for Testing the Translation Hypothesis in the Gospels," JBL, LIII (1934), p. 25.

tinguish it from a semitism caused by translation of a semitic source whether Hebrew or Aramaic.<sup>1</sup> The identification of any given semitic element in a NT writer's style as a LXXism had depended up to this point in time on either the subjective preference of the scholar; the presumed Gentile origin of the NT writer; or on the element's occurrence in the NT writing at places where the writer's editing was most likely to be at work.

Deissmann's and Moulton's evaluation of the semitic evidence in Luke provoked a reaction from Cadbury:

I am inclined to revolt slightly also from the extreme view Deissmann and Moulton, who minimize the Semitic or Biblical or Jewish element in the NT and ascribe such phenomena to the vernacular Greek of the time...much of Luke's post-classical vocabulary appears to be due to a distinctly Jewish-Christian language. This is probably even more true of his post-classical syntax. And still more allowance must be made if it is assumed that in some parts of his work he consciously imitates the LXX or Mark.<sup>2</sup>

Cadbury concluded that Luke was writing according to the best standards of Hellenistic, and sometimes Attic, style.<sup>3</sup> Luke sometimes corrected the semitic element in his source, Mark, making it better Greek.<sup>4</sup> What, then, was the origin of the semitic elements which remained in his gospel?

<sup>1</sup>Robertson, p. 101; cf. D. W. Riddle ("The Logic of the Theory of Translation Greek," JBL, LI (1932), pp. 13ff.), who observes that there is quite a variety of translation practice in the LXX. From that it would follow that there would be difficulty in determining what could be considered a standard Septuagintalism.

<sup>2</sup>H. J. Cadbury, The Style and Literary Method of Luke (Harvard Theological Studies, VI; Cambridge, Mass., 1920), p. 39; cf. Clarke, The Beginnings of Christianity, II, p. 67.

<sup>3</sup>cf. S. Antoniadis, L'Évangile de Luc-Esquisse de Grammaire et de Style (Paris, 1930).

<sup>4</sup>Cadbury, The Style and, p. 191; cf. C. F. Burney (The Poetry of Our Lord (Oxford, 1925), p. 87), who says that the synonymous and antithetical parallelism of Hebrew poetry in which some of the sayings of Jesus were cast appeared to Luke to be redundant and unattractive. He alters some of the sayings into better Greek style; Contrast Cadbury (The Making of Luke-Acts, p. 122), who gives examples of Lukan parallelism which he says are examples of Lukan LXX style imitation.

De Zwaan concluded from Luke's improvement of Mark's style that he could write idiomatic Greek. His semitisms had to be secondary and from either Aramaic sources or an existing, more or less, technical phraseology of missionary preaching. Cadbury admitted that to a limited extent the semitic element might be due to Aramaic or Hebrew sources, but Luke's "method of paraphrase was too thorough to leave much alien style."<sup>1</sup> According to Cadbury the more probable cause of the semitic element in Luke was the semitizing style in imitation of the LXX in which Luke's sources were written, which he took over from them and even sometimes introduced into them.

Cadbury also noted the Jewish background and precedents for such stylistic imitation of the LXX.<sup>2</sup> He conducted an extended comparison of Josephus' use of 1 Macc. 2:1-13:30 (Ant. XII:5:1-XIII:6:6) and 2 Km. 12:1-4 (Ant. VII:7:3) as sources, with Luke's use of Mark. A common practice among Hellenistic writers was to take over a writer's work, thoroughly reworking it, making it conform to the uniform and highly polished style which would characterize the final product. This Josephus did by removing the semitic features of his sources, the repetition of wording, and the picturesque language. This "...Luke himself has refrained from doing with the traditions of Jesus' words and emphasizes the extent to which the evangelist's underlying material has determined its ultimate form."<sup>3</sup> Hence, part of the semitic element in Luke derived from his failure to thoroughly improve Mark's style when he took it over. The other part

---

<sup>1</sup>Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts, p. 74; Contrast Torrey's (pp. livff.) comment, "All the other semitic idioms, (aside from "and it came to pass") "Biblical" only in the sense that they are translation Greek, are Luke's faithful and skilful reproduction of the text which lay before him."

<sup>2</sup>cf. Plumacher's (pp. 38-71) comparison of Luke's LXX style imitation with the practice of atticizing Hellenistic historians.

<sup>3</sup>Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts, p. 154.

derived from introducing LXX style into Mark. Here he formed an interesting contrast to Josephus. "Sometimes the very idioms which Josephus eliminates from his sources the evangelist retains or even adds."<sup>1</sup>

Although Cadbury agreed that editorial semitisms are particularly evident in transition passages, he had advanced the understanding of Luke's use of LXX style in his comments about Luke's handling of Mark.<sup>2</sup> He presented the picture of Luke working under two impulses, the desire to write good Hellenistic Greek and the predilection for a LXX style. E. Hirsch claimed that there was no precedent for such a balance which would make Luke "zugleich biblisch and literarisch [zu] schreiben."<sup>3</sup> Cadbury's evidence from Josephus, who was only interested in writing high quality Greek, and the Jewish religious writers, who were only interested in writing prose according to the LXX style, tended to bear Hirsch out. Luke appeared to be the first to try to do both.

Lagrange took the inquiry into an area which Cadbury had not considered.<sup>4</sup> He explained the theological significance for Luke of each LXX stylistic element. Thus, Lagrange advanced beyond Plummer's and Dalman's identification and collection of LXXisms and De Zwaan's and Cadbury's general hypothesis concerning sacred prose to an analysis of the individual elements and their theological importance for Luke.

It should be noted that two conclusions of previous scholarship governed these approaches to the semitic element in Luke's style. The assumption that Luke the Gentile<sup>5</sup> had Greek, not Aramaic or Hebrew, as

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 175

<sup>2</sup>See above, p. 31.

<sup>3</sup>Hirsch, II, p. 26.

<sup>4</sup>Lagrange, pp. xcfff.

<sup>5</sup>Burney (The Aramaic Origin, p. 10) thinks that LXX style imitation could be an indication that Luke was a Hellenistic Jew and not necessarily a Gentile.

his native tongue meant that Aramaic source theories with Luke as translator were viewed as less likely explanations for the semitic element.<sup>1</sup> The acceptance of the "two document source hypothesis" also eliminated Aramaic sources for Luke would have used Greek Mark and Q.

The contribution of H. F. D. Sparks, besides his emphasis on Luke's conscious copying of LXX style, was his use of the semitic element to distinguish sources. Sparks concluded that "the bulk of his Semitisms are to be ascribed to his reverence for, and imitation of, the LXX.../St. Luke was/ an habitual, conscious, and deliberate Septuagintalizer."<sup>2</sup> He proposed to use this finding to make decisions about the literary source of the material peculiar to Luke. By this time the source analysis of Luke had settled into two generally accepted forms. Each agreed that Luke had used Mk. and Q. However, they could not agree on the origin of the material peculiar to Luke. One view claimed that this material stemmed from either fragmentary oral tradition or from Luke's rewriting and expansion of Mark in accordance with his dogmatic purposes. The other view did not think that the evidence warranted the attribution of such editorial freedom to Luke. It assumed a special source, most commonly signified by "L".<sup>3</sup>

Admitting that Luke's septuagintalizing would not be a factor of primary importance, let alone the key to the solution of the problem, Sparks applied the results of his analysis this way. If semitisms which were Aramaisms were found in matter peculiar to Luke, then, the case for an independent third source would be strengthened. If LXXisms were found

---

<sup>1</sup>e.g. Lagrange, p. xcvi.

<sup>2</sup>Sparks, JTS, XLIV, p. 134; cf. "The Semitisms of the Acts," JTS, n.s. I (1950), pp. 27-28.

<sup>3</sup>See above (p. 30 ) for the views in a previous period that OT thought and semitic stylistic elements should be taken as indicators of "L".

in material peculiar to Luke, then, there would be a case for Luke's re-writing and expansion of Mark.<sup>1</sup> Sparks concluded, "...there is no proof to be gained from Semitisms: there is only probability."<sup>2</sup>

There was difficulty with each of Sparks' equations: Aramaisms signify an independent source; LXXisms signify Luke's editing of Mark. The independent source did not necessarily have to be an example of translation Greek from the Aramaic. It could just as plausibly be written in a septuagintal style. LXXisms might with probability indicate Luke's editing, but not necessarily the editing of Mark only. Luke could be septuagintalizing an independent source. Sparks was correct to caution that the semitic element could not be a factor of primary importance in the solution of source problems.

Thus, during this period the theory of LXX style imitation came to predominate in the thinking of major interpreters of Luke. It received its fullest exposition in Cadbury, Lagrange, and Sparks. It was yet to experience critical scrutiny.

---

<sup>1</sup>See below, p. 92f.

<sup>2</sup>Sparks, JTS, XLIV, p. 138.



## CHAPTER IV

## THE PERIOD FROM 1946 TO 1972

## Introduction

Advancing from a form critical to a redaction critical approach, scholars in this period began to give full attention to the use Luke himself made of the OT through quotation, allusion, idea, and style. Investigation into the use of OT quotations still concerned itself with text-form discrepancies and discrepancies of interpretational methods; but now the predominant aim was to ask what these discrepancies indicated about Luke's literary method. The archaeological finds at Qumran added much to our knowledge of first century interpretational methods. With regard to OT allusions, the explanation that allusions were the evidence of a midrashic method was analyzed. The redaction critical interest in Lukan theology produced a plethora of studies on aspects of Luke's theology. These often analyzed the OT thought content of Luke's theological themes. This met the need which we have noted for research into Luke's use of OT ideas. This was a period of continuing analysis of the semitic element in Luke's style. Although some "one explanation" theories were defended, many scholars attributed the occurrences to a variety of causes.

## Old Testament Quotation

This period saw the flowering of investigations into the individual gospel writer's uses of OT quotation. The matter of definition was a big issue. Scholars still struggled with the text-form discrepancy problem. But now they treated it more as a helpful key to understanding the individual writer's use of the OT rather than as an embarrassment to faith. Several new suggestions were made concerning interpretational method.

The definition of a quotation and an allusion as presented by Swete summed up quite well the consensus of scholarly opinion up to this point

in time. With the increased interest in text-form discrepancy as a key for understanding either the nature of the OT material which the writer quoted or the way in which he quoted that material, it became doubly important to set limits on the material in the Gospels which would be recognized objectively as an intentional quotation or allusion. Theories were now being presented which used the methods of form criticism and the scheme of a history of traditions to explain the text-form discrepancies. The practitioners of these methods needed as objective a definition as possible if they were successfully to describe how this OT material was handled through various stages of the tradition.

One of the points at issue was the classification of material which verbally qualified as OT quotations, but which did not have introductory formulas. Were they intentional quotations? Were they intentional allusions? Were they unintentional uses of Biblical language? M. Karnetzki proposed to use the form critical analysis of the context, the history of traditions scheme, and the comparison with Jewish exegetical tradition to determine whether a given unintroduced quotation or allusion was intentional.<sup>1</sup> The assumption was that if later in the history of traditions the allusion or unintroduced quotation became a full-fledged quotation with introductory formula, then the earlier material was indeed intentional. Also, if Jewish literature of a literary form similar to the form in which the OT material appeared in the NT contained the particular OT passage, then it probably was used intentionally in the NT and may even have been borrowed from Jewish tradition.

M. Rese recognized as OT quotations in Luke only those quotes which were announced by introductory formulas.<sup>2</sup> He did not recognize unintroduced

---

<sup>1</sup>Karnetzki, pp. 3ff.

<sup>2</sup>M. Rese, Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas (Stud. zNT, I; Gütersloh, 1969), p. 36.

quotations because he was primarily interested in Luke's use of OT quotations, and this could be learned only from what was seen to be an intentional reference to the OT.<sup>1</sup>

While Rese was being quite precise, R. H. Gundry, though recognizing the difference between allusion and quotation, sought to give them equal importance as evidence in the text-form discrepancy discussion. He blurred the boundary between allusion and quotation by referring to allusion material as "allusive quotation." He almost erased the boundary on the other side between allusion and OT idea for he said that allusive material was not determined by verbal parallelism but by the fact "that recognizable thought connection exists between the OT and the NT passage."<sup>2</sup> The question, of course, was how it could be decided when a thought connection between the NT passage and one OT passage was "recognizable."

M. D. Hooker, on the other hand, placed strict limits on what may be called a verbal allusion. "To claim that there is verbal similarity between a NT passage and an OT one cannot be taken as conclusive evidence of direct influence unless it can be shown that the language and ideas found in the NT reference have come from and could only have come from, that particular OT passage."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 36; Rese explains that Swete's second category, OT wording without introductory formula, was introduced by him because he was interested primarily, not in Luke's use of quotation, but in the evidence which the NT text-form of OT quotations could give for the reconstruction of the history of the LXX text.

<sup>2</sup>R. H. Gundry, The Use of the OT in St. Matthew's Gospel (Suppl. to NovT, XVIII; Leiden, 1967), p. 2; C. Smits (Oud-Testamentische Citaten in het Nieuwe Testament (Collectanea Franciscana Neerlandica, VIII:1; Hertogenbosch, 1952), Vol. I, p. 159) points out the difficulty of identifying allusions even with the strict criterion of verbal parallelism; E. Flessemann-van Leer ("Die Interpretation der Passionsgeschichte vom AT aus," Zur Bedeutung des Todes Jesu, ed. F. Viering, 2nd ed. (Gütersloh, 1967), p. 82) calls for a distinction between vague and unclear allusions, which refer to OT themes, and clear allusions, which refer to single OT passages.

<sup>3</sup>M. D. Hooker, Jesus and the Servant (London, 1959), p. 62; cf. Lindars (p. 77), who criticizes her analysis as a minimizing view of the implications of literary allusion; R. Summer (St. Luke and the Jewish Heritage: A Study of the OT in Luke-Acts (Diss., B. Litt.; Oxford, 1970), p. 16) adds a further criterion for identifying an OT allusion. In addition to verbal parallelism with a definite OT passage there should be an appropriate use of the original OT context in the allusion's employment in the New. This criterion will help to distinguish OT allusions from LXX stylistic phrases.

R. T. France offered a classification system for allusions. His four categories were: clear verbal allusions; clear references without verbal allusion; possible verbal allusion; possible reference without verbal allusion.<sup>1</sup> He defined "clear" allusions as "those cases where it cannot reasonably be doubted that the OT passage concerned is in mind." He defined "possible" allusions as those where he "feels that an intentional use of OT language or ideas could be reasonably postulated."<sup>2</sup>

The research into this area had obviously progressed from the collection and hypothesis stages to the critical analysis stage. A. Suhl, recognizing the great wealth of possible allusions in Mark, proposed to analyze them according to a twofold criterion: verbal parallelism and function in the NT context. Suhl assumed that an allusion would probably, by its very nature, be unhistorical. He further assumed that its function in the NT context would be exclusively that of alluding to the OT. Therefore, if a supposed allusion was historically probable and served an understandable function within the narrative, besides just alluding to the OT, it did not qualify as an OT allusion.<sup>3</sup>

The Testimony Book Hypothesis had pretty well won the day as an explanation of text-form discrepancies from the perspective of the OT material which the NT used. The discovery at Qumran of the testimony book, 4Q Testimonia, added the weight of fresh archaeological evidence to the theory.<sup>4</sup> But the theory was not without its detractors who questioned

---

<sup>1</sup>France, p. 259.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 15.

<sup>3</sup>A. Suhl, Die Funktion der alttestamentliche Zitate und Anspielungen im Markusevangelium (Gütersloh, 1965), pp. 57ff.; cf. Dibelius' contention that a detail in the passion narrative could be both historical and an allusion; See above, p. 43.

<sup>4</sup>J. A. Fitzmyer "4Q Testimonia and the NT," Theol. Stud., XVIII (1950), pp. 513-537.

whether such a list actually fulfilled the function which Selwyn and Harris had assigned to it.<sup>1</sup> The fluidity in NT times of both the Hebrew text tradition and the Greek LXX text tradition might account for text-form discrepancy.<sup>2</sup> The discoveries of pre-Christian LXX manuscripts at Qumran shed no decisive new light on the state of the LXX text in the first century. It revealed no standardized text-form which coincided so closely with one of the known text traditions of the LXX, that one could identify any NT text-form deviation from such a LXX text tradition as necessarily due to the interpretational methods of the early church or the NT writer.<sup>3</sup> The possibility that text-form discrepancies in any given case might be due to the NT writer's adherence to a LXX or MT text tradition that was no longer extant was still open.

The other text-form discrepancy issue, the inconsistency of the LXX text-form on the lips of an Aramaic-speaking Jesus, was in general solved by attributing the origin of quotations with LXX text-form to the Greek-speaking early church as it passed on the tradition, or to the NT writer.<sup>4</sup>

The easy rule of thumb--Aramaic Targum or MT text-form signifies Jesus or the Palestinian community; LXX text-form signifies the Greek-speaking community and is secondary--came in for criticism. K. Stendahl

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. M. P. Miller ("Targum, Midrash and the Use of the OT in the NT," *JSJ*, II (1971), p. 55), who says the Qumran list was used for liturgical not exegetical purposes; E. E. Ellis ("Midrash, Targum and the NT Quotations," *Neotestamentica et Semitica*, ed. E. E. Ellis and M. Wilcox (Edinburgh, 1969), p. 65) says that Christian lists of testimonia grew out of the practice of Gentile not Jewish Christians, who extracted the lemma, texts, from their midrash, commentary, contexts and compiled them into testimony lists; See below, p. 81.

<sup>2</sup>cf. Miller, *JSJ*, II, p. 55; D. M. Smith, Jr., "The Use of the OT in the New," The Use of the OT in the New and other Essays in honor of W. F. Stinespring, ed. J. M. Eifrid (Durham, N. C., 1972), p. 11.

<sup>3</sup>Smith, The Use of the OT, p. 8.

<sup>4</sup>e.g. Karnetzki, pp. 249, 271.

contested this simple equation which assumes a linear development of gospel tradition from a semitic to a Greek form.<sup>1</sup> He said that the gospel writer's tendency to make quotations conform to the LXX was part of the long process of handing on the tradition and might go back to Jesus himself. Since both Greek and Aramaic were spoken in Palestine,<sup>2</sup> it was just as likely that parallel traditions of LXX and MT text-forms of OT quotations would grow up. To see the Hebraic as necessarily early, and the LXX as necessarily late, was too arbitrary. He concluded that quotations in the words of Jesus early received their authority from Jesus even if they were in LXX Greek.<sup>3</sup>

The purpose of R. T. France's study was to test the authenticity of OT quotations in the words of Jesus by evaluating their text-form. After suggesting reasons, besides inauthenticity, for why the words of Jesus might be in a LXX text-form,<sup>4</sup> he classified the text-form of Jesus' OT quotations according to their agreement or lack of agreement with the LXX and MT. France then analyzed those quotations from categories in which the text-form seemed to show dependence exclusively on the LXX. These were quotations that agreed with LXX against the MT and with one text tradition of the LXX against another. France further distinguished between significant and insignificant text-form agreements with the LXX

---

<sup>1</sup>Stendahl, p. 165.

<sup>2</sup>cf. R. H. Gundry, "The Language Milieu of First Century Palestine: Its Bearing on the Authenticity of the Gospel Tradition," JBL, LXXXIII (1964), pp. 404-408.

<sup>3</sup>cf. Gundry (JBL, LXXXIII, p. 408), who goes further and suggests that Jesus himself may have used the LXX text-form when he quoted the OT.

<sup>4</sup>France, p. 25; Reasons: the translator of the Aramaic tradition quotes the LXX from memory; he unconsciously assimilates a quote to the LXX; he refers to and copies out the LXX when the quotation is long; Reasons for non-assimilation: he does not remember the LXX; the difference between the Aramaic gospel tradition and the LXX text-form is significant, so he reproduces the former literally.

against the MT. Significant agreements occur when the LXX differs in meaning from the MT and the NT takes advantage of that difference in applying the OT quotation to the NT context. France found none of the text-forms of Jesus' quotations showing such a significant agreement with the LXX over against the MT. He did find two quotations (Mk. 4:10; Lk. 23:30) which agreed with one text tradition, A-text, against the whole of the LXX text tradition and the MT. These could be viewed, then, as inauthentic, but the loss to the teaching of Jesus was minimal. The question of the authenticity of Jesus' quotations is especially important for our study since Luke appears to use the LXX when he is expanding a quotation or incorporating quotation material from a source that is no longer extant. When this is added to the fact that all but two of Luke's quotations in his gospel are on the lips of Jesus, the importance of the authenticity question becomes evident.

Besides theories which focused on the OT material which the NT writers had at their disposal, there was continuing interest in presenting explanations for text-form discrepancies from the NT writers' interpretational methods. Using the reverse of Manson's argument<sup>1</sup> W. G. Kümmel, building on Sundberg's findings<sup>2</sup> that there was no fixed OT canon in NT times, concluded that the OT was not necessarily viewed by NT writers as a Holy Book which must be quoted literally.

C. H. Dodd's modification of the Testimony Book Hypothesis meant the introduction of another theory which would make first century interpretational methods acceptable to the scientific historical critical method. The point at issue again was the respect for the original OT

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, p. 35.

<sup>2</sup>W. G. Kümmel, "Schriftauslegung, III im Urchristentum," RGG, 3rd ed. (1958), Vol. V, ¶ 1519-20; A. C. Sundberg, The OT in the Early Church (Harvard Theological Studies, XX; Cambridge, Mass., 1964).

context which a NT writer did or did not show when he placed an OT quotation in its NT context. Instead of a chain of individual verses from various parts of the OT, Dodd believed that the testimony book contained a selection of large sections of the OT (e.g. Isaiah, Jeremiah, the minor prophets, the Psalms).<sup>1</sup> Each section was understood as a whole, "particular verses or sentences were quoted from them as pointers to the whole context rather than as constituting testimonies in and for themselves."<sup>2</sup> Dodd admitted that sometimes in NT writings an isolated OT text could be introduced to illustrate or elucidate, but in passages where the OT was fundamental to the argument or course of the narrative, it usually served as a pointer to its larger original context. Dodd sought to prove his thesis by showing that NT writers independently of one another used the same OT passage.<sup>3</sup>

M. D. Hooker, in her investigation of Isaiah 53 in the thought of Jesus, strongly contested Dodd's thesis.<sup>4</sup> Aside from being based on a circular argument, Dodd's thesis was not borne out by the evidence of NT passages. None show reminiscences of different verses from Isaiah 53 in such close proximity that they would indicate that the NT writer had the whole OT context in mind. Hooker concluded, "Unless we find any evidence to support Dodd's claim, however, either in a unified interpretation by the Jews of the whole Isaianic Servant concept, or in the

---

<sup>1</sup>C. H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures (London, 1952), p. 126.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>cf. B. J. Roberts ("The DSS and the OT Scriptures," BJRL, XXXVI (1953-54), pp. 75-96) for corroborating evidence from the Qumran practice; But see J. A. Fitzmyer ("The Use of Explicit OT Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the NT," NTS, VII (1960-61), pp. 297-333), who shows that the Qumran Literature contains "atomistic" OT quotations taken out of context.

<sup>4</sup>Hooker, p. 22f.; cf. A. C. Sundberg's ("On Testimonies," NovT, III (1959), pp. 268-81) criticism of all of Dodd's evidence.



NT passages themselves, we must assume that he has failed to prove his case, and that the 'atomistic' interpretation is therefore the correct one."<sup>1</sup>

Another new factor which was introduced into the discussion of the NT interpretational method was the information from the Qumran finds. The Qumran sect, like the early Christian community, was a movement outside the mainstream of Judaism. Members of this sect believed that they were living in days near to the End-time. The early church was different, for it believed that the last days had decisively arrived in the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth, the Messiah. However, both movements used the same interpretational methods. They modified the text-form of OT quotations to bring them into agreement with contemporary circumstances in which they considered the OT prophecy had been fulfilled.<sup>2</sup> The Qumran information was variously employed in the area of the NT's use of the OT. For some scholars, it confirmed the judgment that the NT writers did indeed follow first century methods, "the subjective and arbitrary use of prophecy" with its disregard for the original OT context. For others, the differences between the interpretational methods of the NT and Qumran writings showed that the NT writers possessed more of a historical consciousness when using OT writings than their Jewish contemporaries. The discrepancy between their methods and those of the scientific historical critical method was not as great as had been supposed.

J. C. G. Greig saw the Qumran sect's interpretational methods as further evidence for the first century Jewish exegetical practices

---

<sup>1</sup>Hooker, p. 22f.; Atomistic interpretation means that the NT writer only intends to apply to the NT context what he actually quotes. He does not point to the larger original context.

<sup>2</sup>cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, *NTS*, VII, pp. 297-333; J. DeWaard, A Comparative Study of the OT Text in the DSS and in the NT (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, IV; Leiden, 1966).

which the disciples, as opposed to their rabbi, Jesus, took up.<sup>1</sup>

That Luke, for example, makes Jesus the author of like interpretations of prophecy (Lk. 24:25ff.; 44ff.) must therefore make us ask how far these Evangelists were accurate interpreters of him, and how far they were carried away by apocalyptic beliefs and literary techniques for the presentation of prophetic material which they shared with Qumran and he did not. We may indeed ask ourselves whether the Dead Sea Scrolls have not given us the means wherewith finally to discredit the traditional argument from prophecy as evangelical witness to the Messiahship of Jesus, seeing what a Procrustean bed it can be in the peshar of DSH."<sup>2</sup>

F. F. Bruce, through a comparison of Biblical exegesis in Qumran and the NT, concluded that the NT interpretation of the OT did not go against either the original context or the historical intention of the OT writers; rather, it worked within the framework of OT history as a part of, and in line with, "the interaction of God's revelation and men's response in the process of OT history."<sup>3</sup> This was not paralleled in Qumran. Also not paralleled was the belief that Jesus was the final fulfilment of all OT promises. "...Jesus has fulfilled the ancient promises, and in fulfilling them He has given them a new meaning, in which their original meaning is not set aside but caught up into something more comprehensive and far-reaching than was foreseen before He came."<sup>4</sup> There was discrepancy within continuity. But it was a discrepancy which the original context would welcome for it was its fulfilment.

---

<sup>1</sup>S. L. Edgar ("Respect for Context in Quotations from the OT," NTS, IX (1962-63), pp. 55-62) used this presumed difference in method as a device for discovering the authentic words of Jesus. Those quotations which respected their original context were authentic words of Jesus; those that did not originated in the early church; see above p. 22 ; see below, p. 70.

<sup>2</sup>J. C. G. Greig, "Gospel Messianism and the Qumran Use of Prophecy," Studia Evangelica, Vol. I; ed. K. Aland et al (TU, LXXIII; Berlin, 1959), p. 598.

<sup>3</sup>F. F. Bruce, Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts (The Hague, 1959), p. 68.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 77.

Thus, although Qumran did not solve this problem, it did provide needed exegetical material for comparison. And the comparison pointed out more sharply than before that the distinctive thing about fulfilment in the NT was that it is not merely eschatological, but Christocentric.<sup>1</sup>

R. T. Mead analyzes R. L. Edgar's theory concerning the relationship between the respect shown for the original context by an OT quotation in the Gospels and the originator of the quotation. Mead produced a classification of OT quotations according to the degree to which they respect their original OT context. After dividing the quotations into fulfilment (either future or present fulfilment) proof-texts, and non-fulfilment or non-predictive OT quotations, Mead presents these categories: (1) the quote respects the OT context; (2) the quote is detached from its OT context (i.e. the situation which Jesus would explain by quoting may resemble the OT situation in one or a few particulars; the quotation runs far enough to associate these particulars but then stops); (3) the quote violates its OT context (either the OT situation is thoroughly disregarded or novel subjects/objects are substituted for the elements of the original context).<sup>2</sup> Mead concluded that while some future fulfilment proof-texts did violate the OT context, there was little disregard for OT context among present fulfilment proof-texts and no disregard among non-predictive texts. He found that his analysis cut across the distinction between Jesus and the NT writers. Respect for original context had nothing to do with who was speaking but with the function of the OT quotation in the NT narrative. High respect for the original context occurred when the narrative required

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, p. 37.

<sup>2</sup>R. T. Mead, "A Dissenting Opinion about Respect for Context in OT Quotations," NTS, X (1963-64), p. 280f.

a true text to comment on, a solid basis for valid inferences, or a text for an attack or defence in the face of hostile questioners.<sup>1</sup>

Mead concluded that NT writers, in common with their Palestinian Jewish contemporaries, "moved about in an atmosphere of revealed religion which regarded scriptural statements as true both in whole and in various-sized parts." Hence, "historical contextuality was not a cherished principle in NT times."<sup>2</sup> Mead observed interestingly that the understanding of "context" is always arrived at by consensus. For current scholarship which uses the scientific historical critical method "context" means the historical situation and the intention of the original writer. In NT times it meant scriptural truth taken from Scripture as a whole or from its various parts. The NT understanding of "context" allowed even the unrestrained and arbitrary use of proof-texts with its disregard for original context. Mead explains the NT understanding of "context" sociologically. He says that early Christianity flourished in a network of cell groups marked by a strong inner consensus and shielded with an impenetrable parochialism. Without the pressures from outside and from within which would force a more careful and less arbitrary approach to the OT text, the NT understanding of "context" could maintain itself.

J. Barr says that we should evaluate NT use of OT quotations not against their original context but "against the context of what the early Christians were doing with them [*i.e.* OT quotations]. This situation of

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 282.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 288; so also James Barr (Old and New in Interpretation (London, 1966), pp. 143ff.); M. P. Miller (JSJ, II, p. 66) observes that midrashic method worked on the principle that the whole of Scripture could serve as the original context for a given atomistic quotation. Hence, texts from diverse contexts could be linked together in a midrash on the basis of their similarity in wording, with the confidence that this method was legitimate and the resulting interpretation true, because all the texts came from the same author, God himself; cf. the rules of rabbinic exegesis, Middoth 2, 3, and 6 (C. K. Barrett, "The Interpretation of the OT in the New," The Cambridge History of the Bible, ed. P. R. Ackroyd and C. F. Evans (Cambridge, 1970), Vol. I-From the Beginnings to Jerome, p. 383).

both creativity and faithfulness to scriptural tradition (quite apart from traditional texts being quoted) forms the context against which the use of the text is to be seen."<sup>1</sup>

The kind of arbitrariness which we do have is not that of a reasoned or fixed method of interpretation constantly used from a fixed religious structure. It is "the arbitrariness of creativity in departure from a defined tradition."<sup>2</sup> The result is that we can develop no fixed interpretational method from the NT writers' use of the Old. Their use appears only as kerygma with illustrated Biblical texts or as the development of an apologetic argument working with texts. It is a fast and sporadic presentation which cannot be extended to OT texts other than those with which it is used in the NT.

Whereas previously, the prophecy and fulfilment scheme which bound the two testaments together and enabled the NT writers to practice their interpretational methods was understood from the perspective of the spiritual reality which created and maintained it, God's sovereign will,<sup>3</sup> now the same scheme was viewed from the human perspective, the way the NT writer used it. C. H. Dodd described the NT approach this way: "They conceived the OT course of events, with all its unpredictable vicissitudes, to exhibit certain universal principles, embedded in the structure of this world as governed by the law and providence of God."<sup>4</sup> Such truths as glory through suffering and the relation of sin, judgment, and restoration presented a basic plot of God's dealing with men. It was the NT writers'

---

<sup>1</sup>Barr, p. 143; cf. M. P. Miller (JSJ, II, p. 66), who further states that because of the reciprocal relationship between OT text and current experience in the midrashic method, the contemporary needs of the community also provided a context in which atomistic quotes could be understood.

<sup>2</sup>Barr, p. 143.

<sup>3</sup>See above, p. 21.

<sup>4</sup>Dodd, p. 16; Contrast Suhl (p. 47), who sees the life and words of Jesus as the controlling factor in the NT approach to the OT.

perception of this plot, as well as their confidence in the progressively unfolding plan of God, which enabled them to see and proclaim that prophecy was fulfilled.<sup>1</sup>

The way in which this approach overcame the discrepancy between the NT method of interpretation and the scientific historical critical method was to emphasize the historical sense which this framework of understanding lent to the method of interpretation. In the main, this historical sense pushed to the periphery any questionable, arbitrary, or even fanciful exegesis.<sup>2</sup>

One part of NT quotations which had suffered neglect was the introductory formula. In this period we have an analytical-comparative study of the Mishnah and the NT by B. M. Metzger which yielded the following results. The similarities in introductory formulas between the Mishnah and NT are due to a common dependence on the OT as a model for introductory formulas. The differences, notably the greater emphasis in the NT on a telic "fulfilment" formula, are due to a different interpretation of history. "More precisely, the characteristically Christian view of the continuing activity of God in the historical events comprising the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth, fulfilling and completing the divine revelation recorded in the OT, is reflected even in the choice of formulas introducing quotations of Scripture in the NT."<sup>3</sup> Increasingly, the importance of the introductory formulas for understanding a NT writer's use of the OT was realized.<sup>4</sup> But Tilden dismissed the importance of intro-

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. Barrett (The Cambridge History of the Bible, I, p. 403) who observes, "...NT thinkers worked their way so successfully into the essential meaning of the OT that they were sometimes at least able to bring to light a genuine community of thought and feeling between what had been experienced and said in the distant past, and the event of Jesus Christ."

<sup>2</sup>Dodd, p. 133.

<sup>3</sup>B. M. Metzger, "The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and Mishnah," JBL, LXX (1951), p. 307; The Qumran literature further confirmed these observations (Fitzmyer, NTS, VII, p. 303).

<sup>4</sup>cf. Karnetzki, pp. 8ff.; W. Rothfuchs, Die Erfüllungszitate des Matthäus-Evangeliums (BWANT, V:8; Stuttgart, 1969), p. 17.

ductory formulas because of their great variety in the Gospels and their seeming ad hominem usage. Jesus rests his argument "rather on the force of the OT than on the literary form of the introductory words."<sup>1</sup>

There was just as much activity during this period which focused on Luke's use of the OT.<sup>2</sup> The text-form of Luke's quotations was analyzed for what it could tell us about the materials Luke used as well as what he did with those materials. T. Holtz set out to determine how much of the OT Luke knew at first hand.<sup>3</sup> He treated as relevant evidence only those quotations which are in agreement with the LXX. The rest he supposed came from Luke's sources. Holtz concluded that Luke knew at first hand the A-type LXX text of Isaiah, some of the Psalms,<sup>4</sup> and three minor prophets. He probably didn't know the Pentateuch and was familiar with only a little of Israel's history and that through traditional summaries. He had access to testimonies. Holtz admitted that Luke quotes OT material on subjects which interest him, namely prophecy in the prophets and the writings. So, the fact that he does not quote from a section of the OT does not mean he does not know it. Yet, even with this proviso, Holtz still claimed that Luke did not know, or was not interested in the Pentateuch. This was because he and his readers had a Gentile background.<sup>5</sup>

M. Rese criticized Holtz for not taking into account the possibility that Luke did not make accurate use of the text-form of the LXX at his

---

<sup>1</sup>E. E. Tilden, "The Study of Jesus' Interpretational Methods," Interpretation, VII (1953), p. 49.

<sup>2</sup>Rese, p. 23.

<sup>3</sup>T. Holtz, Untersuchung über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas (TU, CIV; Berlin, 1968).

<sup>4</sup>Hinderlich (p. 34) maintains that Luke by procuring from the Psalms a greater number of meaningful messianic proof-texts, indicates the importance of this OT book for him. He even raises it to the same level of significance as the OT sections, the law and the prophets (cf. 24:44).

<sup>5</sup>Smith (The Use of the OT, p. 49) offers a historical reason for Luke's limited canon. He was writing toward the end of the first century when the separation of the early church from the Hellenistic synagogue meant that he no longer had access to the synagogue library.

disposal.<sup>1</sup> Rese asked Holtz to consider the possibility that some of the text-form discrepancies in Luke were due to Luke's own editing of the LXX for stylistic or theological reasons. This was, in fact, the way Rese understood the origin of the text-form discrepancies in Luke. He treated the OT quotations as tradition which Luke worked into his gospel. The text-form differences helped Rese to understand the relationship between tradition and composition in Luke; to determine individual features of Lukan style; and to uncover Luke's attitude towards tradition and his place within the history of traditions.<sup>2</sup> To the present, then, both areas of explanation of text-form discrepancy: the materials Luke used and the use he made of them, have had theories presented in their favor.

With the focus on Luke the writer during this period, the question of the lack of OT quotations in his gospel received much attention. Dodd did not see it as simply Luke's preference for fewer quotations for "why, having cut down Mark's list, has he then added fresh testimonies which do not occur in Mark? And why, if he did not want to reproduce Mark's list, did he, while rejecting some of his testimonies, substitute others drawn from the same parts of scripture and carrying the same implications for the understanding of the passion and death of Jesus?"<sup>3</sup> The answer is not obvious if we just say Luke edited Mark. But if we suppose that the testimonia were important in shaping the passion narrative from the first, "we should not be rash in concluding that Luke was probably acquainted with an account formed independently of Mark, supported by a different set of testimonies..."<sup>4</sup>

A. A. T. Ehrhardt proposed that Luke's place in the general development

---

<sup>1</sup> Rese, p. 212.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 34; See above, p. 36.

<sup>3</sup> C. H. Dodd, Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel (Cambridge, 1963), p. 36.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.



of the use of testimonia in the early church explained his use of Scripture. The development proceeded in three phases from the early uncritical adoption of Jewish collections of testimonia concerning the Messiah, in general, to the Christian collections intended to prove that the death and resurrection of Christ happened in accordance with the Scriptures (even as late as Barnabas). Finally, there was a conflation of Jewish and Christian testimonia (Cyprian, a chief example).<sup>1</sup> Ehrhardt placed Luke between Matthew and John in the midst of the second phase. Luke's reference to "all the scriptures" (24:25-27, 44) reflected his and the early church's dissatisfaction with the Jewish testimonia. These did not deal with Jesus' promised death and resurrection. He was a step beyond Mt. 26:54, 56, where the Jewish testimonia have been removed, but he had not advanced quite as far as John with his secure proof-texts. Luke filled the gaps, not with proof-texts, but with the explanation that the ignorance of the Jews caused Jesus' death.

Most explanations of the lack of quotations in Luke appealed to Luke's interpretational methods. Writers took up the observations of the previous period based on the "two document source hypothesis" and attempted to give positive explanations for Lukan evidence. Reese pointed out that the placement of the quotations was of high significance for the message of the gospel,<sup>2</sup> and outweighed their fewness. D. M. Smith observed that Luke's tendency to place quotations on the lips of Jesus was due mainly to the precedents established by Mark and Q.<sup>3</sup> He said it was

---

<sup>1</sup>A. A. T. Ehrhardt, "The Disciples of Emmaus," *NTS*, X (1963-64), p. 189; cf. M. F. Wiles' ("The OT in Controversy with the Jews," *SJT*, VIII (1955), p. 118) reconstruction which supports Dodd's theory about proof-texts as pointers to the larger original context.

<sup>2</sup>Reese, pp. 207ff.; cf. Kümmel's (*RGK*, 3rd ed., V, ¶ 1518) comment that the importance which a writer attaches to the OT should not be judged by the number of his quotations for the number may be determined by the literary character and purpose of the NT writer's work.

<sup>3</sup>Smith, *The Use of the OT*, p. 49.

also significant that Jesus' initial and final utterances in Luke's gospel included OT quotations.

In the wake of H. Conzelmann's seminal work on Lukan theology, there was a revived interest in the role of prophecy and fulfilment in Lukan thought. Many following P. Schubert and H. Conzelmann reasserted the prominence of this scheme in Luke. They emphasized the distinctive perspective of Luke, which they recognized as his sense of salvation history. This in one way or another modified the way in which Luke presented the fulfilment of prophecy.<sup>1</sup>

G. B. Caird observed that Luke didn't present isolated explicit OT quotations but "the whole tenor, purport, and pattern of OT teaching and history."<sup>2</sup> Suhl concluded that Matthew wrote from the perspective of the present looking back on the past in which the great promises of the OT were fulfilled. He could thus indicate his promise and fulfilment scheme through editorial formula quotations. Luke wrote as though he were in the past, as though he were a contemporary with those whose actions he portrays. He relived the events and let the successively realized plan of God work itself out before his readers' eyes. To editorially introduce formula quotations would destroy this perspective. The idea of scriptural fulfilment could come across just as well through general statements about

---

<sup>1</sup>Rese, p. 23f.; P. Schubert, "The Structure and Significance of Lk. 24," Neutestamentliche Studien für R. Bultmann, ed. W. Eltester, 2nd ed. (BZNW, XXI; Berlin, 1957), pp. 165-186; Conzelmann, p. 162; Contrast S. G. Wilson ("Lukan Eschatology," NTS, XVI (1969-70), p. 335), who claims that Conzelmann's three epoch scheme of salvation history does not accurately describe Luke's thinking. Wilson thinks a promise and fulfilment scheme controls Luke's view of salvation history.

<sup>2</sup>G. B. Caird, The Gospel of St. Luke (Pelican Gospel Commentaries; Harmondsworth, Eng., 1963), p. 34.

OT fulfilment and the simple presentation of historical facts.<sup>1</sup>

Rothfuchs noted the distribution of OT fulfilment quotations in Luke.

They are focused on the death and resurrection while Matthew's are distributed throughout his gospel.<sup>2</sup>

Luke's Gentile audience was still held to provide a reason for his few quotations. The writers now however sought to present the reasons behind that reason. S. Schulz explained that in confronting Gentiles, Luke could no longer use Scripture as the self-evidently true witness to the revelation of the will of God, as the early Christian missionaries had done with the Jews. Rather, the existence of God's will and the proclamation that it was working itself out, became primary. The Scriptures were of secondary importance though they were still direct proof of the fulfilled will of God.<sup>3</sup>

U. Luck explained the small number of fulfilment of prophecy quotations in Luke by referring to Luke's theology of the Holy Spirit.<sup>4</sup> The Holy Spirit, not the inspired Scriptures, was the active agent fulfilling the plan of God in the life of Jesus. Indeed, the Scriptures did not have authority on their own, but rather, the Spirit spoke in them as prophetic witness. Hence, presentation of the fulfilment of the plan of God primarily by means of authoritative proof-texts was inappropriate.

While many were embracing the idea that a prophecy and fulfilment scheme was dominant in Luke, though salvation history had altered its mode of expression, Rese called this understanding of Luke into question. He proposed an analysis of the quotation material in Luke-Acts to see whether it would support this theory. The two features of an OT quotation which

<sup>1</sup>Suhl, p. 165; cf. E. Lohse, "Lukas als Theologe der Heilsgeschichte," EvTh, XIV (1954-55) p. 264.

<sup>2</sup>Rothfuchs, pp. 147-149.

<sup>3</sup>S. Schulz, "Gottes Vorsehung bei Lukas," ZNW, LIV (1963), pp. 104-116; cf. W. Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (ThHK, 2nd ed., III; Berlin, 1961), p. 23.

<sup>4</sup>U. Luck, "Kerygma, Tradition und Geschichte Jesu bei Lukas," ZTK, LVII (1960), pp. 51-66.

is used in a true promise and fulfilment scheme are its functioning as a proof-text and its manifestation of an awareness of a distinction between the time of the promise and that of its fulfilment. Luke's use of OT quotations according to Rese fell into four categories: (1) The "hermeneutical" use of an OT quote functioned to explain an idea or event. The quotation did not serve to prove anything and there was no recognition of the time distinction between the OT context and the NT use. (2) The "simple proof" use functioned to prove the truth of an assertion by confirming it through a quote from the OT, which was the authoritative Word of God. Here again there was no recognition of time distinction between OT and NT expressed by a promise and fulfilment framework. (3) The "proof" use in a "scheme of fulfilment and promise" does have both of the features necessary to qualify it as a use within the promise and fulfilment scheme. And, it should be noted that this use emphasizes the present fulfilment. The fulfilment event was, in fact, the criterion for the choice of the OT quotation. (4) The "proof" use in a "scheme of promise and fulfilment" also has the necessary features of a fulfilment from prophecy quote. Here, the emphasis is on the past and the OT promise which has been made.<sup>1</sup>

After classifying the various quotations according to these categories, Rese concluded that the "proof" uses within promise and fulfilment schemes were less significant for Luke than his "hermeneutical" and "simple proof" uses. Of the two fulfilment schemes, the "fulfilment and promise" variety was more important in Luke. On this evidence the usual understanding of Luke's theology, a salvation history approach grounded in a linear view of history and unfolding according to a promise and fulfilment scheme, does not stand up. Rese concluded that Luke saw the function of the OT,

---

<sup>1</sup>Rese, pp. 37ff.

not as providing a body of prophecy ready to be fulfilled, but as an essential aid for understanding the actions of God in the past, the present, and the future.

The influence of Scripture's role in Luke's apologetic purposes, which Cadbury stressed,<sup>1</sup> Rese says must be left undecided.<sup>2</sup> Other scholars, however, attempted to define Luke's apologetic purposes and the way Scripture was used in them in terms of situations of controversy within and without the early church. L. C. Crockett saw Luke's use of the OT in aid of a theology of forgiveness and reconciliation which was aimed at solving the Jewish-Gentile table fellowship problem.<sup>3</sup> C. H. Talbert believed that the controversy to which Luke addressed himself was the Gnostic-Christian conflict. Part of his anti-gnostic polemic was a counter-attack against the gnostic misinterpretation of Scripture. By setting out the whole range of salvation history within a framework of scriptural promise and fulfilment and by showing a parallel use of this framework by Jesus and the early church, "it is as though Luke were trying to say that the church's interpretation of Scripture and thereby of salvation history is nothing more than an extension in time of Jesus' interpretation of the OT and his view of salvation history."<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, p. 39; cf. H. Anderson, "The OT in St. Mark's Gospel," The Use of the OT in the New and other Essays in honor of W. F. Stinespring, ed. J. M. Eifrid (Durham, N. C., 1972), p. 306.

<sup>2</sup>Rese, p. 210; J. Ernst ("Schriftauslegung und Auferstehung bei Lukas," Theologie und Glaube, LX (1970), p. 371) criticizes Rese on this point, saying that while his categories of OT usage in Luke may be true formally they do not account for the polemic purposes, especially the apologetic concerning the Gentile mission, for which Luke uses the OT.

<sup>3</sup>L. C. Crockett, The OT in the Gospel of Luke (Diss., Brown U.; Providence, R.I., 1966); cf. F. Schütz (Der Leidende Christus (BWANT, V:9; Stuttgart, 1968), pp. 41, 98), who contends that a persecution situation determined the way the gospel was written; Contrast Smith (The Use of the OT, p. 50), who says that Luke the Gentile can use the Scriptures and stress the continuity between Judaism and Christianity only because the struggle with the Jewish Christians over the observance of the OT law has ended.

<sup>4</sup>C. H. Talbert, Luke and the Gnostics (Nashville, 1966), p. 35.

### Old Testament Allusion

In the study of OT allusions during this period, midrashic methods received more careful attention; the relationship of NT historical detail to OT prophecy was looked at from a different angle; several new functions for allusions, besides proof from prophecy, were proposed; and non-allusions received close scrutiny.

J. W. Doeve performed a most extensive analysis on the Gospels to show that a Christian midrash on related OT proof-texts was the literary form in which the gospel tradition developed. Both he and B. P. W. ~~Stather~~-Hunt offered this method as the explanation for the discrepancies in chronological order among the Synoptic Gospels.<sup>1</sup> Since the order of material in the gospel traditon was originally determined by considerations of Jewish exegetical method, including the linking of related proof-texts, chronological considerations were never decisive in the process. The gospel writer merely worked with the received tradition. According to Hunt the gospel writer also played an active role in selecting and editing his material "to show how completely the incidents in the life of our Lord fit into the pattern which had been laid down for the Messiah in such profuse detail by the prophets."<sup>2</sup>

With the discoveries of Qumran came the renewed discussion of what was actually meant by the term, "midrash." Ellis put the issue succinctly: "What are the guidelines to distinguish midrash as a literary genre and midrash as an activity? Or is this distinction a later refinement that has no place in the pre-Christian or pre-rabbinic usage? How much and what kind of paraphrastic elaboration is required before a "targum" becomes a "midrash" (or "midrash--targum")?"<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>J. W. Doeve, Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts (Assen, 1953); B. P. W. ~~Stather~~-Hunt, Primitive Gospel Sources (London, 1951).

<sup>2</sup>~~Stather~~-Hunt, p. xii.

<sup>3</sup>Ellis, Neotestamentica et Semitica, p. 64f.

These questions are important for NT studies because very rarely does the NT present material in the literary genre of midrash. So we must seek ways to identify when the midrashic method is being used. Ellis took a slightly different approach from Selwyn's for he used the literary genre as his clue. This genre is made up of two basic parts: the lemma, the text of Scripture on which the writer wished to comment; and the midrash, the commentary itself. When we encounter a pattern of OT allusions from different, though related OT passages clustered around a given event in the NT narrative and seeming to provide the substructure for it, then we are probably face to face with a detached midrash, without its lemma text. When we find brief, isolated OT quotations, then we have to do with detached lemma without its commentary. In this approach the concern with literary genre helps keep a check up on an imagination such as Selwyn manifested. As we noted he had a tendency to see the midrashic method at work wherever verbal parallelism to the OT could be noted.

Midrashic method also provided a way for looking at the relationship of prophecy to fulfilment in history. Miller commented about the perspective of midrash:

And if this is the case that Scripture is prophetic, text and experience are not two autonomous domains. On the contrary, they are reciprocally enlightening even as the immediate event helps make the age-old text intelligible, so in turn the text reveals the fundamental significance of the recent event or experience... Such a reciprocal relation is at work in the NT where the Scriptures witness to and interpret the person and work of Christ even as his person and work unveils the mystery and wisdom of the Scripture.<sup>1</sup>

C. F. D. Moule expressed this reciprocal relation in the following way. While the OT had a profound influence on the church's NT writing, "this influence was evidently subordinate both to the influence of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Miller, JSJ, II, p. 44.

apostolic witness to Jesus and to the living inspiration of Christian prophets in the church."<sup>1</sup>

C. Maurer investigated Mark's OT allusions and suggested that they presented a "fulfilment in fact," in contrast to the "fulfilment in word" of the many proof-texts of Matthew.<sup>2</sup> They show fulfilment in the person of Jesus through the simple presentation of the facts. Karnetzki disagreed with Maurer's description of allusions. He saw the difference in presentation of proof by allusion instead of quotation, as the result of a different view of Scripture. Holy Scripture was being narrated as promise not as proof to those who do not need to have the messianic prophecies demonstrated to them. The allusion functions as a witness to Christ, showing in the words of OT promises which of them had been fulfilled in Jesus.<sup>3</sup> Suhl wanted to take Mark's allusions completely outside the sphere of promise and fulfilment. They are just examples of the natural OT coloring of a narrative about one in whom the writer was convinced God was acting according to the Scriptures.<sup>4</sup> Rese opposed Suhl by asking, if the OT allusions are merely a coloring of the narrative with OT language, how can we distinguish between gospel tradition in OT language and gospel tradition that has been shaped by the OT?<sup>5</sup> The significance of the allusive material should not be limited to that of descriptive language. Since Luke used Mark as one of his sources, these analyses of Mark's method of alluding to

---

<sup>1</sup>C. F. D. Moule, The Birth of the NT (Companion Vol. I to Black's NT Commentaries; London, 1962), p. 85; cf. Kümmel, RGK, 3rd ed., V, ¶ 1519.

<sup>2</sup>C. Maurer, "Knecht Gottes und Sohn Gottes im Passionsbericht des Markusevangelium," ZTK, L (1953), p. 7.

<sup>3</sup>Karnetzki, p. 84; cf. S. Amsler, L'Ancien Testament dans l'église (Bibliothèque Théologique; Neuchâtel, 1960).

<sup>4</sup>Suhl, p. 65; See above, p. 63.

<sup>5</sup>Rese, p. 72.



the OT are important for understanding the use Luke made of Mark's allusions.

R. Sumner<sup>1</sup> discusses Luke's use of allusion and concludes that it was employed sometimes to compare and sometimes to contrast God's activity among his people through Jesus and through the servants of the Lord in OT times. The density of allusions in any given section depends on its setting. Sumner is not hard pressed to explain non-allusions. Rather she is impressed with the number of allusions in Luke. She notes especially Luke's practice of changing Mark's explicit quotations into "subtle allusions" and his development of a pattern of allusion throughout his work which entails not only references to OT passages but allusions to John the Baptist's or Jesus' ministry in his later narrative of the growth and witness of the early church. This method of allusion used in these ways, which should not be understood as a rigid scheme of typology, not only brings out the theological implications of the events recorded when they are tied to the OT, but it also gives unity to Luke's whole work. It is a practical demonstration of the belief in the continuity of revelation throughout salvation history.

The non-allusions of Luke still caused concern. This period saw a mixture of new theories proposed and some analyses made of individual cases. Conzelmann wondered, "We cannot be sure of the reason for the omission, as fulfilment plays as important a part in Luke as in Mark."<sup>2</sup>

Karnetzki and Maurer offered a mixture of reasons for Luke's failure to take over OT allusions from Mark: Luke's historical interests, his stylistic or theological motives, his choice of another source.<sup>3</sup> Any of

---

<sup>1</sup>Sumner, pp. 98ff.

<sup>2</sup>Conzelmann, p. 158, n. 4.

<sup>3</sup>Karnetzki, p. 249; Maurer, ZTK, I, passim.

these might govern an editorial alteration which destroys an allusion. His treatment of OT allusions in his sources appeared to be no different from the way he treated the other content of his sources. Thus, he often seemed not to be aware of the allusion's existence.

#### Old Testament Idea

The research into Luke's use of OT ideas also flourished during this period. The approach generally gave proper attention to the roles that both the OT and the immediate Jewish background played in Luke's thought. Conzelmann gave impetus to the redaction critical endeavors in the study of Lukan theology. Many studies of individual theological themes took the OT background into account.

E. Stauffer well summarized the balanced approach to the OT and Jewish background of NT thought which prevailed during this time. Since the OT was the Bible of primitive Christianity, "wherever in the NT the presuppositions of primitive Christian theology are not sufficiently self-evident, we must turn in the first place to the OT to find their antecedents."<sup>1</sup> But we must also take the Jewish Intertestamental literature into account: "...the NT writers are rooted so far as their exegetical and theological thought forms go, in a living tradition which comes from the OT via the apocryphal literature down to the apocalyptic national writings of their own time."<sup>2</sup>

David Hill's study was along the same lines as Stauffer's.<sup>3</sup> The main difference was that he emphasized the importance of the immediate

---

<sup>1</sup>E. Stauffer, NT Theology, trans. J. Marsh (London, 1955), p. 18.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 20; cf. Karnetzki (p. 184), who sees the history of tradition, which determined the text-form and interpretation of OT quotations in the New, beginning in the exegetical tradition of the pre-Christian Jewish community.

<sup>3</sup>D. Hill, Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings (SNTS Monograph Series, V; Cambridge, 1967).

context for the determination of a word's meaning. This was part of a necessary control against the "illegitimate transfer" of the whole range of meanings of a word to its use at any given place. Further, Hill did not wait for a word's meaning to create difficulty before he went to the OT for help. Rather, he wanted to uncover the changed or added new meaning which Greek words received when they were used by Jews and Christians. He takes the translation Greek of the LXX as the primary factor in the creation of this peculiar use of Greek words among Jews and Christians. The OT became again a positive aid for understanding Greek words with Hebrew meanings.

F. F. Bruce studied the conscious use of OT ideas in the NT. The object of his examination was to stand at some distance and view "the dominant motifs which recur throughout the Biblical literature and bind them together."<sup>1</sup> He wanted to see how the NT writers continued to use these vehicles of revelation; motifs, images, themes, to set forth the perfected revelation in Christ. Bruce provided an important qualification. The plain sense of the Biblical narrative and language provided a control both in the OT and in the New for determining what OT material was appropriate for use as motifs and themes, and what NT passages in their plain sense actually showed the use of such themes.

R. V. G. Tasker commented on OT ideas in Luke in particular. He conceded that Luke told his narrative of Jesus' life and ministry with "much less attempt to see in it fulfilment of OT prophecy." He did insist, however, that the gospel was told against an OT background. "This [OT background] is perhaps a feature of this gospel that is not sufficiently recognized."<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>F. F. Bruce, This is That (Exeter, 1969), p. 18.

<sup>2</sup>R. V. G. Tasker, The OT in the NT (London, 1946), p. 38; cf. C. K. Barrett, Luke the Historian in Recent Study (London, 1961), p. 17.

Tasker rejected the explanation that any OT or Jewish interests are due to Luke's sources. Such interests are present in all strata of his work and chiefly in his special material. Although here, too, Luke is using reliable tradition, they "would appear to have been 'written up' by the evangelist; and we are justified in regarding them as evidence for his point of view."<sup>1</sup> Tasker offered Luke's sense of the dramatic, his literary skill, and his wide humanitarian sympathies as the reasons why the OT background in his gospel was often not noticed. These factors tended to smooth over any roughness in the narrative which usually indicates a semitic or OT background in thought and style.

Just as Luke's interpretational methods, especially the use of the promise and fulfilment scheme, were viewed within a framework of salvation history, so scholars saw the theology of Luke and its use of OT ideas as basically within the same salvation history framework. Conzelmann said that Luke divides salvation history into distinct epochs. The OT Scriptures belong to the epoch of the past up to the coming of Jesus. Yet, through their prophetic elements they provide a continuity between that past epoch and the middle epoch, Jesus' earthly ministry, and the present epoch of the church. What was promised in the past has come to fulfilment in the later epochs. Yet one must not think that details from Israel's past have come to fulfilment. Rather, the idea of the people of God is the continuing reality in the plan of redemptive history.<sup>2</sup> As Conzelmann described these epochs of history and sections within them, they appear as blocks of time, each characterized by a single OT idea (e.g. "temptation" is the main theme of the passion narrative; "people of God"

---

<sup>1</sup>Tasker, p. 38:

<sup>2</sup>cf. N. B. Stonehouse (The Witness of Luke to Christ (London, 1951), p. 162), who interprets Luke in a somewhat similar way, from a covenant theology viewpoint.

is the main idea of the OT epoch). For Conzelmann the identification of a number of OT ideas within a narrative of a given part of salvation history, like the passion narrative, is often made irrelevant. Where various OT ideas are identified, they are bound together in a larger complex of thought so that an interest in the unity of thought takes precedence over concern with its various parts. While Conzelmann rendered the valuable service of introducing a theory to explain the OT thought content in Luke within Luke's basic theological perspective, his natural tendency to lump concepts together into complex wholes prevented a thorough analysis of any given OT idea in Luke.<sup>1</sup>

Conzelmann helped to open up a new perspective for thinking about Luke's use of OT ideas. Many that followed simply collected the information, trying to trace out the patterns of individual theological themes in Luke and identify the appropriate OT background. While some ambitious, and some not so ambitious, theories to explain the central focus of Luke's theology were offered,<sup>2</sup> only R. Sumner<sup>3</sup> has attempted to look at Luke's theology from the standpoint of OT ideas and ask how Luke used an OT idea in his theology. While most approached Luke's theology from the standpoint of Luke himself and asked how OT ideas influenced him, Sumner tries to discern what OT themes Luke consciously uses. She discusses how these themes, especially Davidic messiahship and the scheme of prophetic promise and fulfilment, advance his aim to show the continuity of revelation. Sumner makes a good start but her work is only at the collection and hypothesis stages. The work of analysis on the OT ideas in Luke from the perspective of Luke's conscious use of OT material in his theology is yet to be done.

---

<sup>1</sup>Conzelmann, pp. 157ff.; Contrast J. Navone, Themes of St. Luke (Rome, 1971), and many studies on individual ideas in Luke:

<sup>2</sup>cf. I. H. Marshall's (Luke: Historian and Theologian (Grand Rapids, Mich., 1971), pp. 77ff.) survey.

<sup>3</sup>Sumner, pp. 178ff.

### Old Testament Style

Scholars studying OT style in the New revived the Biblical Greek theory of the nature of NT language. This meant an attack upon the koiné theory and its semitic source explanation for the semitic element in the Gospels. The semitic source explanation was also attacked by a LXX style imitation theory. There was greater precision in defining a LXXism. The semitic element in Luke's gospel received close attention.

N. Turner built his case for a peculiar Biblical Greek language spoken by Jews and Christians on the syntactical features of NT Greek. The previous representatives of such a theory based their case mostly on vocabulary. He took syntactical features which, while not obviously semitic, occur more frequently in the LXX and the NT, than in the koiné represented in the papyri. He observed, "...this language is not as close to that of the papyri as was formerly suggested--even when the more obvious 'Semitisms' have been eliminated."<sup>1</sup> The tendency of syntactical agreement between the LXX and the NT based on this frequency led him to propose that they were documents written in a peculiar language. Since the LXX is the only other major extant example of this peculiar language, Turner was, as his predecessors were, unable or unwilling to distinguish in the NT material between semitisms that were really characteristics of the Biblical Greek language and semitisms that were LXX style imitation.

D. Tabachovitz and E. Plumacher present a case for LXX style imitation as the explanation of semitisms in the NT and Luke. Tabachovitz showed the untenability of the alternative explanations. Through an analysis of semitic elements in the NT which were identified as Aramaisms he showed that these were not exclusively Aramaisms. The Biblical or Jewish-Greek explanation of the semitic element in the NT was on shaky ground because

---

<sup>1</sup>N. Turner, "The Unique Character of Biblical Greek," VT, V (1955), p. 212; cf. H. S. Gehman, "The Hebrew Character of Septuagint Greek," VT, I (1951), p. 90.

evidence for it could also be used to substantiate the LXX style imitation explanation. The most that could be said for the Jewish-Greek theory was that Jews of the Diaspora used expressions in religious connections that they took from the LXX. Tabachovitz concluded that quite naturally Christians who wrote about the fulfilment of the OT would record that fulfilment in OT LXX style. This lent authority to their writing and was a means of combatting Hellenism.<sup>1</sup>

E. Plumacher's analysis of the LXX style in the Acts speeches contributes both a method for identifying LXXisms and a theological reason for Luke's use of this style. He identifies LXXisms through a process of elimination.<sup>2</sup> Not only are the semitic elements not the result of Luke's use of sources or translation Greek, but they must be distinguished from quotations and allusions common in the early church. Especially quotations and allusions which serve as proof-texts must be set aside. The vocabulary choice and the grammatical constructions which remain may then be identified as evidence of Luke's LXX style imitation. In comparing Luke's practice with that of current Hellenistic historians<sup>3</sup> Plumacher discovers that both appear to use an archaizing style in order to show the glories of the ideal epoch of their origins. Dionysius of Halicarnassus writes his history in this way in order to show that the Romans are the authentic heirs of Greek culture. Luke writes in LXX style in order to show that the epoch of the beginnings of Christianity in the founding of the Jerusalem church has the splendor of a wholly unique time, a time

---

<sup>1</sup>D. Tabachovitz, Die Septuaginta und das NT: Stilstudien (Lund, 1956), p. 14.

<sup>2</sup>Plumacher, p. 41.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., pp. 51, 71.

separated from the church of his own day. It was a time of salvation history when the apostolic word was spoken with an authority equal to that of Holy Scripture. It is thus appropriate that the apostolic speeches should be expressed in LXX style.<sup>1</sup>

The other major approach, the koiné theory with its semitic sources explanation, was given greater precision by K. Beyer.<sup>2</sup> He assumed that the semitic element in the NT was due ultimately to the Palestinian Aramaic which Jesus spoke and in which the oral tradition was originally passed on. Through careful classification of the syntactical element in NT Greek he proposed to explain the semitic element on the basis of this language. He classified LXXisms under three categories: LXX<sup>1</sup> --probably a LXXism; LXX<sup>2</sup> --very probably a LXXism; and LXX<sup>3</sup> --neither semitic nor Greek, certainly a LXXism.<sup>3</sup> Beyer recognized what we have already noted, that some semitic elements may qualify simultaneously as both an Aramaism, Hebraism, and LXXism. He defined LXXism in the strictest sense by saying only those semitic elements which are neither possible Greek nor possible Aramaic or Hebraic semitisms, but are peculiar to the LXX can be classified as LXXisms.

Tabachovitz and Beyer had shown again that a LXXism cannot be established on grammatical grounds alone. Other factors determined whether the semitic elements in the overlap area are to be classified as LXX style imitation or as evidence of semitic source translation.

In the case of Luke, two of the theories about the nature of NT language claimed that Luke provided evidence for them. Turner concluded,

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., pp. 67, 138.

<sup>2</sup>K. Beyer, Semitische Syntax im NT (Studien z. Umwelt d. NT, I; Göttingen, 1962), Vol. I, Pt. 1; cf. M. Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, 3rd ed. (Oxford, 1967).

<sup>3</sup>Beyer, I:1, p. 299.



"...we do not think it needed much conscious effort for St. Luke to write in what merely looks like a LXX style, because it was Jewish Greek; this was his natural speech."<sup>1</sup> Tabachovitz, in applying his theory to Luke, used the argument that the cumulative evidence of Biblical style in any given context was proof that each part, as well as the whole, was intended as LXX style imitation.<sup>2</sup> If any part was also paralleled in the koiné papyri, this didn't mean that it was not LXX style imitation. The general impression of the whole as LXX style imitation, overrode the koiné explanation. Tabachovitz was able to use this method successfully because he emphasized the uniqueness of the LXX as translation Greek. Therefore, any semitism in Luke that was a frequent stylistic feature in the LXX, even though it existed in the koiné, should be judged as LXX style imitation because the translation Greek of the LXX was neither an example of a peculiar language nor a normal example of koiné vernacular.

Beyer, even with his restrictive definition of LXXism, concluded that Luke-Acts was the most heavily septuagintal of all the NT books.<sup>3</sup> He observed that the number of LXXisms would be even higher if he had counted as LXXisms semitisms which are present in the LXX, and which though they are not peculiar to it do represent translations of acceptable Hebrew constructions.

The theory of Sparks, that LXXisms as an evidence of Lukan style

<sup>1</sup>N. Turner, "The Quality of the Greek of Luke-Acts," G. D. Kilpatrick Festschrift (xeroxed typed copy; a gift of the author; forthcoming), p. 22.

<sup>2</sup>Tabachovitz, p. 75.

<sup>3</sup>Beyer, I:1, pp. 296ff.; (Mt.- 8 occurrences of LXX constructions, .12/page; Mk.- 3, .07/page; Lk.- 23, .32/page; Ac.-27, .39/page; cf. E. P. Sanders, The Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition (SNTS Monograph Series, IX; Cambridge, 1969), p. 248.

could help solve source critical problems, came in for modification in this period. T. Schramm<sup>1</sup> called for a more precise definition of a Lukan LXXism. He rejected the stylistic and theological reasons given for the "nests" of semitisms in Luke-Acts. He claimed that since Luke viewed his work as a unity, if he were theologically motivated in his use of LXX style as the style of sacred prose, he would have used it evenly throughout his work. But since this was not the case, LXXisms were due to the sources which Luke used. Now LXXisms joined ranks again with other semitic elements like Aramaisms as indicators of Luke's sources and not of his editorial hand. Schramm admitted the possibility of Lukan LXXisms. But he demanded that they be present throughout Luke-Acts, especially in Acts 15ff., if they were to be adjudged Luke's redaction and not evidence of a source. Schramm, then, was able to use LXXisms in Luke to prove just the opposite of Spark's theory. Schramm said that Septuagintalisms indicated Luke's use of an independent source inserted into, or augmented by, Mark. They did not signal Luke's free redaction of Mark.

M. Wilcox was dissatisfied with the three main explanations for the semitic element in the NT and in Luke. By showing that the LXXisms were not distributed at random throughout Acts, he concluded that the Biblical or Jewish-Greek explanation was not appropriate. It was an explanation which contended that the semitic element was the result of an unconscious use of a peculiar language. A random distribution of semitic elements would have shown that no conscious purpose was behind their occurrence. Rather the unconscious factor of a natural language accounted

---

<sup>1</sup>T. Schramm, Der Marcus-Stoff bei Lukas (SNTS Monograph Series, XV; Cambridge, 1971), p. 84.

for their presence.<sup>1</sup> Wilcox next analyzed the setting of the LXXisms and discovered that they were clustered about OT testimonia in liturgical or apologetic settings. The clusters were not accompanied by an even distribution throughout their immediate contexts so the semitic style could not be attributed to either the semitic source or the LXX style imitation explanations. For Wilcox, Luke's LXXisms should be termed "liturgico-septuagintalisms."<sup>2</sup> Even so, Wilcox had not finally solved the question of sources to his satisfaction. How could one distinguish between Luke's own use of "liturgico-septuagintalisms" and his taking over of a Greek source which has used them?

D. F. Payne warned against explaining the whole of the semitic element in Luke's writing by a single theory. He proposed four categories: (1) naturalized Semitisms--the result of the effect of Aramaic on koiné (spoken); (2) Biblicisms--"These might take the form of direct quotations from the Scripture, or of allusions to the OT, or simply of a style and phraseology borrowed from it." (3) ecclesiastical vocabulary; (4) the residue--attributed to sources written or oral, available to Luke.<sup>3</sup> Biblicisms or LXX style were determined by the frequency and significance of the LXX parallel. Payne would rather err on the side of identifying too few semitisms as LXXisms than do the reverse. LXXism still had not found an established place as a recognizable category.

---

<sup>1</sup>M. Wilcox, The Semitisms of Acts (Oxford, 1965), p. 58f.; Turner (Kilpatrick Festschrift, p. 9) answers this difficulty, though not in response to Wilcox specifically. He gives a historical explanation. Those portions of Acts (e.g. the "we sections") which have few semitisms were written by Luke early in his experience as a Christian. The sections of his writings which have many semitisms were written later, when he had mastered the Jewish-Greek of the Christian community.

<sup>2</sup>Wilcox, p. 84.

<sup>3</sup>Payne, Apostolic History and the Gospel, p. 139.

## CHAPTER V

## THE TASK

## Introduction

With all these observations, theories, analyses, and methods as background we may now describe our task in studying the various kinds of OT use. Before we state working definitions and describe methods, we need to comment on our general approach as it expresses itself in the form of the remainder of this paper. The next section, exegesis, is the place where we will collect and analyze the OT material in Luke 22-23. In the final section, conclusions, we will seek hypotheses which will best explain the material we have gathered and analyzed.

We seek to enter this study with as few controlling presuppositions as possible. For instance, we have not decided on external grounds whether Luke was a Jew or a Gentile; whether he or his audience, because of their background, lacked interest in the OT or had great interest in it. We have not decided whether Luke knew the MT at first hand or not. We will try to let the evidence of his writings speak to us and pass judgment on the theories which espouse one or another of these explanations for the nature of the OT material in Luke. If necessary, a more adequate explanation may also emerge from the pattern of usage which his writings give us.

Although our task in the exegesis section is primarily collection, classification, and descriptive analysis, it also will include provisional conclusions concerning which theory or theories contain the probable explanation of the evidence. In the conclusion section our study hopes to draw from this close examination of the material that arrangement of explanations in their proper proportions which will as closely as possible represent how Luke used the OT in Luke 22-23.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>R. Sumner is the only predecessor in this enterprise who, as we discovered, has dealt with Luke's use of the OT in all four types of usage: OT quotation, allusion, idea, and style. Her work is limited to collection, classification, and the development of theories to explain the OT material in Luke. There is little analysis.

## Old Testament Quotation and Allusion

To avoid repetition we shall describe the tasks involved in studying OT quotation and OT allusion together. Where there are tasks which are unique to one or the other we shall point them out. We define an OT quotation as any OT material, which is preceded by an introductory formula or whose function in its NT context depends on its recognition as a quotation. Verbal agreement with the OT, either MT or LXX, will not be sufficient reason for the identification of OT material as an intentional quotation. An OT allusion is any OT material which has verbal or material parallelism with a particular passage in the OT. It must by its situation in the NT context and the expectations created by that context indicate that the writer intended to allude to the OT. OT material which is not announced by an introductory formula and does not appear to function in the NT context as a quotation, but yet has extensive verbal parallelism with a definite OT passage, may qualify as an OT allusion.

In the exegesis section we will study the text-form of the quotation and allusion to determine its probable OT textual source. We shall note any text-form discrepancies and seek their probable cause either in the nature of the OT material which the writer had at his disposal or in the writer's editorial method. By its very nature an allusion does not provide as high a degree of certainty that the writer is intending to point to the OT. Hence, conclusions about the NT writer's OT materials and editorial methods drawn from any text-form discrepancies in allusions are not as valuable as those drawn from the study of quotations. Still, the evidence from the study of allusions may serve as corroborating evidence.

The introductory formula will be scrutinized for what it can tell us about the purpose of the quotation as well as Luke's general hermeneutical perspective.

The function of the quotation and allusion within its immediate context, as well as the larger context of the writer's work, will be investigated.

There will be questions about the handling of the original OT context of the quotation and allusion. How does the NT application of the OT text relate to its original meaning in its historical context? Is that context respected, violated, or superseded? By what interpretational methods has the OT text been appropriated for the New: typological, promise and fulfilment, midrashic? Are there any indications that the quotation is used as a pointer to the rest of its original context?

In the case of allusions, if a cluster of them occurs, we need to determine whether they are connected according to midrashic rules and, if so, whether they might be evidence of a detached midrash.

Of special interest in the study of OT allusion is the relationship between OT prophecy and the historical details of the fulfilment events. How far did the OT determine Luke's choice and presentation of the NT fulfilment events? Was the OT the source for some of the details of the NT events? Was the influence reciprocal? There is also the matter of non-quotations and non-allusions, OT material which Luke did not take over from Mark. What is the probable cause of these omissions?

In addition to this analysis of OT materials and methods in the quotation and allusion area, we need to ask about sources. Did the quotation or allusion originate with Jesus; the early church in the formation of the gospel tradition; Luke's sources; or Luke himself? In what form did it come to Luke and what did he do with it? If Luke takes the material over unchanged from his sources, we shall still treat it as evidence for Luke's use of the OT.

In the conclusion section of the paper we will attempt to discern a pattern in the usage of quotations and allusions, which will enable us to present a probable theory or theories to explain how these furthered Luke's general purpose in writing his passion narrative. Of interest also will be the way Luke relates his use of OT quotations and allusions to his use of OT ideas and style.

### Old Testament Idea

Precise definitions are difficult here. It would be much more simple if we could limit this area to vocabulary which either occurs only in Luke-Acts and the LXX, or has a special meaning that is used only by Luke and the LXX. Such vocabulary will certainly come under our purview. But, we must also seek out those particular uses of a word by Luke in which a distinctive OT meaning comes to the fore, even though Luke does not always employ the word in that distinctive way. We encounter an OT idea when at a particular place in Luke we meet a word which has as its primary meaning a meaning which is peculiar to or characteristic of the OT.

In the exegesis section we will use the LXX as our basic OT source, though taking into account its relation to the Hebrew behind it. We shall present enough of the basic field and shape of the OT use of a word to serve as a context in which to understand those particular elements of OT usage that Luke takes up in his own use of the word. Luke's own use in any given instance must be set within the context of his usage throughout Luke-Acts. Having identified an OT idea we need to see what interpretational methods Luke uses in applying it to his NT context. Also, what theological themes in his work does it serve? OT material which has not qualified as allusion may possibly be seen as OT idea.

In our study of Luke's use of OT ideas the question of the sources Luke used and the way in which he used them is important. Luke's editing of his sources aids us in our understanding of his theological purposes and themes. In turn we shall seek to relate Luke's conscious use of OT ideas to these theological purposes and themes. If Luke takes an OT idea over from his source without change it must still be treated as evidence for his use of the OT, though the use may not have originated with him.

In the study of OT ideas and style in Luke it is difficult to

distinguish between the unconscious influence of these OT elements on Luke, and the conscious use which he may have made of them. We are interested in conscious use. We will try whenever possible to identify such use as opposed to unconscious influence.

Our exegesis section will again be the place for collection and analysis of the individual pieces of evidence. For an OT idea which recurs in the narrative, we shall present only once the general background of OT and Lukan usage. At each occurrence, when appropriate, we shall point out the particular significance of the OT element in its use. Our concluding section will try to view the patterns of OT idea usage as wholes, to relate them to one another, and by so doing to identify the dominant theme or themes in Luke's passion narrative. One important issue will be Luke's theology of the death of Jesus and the role which OT ideas play in conveying its meaning.

#### Old Testament Style

The OT style area includes both vocabulary and grammar. While most of the vocabulary will fall in the OT idea area, any words whose forms are septuagintal will be considered here. We will work again with the LXX as our basic OT source, since from the standpoint of language it is the more immediate source of reference and point of comparison. Since Luke wrote in Greek we make the assumption that the OT to which he wanted to refer his readers, or at least to which they would have the most ready access, was the LXX. We are willing to have this assumption proved wrong, but from our preliminary survey of the evidence of Luke's style, this appears to be a proper assumption.

We define a LXXism both as any grammatical construction which is peculiar to the LXX and NT, and as any grammatical construction, possible in Greek, which from its frequency in the LXX and NT, in contrast to koiné usage, shows itself to be an imitation of LXX style. By frequency in the LXX we mean at least 25 occurrences of the construction throughout



the OT.<sup>1</sup> The frequency of the construction in the LXX should be caused by the consistent translation of one Hebrew construction. The frequency in Luke must be judged against the background of source criticism. Though we depend on the LXX usage to establish a given semitic construction as a characteristic of LXX style, the possibility that its presence in Luke is evidence for a semitic gospel source and not Luke's conscious imitation of LXX style must always be taken into account. In the end the use of the construction within its immediate context, as well as its relation to other semitic elements within that context, will help determine whether a given construction occurs in imitation of LXX style.

Once identified we shall analyze the LXXisms in Luke according to their function and meaning for Luke. When the construction occurs more than once we shall give the general OT and Lukan background only once. The question of literary sources will be important for determining how much LXX style in Luke is due to his editing and how much to his sources. Still, even if the LXX style comes from his sources, the fact that he took it over means that he approved of it or at least did not disapprove of it. He may even have had some positive use for it. Our concluding section will trace out any pattern of LXX style which emerges and will seek to relate it to the other kinds of OT use. It will also be necessary to see which theory of the nature of NT Greek and explanation of the semitic elements within it will best explain our evidence for Luke's use of OT style.

#### Source and Historical Criticism

Throughout the description of our task we have referred to the importance of literary source criticism for understanding Luke's use of the OT. It is necessary for us to mention our basic approach to the question

---

<sup>1</sup>Clarke, The Beginnings of Christianity, II, p. 70.

of sources in Luke's passion narrative.

Unlike the rest of the gospel where Luke appears to deal with his sources in blocks, the passion narrative shows a strange mixture of Markan and non-Markan material. The verbal correspondence with Mark is only half as great as it is in the Lukan account of Jesus' ministry. The non-Markan material is connected with the Markan material in such a way that significant alterations and modifications of Mark occur, including twelve transpositions. Luke does not make such changes so frequently when he uses Mark as his source in the rest of his gospel.<sup>1</sup> We might conclude that Luke has gone against his practice in the rest of the gospel and has thoroughly reworked the Markan passion narrative according to his theological and stylistic interests. Or, we might suppose that Luke used another source as his basis for many portions of his passion narrative and inserted material from Mark into it.<sup>2</sup>

The convincing arguments emerging from the detailed analysis by the practitioners of the second approach have given us good reason for accepting it as essentially correct. This approach does justice to both the Markan and non-Markan material which is present. It accounts for the influence which the non-Markan material has on Luke's use of Mark by presenting an explanation, which is most in line with what we know of Luke's method of handling Mark in the rest of his gospel. There are, then, at least two sources which Luke uses in his passion narrative and his non-Markan source serves more often than not as the framework into which material from Mark is inserted.

---

<sup>1</sup>J. C. Hawkins, "Three Limitations to St. Luke's Use of St. Mark's Gospel," Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem, ed. W. Sanday (Oxford, 1911), p. 80; cf. T. W. Manson, BJRL, XXVIII, p. 392.

<sup>2</sup>See above p. 31, n. 1.

We have at our disposal for comparison only one of Luke's sources, Mark. It is a temptation to assign to a single source or to Luke's editing all of the remaining non-Markan material in Luke. This we must resist.

The consideration of Luke's handling of Mark and his use of vocabulary and stylistic elements throughout the whole of Luke-Acts can be very helpful in distinguishing between Lukan editing and the presence of a second source. But whether this second source is actually a number of sources must remain an open question. We recognize that we are working with insufficient evidence to make a more precise determination. We will state at the beginning of each chapter in our exegesis section whether we view Mark or a non-Markan source as the basic narrative which Luke followed. We will point out which portions of Mark were probably inserted into a basically non-Markan narrative. We will also note when non-Markan material is inserted into Mark. Distinctively Lukan style and vocabulary will also be noted, but only when it is relevant to the OT ideas or style which we are considering.

We need to always keep in mind the proper use of source criticism. It is valuable in the detection of Luke's editorial practices. It helps us draw conclusions concerning his use of the OT from the way he uses the OT material found in his sources. Yet, the conclusions drawn on the basis of source criticism are only part of the picture. What Luke changes in his sources must be combined with the OT material which he takes over unchanged from his sources. Then we have the whole picture of how Luke uses the OT as reflected in the final product, Luke 22-23.

A final factor in understanding Luke's composition of his passion narrative is Luke's knowledge of and desire to write accurate history. Thus, a third point of comparison in our analysis of Luke's composition of the passion narrative (in addition to his sources and his redaction) is the actual historical course of events.

Luke did not construct his narrative in a historical vacuum. He did not have at his disposal only one or at the most two literary sources (i.e. Mark, or Mark and "L") from which he had to try to make sense of what happened during Jesus' last days. We assume that he had access to eyewitnesses of the events (Lk. 1:1-4) and that he was very familiar with the gospel tradition of the passion narrative in the form of missionary preaching. Our assumption is that any liberty which Luke takes with his sources is done from the standpoint of knowledge and not ignorance. He is not a captive of his literary sources. He is not limited to their information. The freedom with which he uses them is controlled by a desire to portray the history of the passion events faithfully and to present their theological significance powerfully.

We realize that too easily we may explain away supposed historical contradictions between Luke and the other synoptic writers by confident appeal to Luke's superior knowledge. Also, details peculiar to Luke which may be examples of his editing for theological purposes could go unrecognized as such since they too would be attributed to Luke's superior knowledge. We shall try to guard against this by letting the evidence substantiate our confidence. However, while not allowing Luke an unreasonable amount of knowledge, we shall not be tied to an unreasonable amount of a priori skepticism concerning the historical data Luke had at his disposal. We shall not be satisfied with concluding that he knew no more than what Mark or even Mark and "L" told him. We shall assume he knew more but consciously chose what he would tell his readers so that he could portray faithfully the history of the passion events and at the same time powerfully proclaim their theological significance.

PART II. AN EXEGETICAL STUDY OF LUKE'S  
USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN LUKE 22-23

## CHAPTER I

## LUKE 22:1-14: PLOT AND PREPARATION

Introduction.<sup>1</sup>

The narratives of the Jewish leaders' conspiracy with Judas against Jesus (22:1-6) and the preparation for the Passover meal (22:7-14) introduce almost all the principal characters in the passion drama. The basic source for these sections is Mark. There is possibly influence from another source at v. 3 (cf. J. 13:27) and v. 8.<sup>1</sup> There are no quotations. Concerning the use of OT allusions we need to discuss the non-allusions in the Judas plot episode and the possible allusion in the sign of the man with the water jar. Since this section is part of the introduction to the Passion (22:1-38) it contains some of the theological themes based on OT ideas which are developed in the passion narrative itself. The OT style of this passage is significant. It is one of the few times in Luke 22-23 that we may with relative certainty distinguish between Luke's redaction and his source, for Luke's basic source, Mark, is available for comparison.

## Old Testament Allusion

Mark 14:1-2 and parallels may present a material allusion to the plot of the rulers in Ps. 2:2 against the Lord and his anointed.<sup>2</sup> Matthew evidently recognized this and took up a verb from Ps. 2:2, συνήχθησαν (Mt. 26:3). This seemed to remind him of another psalm to which he may have assimilated his description (Ps. 30(31):14, ἐπισυναχθήναι... ἐβούλευσαντο; Mt. 26:3, 4, συνήχθησαν... συνεβούλευοντο).<sup>3</sup> Luke, reproducing Mark, does not present any verbal parallelism with either psalm. In Acts Luke reports that the early church did see this part of Psalm 2 as fulfilled in Jesus' sufferings (Ac. 4:25-28). However, the contemporary rulers with whom the church identified the "kings" and the "leaders" of

<sup>1</sup>cf. Taylor, The Passion Narrative, pp. 42-46;; J. M. Creed, The Gospel According to St. Luke (London, 1930), pp. 259, 263.

<sup>2</sup>Doeve, p. 188; cf. Hühn (p. 65), who also mentions Ps. 40(41):8.

<sup>3</sup>Gundry, The Use of the OT in Mt., p. 56; cf. Ps. 70(71):10.

the psalm were Herod and Pilate, not the members of the Sanhedrin. Identification of the Sanhedrin with a leadership figure in the psalm may have been prevented by the chiastic structure of the psalm in which the Jewish opponents of the Lord are "the peoples" and "the kings" while the Gentile opponents are "the nations" and "the leaders." Since the Sanhedrin are not kings and since the term "the leaders" which might most appropriately be applied to them is interpreted as a title denoting Gentile leadership, it is easy to understand how Herod the ~~tetrarch~~ and not the Sanhedrin is identified as the Jewish leadership which fulfilled the psalm in opposing Jesus. Luke appears to have accepted this identification for in his passion narrative alone does Herod play a role (23:6-12).<sup>1</sup> The prayer in Ac. 4:24ff. was in response to persecution by the Sanhedrin. The parallelism would have been all the closer and the point about the church suffering under the will of God as their master had would have been made all the more strongly, if Ac. 4:27 had spoken of the Sanhedrin gathering against Jesus. Real doubts are thus raised whether Luke did see, even in a material way, the Jewish leaders' plot as an allusion to Psalm 2.<sup>2</sup> Luke (22:2) by abbreviating Mark (Mk. 14:1-2) shifts the emphasis from the plot and treachery by which the rulers were to achieve their ends to the ends themselves, the destruction of Jesus. This shift may account for the fact that Luke wasn't led as Matthew was to contemplate OT allusions which might describe and give an OT basis for the treachery.

---

<sup>1</sup>See below, p. 452f.

<sup>2</sup>A. Rose ("L'influence des psaumes sur les annonces et les récits de la Passion et de la Résurrection dans les Évangiles," Le Psautier, ed. R. de Langhe (Orientalia et Biblica Louvaniensia, IV; Louvain, 1962), p. 301) points out that neither Mark nor Luke have material parallelism with Psalms 30(31) or 2.

Another allusion peculiar to Matthew in this section is the "thirty pieces of silver" detail (Mt. 26:15/Zech. 11:12; cf. Mk. 14:11/Lk. 22:5).<sup>1</sup> Mt. brings out the allusion clearly by changing the verb which describes the transaction between Judas and the religious leaders (ἐπηγγείλατο τοῖς ἑσθῆσαν) and making specific the amount of the betrayal price (ἀργύριον τοῦ τριάκοντα ἀργύρια). Luke also changes the verb of transaction (to συνέθεντο), possibly because for him ἐπηγγείλατο usually has a positive theological meaning (Ac. 7:5; cf. ἡ ἐπαγγελία, Lk. 24:49; Ac. 1:4; 13:23; 26:6; an exception, 23:21). Luke does not make the betrayal price a specific amount.

Though Luke does not show verbal parallelism between his description of the transaction between Judas and the religious leaders, and the Zechariah passage, may there not be material parallelism? The mention of the money seems to be used as an evidence of the leaders' eagerness to get their hands on Jesus, for it is mentioned in connection with their joy. Neither this reason nor the general purpose of betrayal plays a part in the Zechariah context. Thus, a material parallelism is probably not intended by Luke. The most that can be said for the influence of Zech. 11:12 on the gospel tradition as it came to Luke is that it may have controlled the selection of this detail for preservation in the tradition.

The instructions of Jesus to the disciples have been seen by some to contain details that were inspired by or allude to Samuel's instructions to the newly anointed Saul (Mk. 14:13/Lk. 22:10/1 Km. 10:1-7).<sup>2</sup> The verbal parallels are εἰσελθόντων ὑμῶν εἰς τὴν πόλιν συναντήσῃ (Lk. 22:10); εἰσελθὼντες ἐκεῖ εἰς τὴν πόλιν καὶ ἀπαντήσῃς (1 Km. 10:5). The material parallelism consists of two factors. Both narratives have to do with signs delivered by a prophet. Both mention a man carrying a vessel for liquids as part of the sign.

---

<sup>1</sup>Gundry, The Use of the OT in Mt., p. 143.

<sup>2</sup>Hahn, p. 65; M. E. Boismard, Synopsis des Quatre Évangiles en français (Paris, 1972), Vol. II, p. 377.



The significant thing about this comparison is the differences both in the verbal and material parallels which make it unlikely either that the OT is the origin of the historical detail or that Luke intended his narrative to allude to this OT passage. It is true that there is no other occurrence of εἰσερχομαι with either of the verbs for "to meet" in the LXX. However, the phrase εἰσερχομαι εἰς τὴν πόλιν is fairly common (14X). Luke's editing of Mark both creates similarities with and differences from 1 Km. 10:5. The paratactical construction is replaced by the subordination of a genitive absolute participle to a finite verb (εἰσελθόντων for ὑπάγετε ). This destroys a similarity of syntax with 1 Km. 10:5. But, in the process it brings in one of the verbs that is found in 1 Km. 10:5, but which is not in Mark. These changes may be accounted for by Luke's stylistic improvement of Mark. Luke does not appear to intend to consciously allude to 1 Km. 10:5.<sup>1</sup> Further, if Luke were wanting to allude to 1 Km. 10:5 he probably wouldn't have changed the verb to συναντήσας.<sup>2</sup> It is this change that in fact removes the one distinctive verbal link, besides the common εἰς τὴν πόλιν,<sup>3</sup> which Mark had with 1 Km. 10:1-7.<sup>4</sup> Hence, Luke does not seem to recognize the possible allusion that may exist in Mark for he makes the verbal parallelism both clearer and less distinct through his stylistic improvement of Mark.

The material parallelism fails to be convincing. In 1 Samuel the prophet gives the newly anointed Saul three signs to confirm that it is

---

<sup>1</sup>H. Schürmann, Eine Quellenkritische Untersuchung des Lukanischen Abendmahlsberichtes, 2nd ed. (NT Abhandlungen, XIX:5; Münster, 1968), Vol. I - Der Paschamahlbericht Lk. 22, (7-14)15-18, p. 93f.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 95; this is an example of Lukan redaction according to his love for σύν as a pre-formative; cf. n. 422.

<sup>3</sup>43X in the LXX, but only associated with ἀπαντάω at 1 Km. 10:5.

<sup>4</sup>As mss C, 1242, X, 1071 show, ὑπαντήσας is probably the more customary usage.

truly the Lord God who has anointed him king over Israel. The first sign (1 Km. 10:2), the encounter with two men who will tell Saul where his lost asses are, corresponds most closely with the function of the sign in the Passover preparation narrative (Lk. 22:10-12). Both are not simply confirmatory signs but also involve miraculous foreknowledge used to accomplish an end. In the case of Saul, the end is the recovery of property, while for the disciples it is the finding of a place in which to prepare the Passover. However, no parallels to this first sign either verbal or material can be found in Luke. The second sign (1 Km. 10:3) was an encounter with three men bearing food. One of the men is carrying a skin of wine which is supposed to correspond materially to the man with the water jar in Lk. 22:10. Although the man with the wineskin may, as the man with the water jar, be a part of the detail which is predicted by a prophet, the purpose of the three men bearing food is not to aid in the accomplishment of a task but to present a gift to Saul. The final sign (1 Km. 10:5), the meeting with the prophets upon entering the city, provides the alleged verbal parallelism to Lk. 22:10. However, in Lk. 22:10 it is the man with the water jar, not a band of prophets, whom the disciples will meet. The verbal parallelism comes from the wrong sign in 1 Samuel, if the allusion is to be clear. This confusion speaks against 1 Samuel as the origin of the historical detail of the gospel tradition. At the most, the detail in the gospel tradition could have reminded Mark, or his predecessors<sup>1</sup> in the history of tradition, of the 1 Samuel story. They would then have chosen some of the story's language to describe the preparation episode. Aside from the material parallels of a prophetic sign and the man with a vessel, the major hermeneutical

---

<sup>1</sup>Boismard (II, p. 377) assigns the creation of the detail from 1 Km. 10:1-7, as well as the verbal parallelism, to his Document B.

perspective which would enable the early church to link Saul and Jesus was messianic typology. Jesus re-enacts and fulfills the role of the king of Israel.<sup>1</sup> There are, however, other possibilities for understanding how Luke portrayed Jesus in this episode and we shall consider them in our OT idea section. At least, there does not seem to be firm ground for the view that Luke has an intentional allusion to 1 Km. 10:5 at Lk. 22:10.

#### Old Testament Idea

In Lk. 22:1-6 there is a cluster of OT ideas which describes the treachery of the religious leaders and Judas. The abbreviation of Mark by Luke (Mk. 14:1, 2/Lk. 22:1-2) places the emphasis on the purpose of their plotting, Jesus' death (ἐξήτουν...τὸ πῶς ἀνέλωσιν αὐτόν, 22:2).<sup>2</sup> The use of this phrase immediately places their action in a moral context, for ἐξήτνω is frequently used in the Psalms to describe the intentions of the wicked against the innocent (cf. Ps. 36(37):32; 34(35):4; 39(40):15; 85(86):14). The verb ἀναρέω is used to describe the designs against the prophet Jeremiah (Jer. 33(26):15, 24; cf. v. 19). Although ἀναρέω is not used exclusively of Jesus' death, its presence in missionary preaching as a description of Jesus' death (Ac. 2:23; 10:39; 13:28) and in the editorial comment at Lk. 23:32 indicates that its use in connection with Jesus did have some significance. Indeed, it is the word used most frequently by Luke in Acts to describe the Jews' act of putting Jesus to death. Without the OT background the word simply indicates that the Jews were able to do away with Jesus.<sup>3</sup> However, the injustice of that act

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.; Hühn (p. 65) calls it a messianic allusion; cf. Lk. 19:28-31.

<sup>2</sup>Admittedly, the πῶς (22:2/Mk. 14:1,2) taken over from Mark still communicates the concern over method in the treachery of the leaders. However, the abbreviation of Mark here and at v. 6 (cf. Mk. 14:11) shows a removal of the emphasis on this aspect of their machinations.

<sup>3</sup>cf. Josephus' (Ant. II:20) description of the brothers' opposition to Joseph, "keen ἀναρέειν him." Contrast this with ἀποκτείνωμεν in the LXX (Gen. 37:20).

may often be inferred from the immediate context. It is either implied by the contrast between the Spirit-empowered life and healing ministry of Jesus and the death to which the Jews sent him (Ac. 2:23; 10:39), or by the explicit statement that he was innocent (Ac. 13:28). In our own passage Luke may imply the injustice of the act by the way he abbreviates the reference to the people. In Mark, the execution on the feast day is the reason why the people would react against the leaders' action. This could mean that the crowd would have approved the action at another time, or that it is the assembled mass of pilgrims at Passover who favoring Jesus would create the uproar. At another time with Jerusalem at its normal population level the leaders could have controlled any opposition. Luke implies the second reason and even intensifies it.<sup>1</sup> The leaders sought to get rid of Jesus because they feared the people's approval of him and his ministry. In this way Luke emphasizes what the speeches in Acts say, that Jesus had favor with all the people and that the leaders' action was patently unjust.

If the OT phrase, "were seeking how to put him to death" (22:2), places the action within a moral context, the introduction of Satan (22:3) gives theological significance to that action.<sup>2</sup> The amount of OT material which witnesses to the activity of Satan is not very great. There is no reference to Satan entering into a man<sup>3</sup> but 1 Ch. 21:1 speaks of Satan stirring up David to sin against God by numbering the people.<sup>4</sup> There is

---

<sup>1</sup>See below, p. 544.

<sup>2</sup>Finegan (p. 39) comments that Luke out of the life and thought of the community gives a theological grounding to history.

<sup>3</sup>cf. rabbinic references to evil spirits entering a person in SBK, II, p. 559.

<sup>4</sup>cf. 2 Km. 24:1 where it is the wrath of God which incites David to sin. The introduction of Satan by the writer of Chronicles may be a later circumlocution, intended to avoid ascribing to God the act of tempting.

also the OT background from Job 1 and 2 where Satan functions as a tempter in order that he might accuse righteous Job before God. When Luke mentions Satan, he is not so much interested in using him as the reason for Judas' betrayal<sup>1</sup> as in the fact that Satan is the real instigator of opposition against God. Satan is the author of the suffering of Jesus.<sup>2</sup> Luke wants us to place the Passion of Jesus within the theological framework of a salvation history which moves to its climax where salvation comes in a victory over Satan.

Luke is also concerned with Judas and the mystery of how he was an instrument of Satan. Luke stresses in verse six, by inserting "So he agreed," that Judas of his own free will entered into the plot to betray Jesus.

And it is the fact that Satan is behind the plotting of men that Luke is emphasizing here. This perspective with which Luke wants us to see the Passion of Jesus will come out again in the narrative. We do not have enough data here to conclude whether Luke presents Jesus' Passion simply as a cosmic battle between the forces of good and evil or whether Satan's opposition is primarily portrayed as the offering of a last temptation to Jesus.<sup>3</sup> What can be confidently stated is that a spiritual power of

---

<sup>1</sup>Contrast A. Vööbus, The Prelude to the Lukan Passion Narrative (Papers of the Estonian Theological Society in Exile, XVII; Stockholm, 1968), p. 61.

<sup>2</sup>Conzelmann (p. 80) sees a similarity of approach between Luke and John; S. M. Gilmour ("Commentary on Luke," The Interpreter's Bible, ed. G. A. Buttrick (Nashville, 1952), Vol. VIII, p. 375) compares Luke with "Paul's belief that the hierarchy of demonic forces who are 'the rulers of this age' were the ultimate agents responsible for the crucifixion of 'the Lord of glory' (1 Cor. 2:8)."

<sup>3</sup>G. Baumbach, Das Verständnis des Bösen in den synoptischen Evangelien (Theologische Arbeiten, XIX; Berlin, 1963), pp. 187ff.

evil in the person of Satan,<sup>1</sup> plays a definite role in the Passion. It appears that Luke has taken up the OT understanding of the interaction of the spiritual and human dimensions of reality in history, as well as the perspective of the conflict of good and evil. He has used them even more positively than the Chronicler. Spiritual powers of evil are no longer merely a method of circumlocution by which one may avoid the imputation to God of the role of tempter. They are a necessary part of the portrayal of salvation history.<sup>2</sup>

Other evidence from Luke's writing that he views salvation history in these perspectives is his description of the triumph of the mission of the seventy (Lk. 10:18), the power of the gospel (Ac. 26:18), the binding of a person by Satan with disease (Lk. 13:16; Ac. 10:38), and Satan as the source of evil actions (Ac. 5:3). Since all of these references are in material peculiar to Luke and since this perspective, especially as it applies to Judas' action, was probably common in the early church,<sup>3</sup> it is difficult to decide whether this element is due to Luke's editing or to influence of a parallel source or tradition. Since Luke twice replaces  $\Sigma\alpha\tau\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  with  $\delta\iota\alpha\beta\omicron\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  (Mk. 1:13/Lk. 4:2; Mk. 4:15/Lk. 8:12) and elsewhere never introduces  $\Sigma\alpha\tau\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  into Mark, possibly we should see the influence of an outside source at Lk. 22:3. In any case, this episode (22:1-6) has introduced us to the importance of the evil forces who are actively ranged against Jesus in the Passion.

The final word in our cluster which may have OT background is  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\delta\iota\delta\omega\mu\epsilon$

---

<sup>1</sup>T. Zahn (Das Evangelium des Lukas (Kommentar zNT, III; Leipzig, 1920), p. 665, n. 24) claims that since  $\Sigma\alpha\tau\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  is without an article in Lk. 22:3 it indicates a class of demons and not the Devil himself. Of his other evidence Lk. 8:30 is the most convincing. However, the occurrence with the article at Ac. 5:3 would appear to be a clear precedent for the presence in Luke's thought of the idea of Satan entering an individual. The lack of evidence for  $\Sigma\alpha\tau\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  with or without the article indicating such a class of demons (cf. Lk. 11:26) leads us to conclude that Lk. 22:3 refers to the Devil himself.

<sup>2</sup>See below, p. 352f.

<sup>3</sup>V88bus, p. 61; cf. J. 13:2, 27.

(Lk. 22:4, 6). While the view is still maintained<sup>1</sup> that this word became a technical term in early Christianity to describe the suffering and death of Jesus as promised in Isaiah 53, close analysis of the NT evidence has led some to conclude that παράδωκε does not carry in itself an automatic reference to Isaiah 53. There is nothing in the use of παράδωκε at Lk. 22:4, 6 which shows that it draws its meaning specifically from Isaiah 53. In fact, no NT writer explicitly indicates that Judas' action is a fulfilment of Isaiah 53.<sup>2</sup> However, several factors in Luke's use of παράδωκε may indicate that the special OT meaning is being consciously employed. In the OT παράδωκε describes God's delivering Israel's enemies into the nation's hands (e.g. Josh. 8:18), and God's delivering Israel into the hands of enemies (e.g. Jer. 39(32):28).

The usual Greek word to describe an act of betrayal like Judas' is πρόδοσις. Since betrayal is often the means by which one may deliver a person into the hands of his enemies, παράδωκε naturally sometimes may mean, "to betray." But this meaning can be understood only from its immediate context.<sup>3</sup> Luke was not averse to using the substantive of παράδωκε as a description of Judas and the Jewish leaders (Lk. 6:16; Ac. 7:52). Yet, he preserves the more general παράδωκε in the passion narrative to describe what Judas did (Lk. 22:4, 6, 21, 22, 48). It must have had some significance for him. Luke's removal of the use of παράδωκε to describe the judicial procedure by which the Sanhedrin handed Jesus over to Pilate (Mk. 15:1 cf. Lk. 23:1) and his making more general the use of παράδωκε at Lk. 23:25<sup>4</sup> indicate further that the term, while

<sup>1</sup>TDNT, V, pp. 710, 712; Contrast H. E. Tödt, The Son of Man in the Synoptic Tradition, translated from the 2nd German ed. by D. M. Barton (NT Library; London, 1965), pp. 156ff.

<sup>2</sup>W. Popkes, Christus Traditus (ATHANT, XLIV; Zürich, 1967), p. 218.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 92f.; cf. Thucydides, I:86:3, 5 - οὗς οὐ παράδοτέα τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις ἔστιν ... μήτε τοὺς συμμάχους κατὰ παράδοσιν; Josephus, B. J. IV:521, 523 - ἡ παράδοσις ... ἐθιμολογούμενος... καὶ πρῶτον παρὰδόναι συντίθεται τὴν αὐτοῦ παράδοσιν.

<sup>4</sup>See below, p. 471.

used mainly to describe human activity, was restricted in its usage so that the divine dimension of such activity could be emphasized. Luke introduces this divine dimension through the use of the word without either explicitly stated subject, direct, or indirect object. A supernatural agent may then be implied as fulfilling the role of the actor who is not definitely identified. Where all the actors are definitely identified as human agents there is little room for the divine dimension to make its influence felt. This is particularly true of its use with reference to Judas. The verb always has a subject and a direct object although the indirect object is not always present. In our section, however, we do have the indirect object. It is the intention of Judas to hand Jesus over to the rulers (22:4; v. 6 lacks the specific indirect object but the immediate context (v. 4) does give it). There is, therefore, no room to introduce theological interpretation by supplying God or Satan for the unmentioned indirect object. The only room for theological overtone seems to be in the fact that this simple act of betrayal is described by a more general verb, which may in turn emphasize that Jesus is being captured and placed in the custody of powers under whom he would not justly deserve to be subordinated. The OT usage is the proper background for understanding the theological significance of such an action. In only a small way, then, does Luke hint at this in his use of παράδωκε here. The theological significance becomes greater in his use elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> "To seek to put him to death," "Satan," and "to betray or hand over," then, carry OT content which indicates to the reader that Luke places Jesus' sufferings within a moral and theological context, so that the significance of his death must be seen to be more than just the unfortunate mistake of envious religious leaders.

Luke also would place Jesus' suffering within the ritual context of the Passover. His editing of Mark's time references and Mark's episode

---

<sup>1</sup>See below, pp. 203, 346, 471.



on the preparation brings out those elements in the preparation for Passover which serve his theological purposes.

As we shall discover when we study the succeeding sections, Luke more than any of the other synoptic writers stresses both that the Last Supper was a Passover and that this Passover is closely connected with Jesus' suffering (22:15ff.). By making more general the first time reference (Lk. 22:1/cf. Mk. 14:1), omitting the anointing story, inserting ἡλθεν at Lk. 22:7 (cf. Mk. 14:12), and making more definite the time designation for the commencement of the feast (Lk. 22:14, ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα Mk. 14:7),<sup>1</sup> Luke creates a continuity and progression in his narrative which naturally climaxes at Lk. 22:15-20. The first time reference, because it is now general, allows the plot against Jesus to come within the general temporal framework of the Passover feast and its preparations.<sup>2</sup> Also, either to avoid a contradiction with what they actually did, or to maintain the close connection of Passover and plot, Luke omits the leaders' intention expressed in Mark not to put Jesus to death on the feast day (Lk. 22:2 cf. Mk. 14:2). In verse six as at verse two Luke notes that the leaders' plot was necessary because of the people's support of Jesus. But this fact is stated in general terms and not related directly as in Mark to the possible uproar which would be caused by apprehending Jesus on a feast day.

We cannot tell from this section what significance the Passover will

---

<sup>1</sup>R. S. Barbour ("Gethsemane in the Tradition of the Passion," *NTS*, XVI (1969-70), p. 239, n. 2) sees the phrase as a reference to the fact that the hour of the final struggle has begun; Grundmann (p. 392) recognizes this possibility in a positive vein. This is the "divinely established hour of the Passion." However, he also recognizes it designates primarily the hour of the Passover. Luke's use of ὥρα throughout Luke-Acts doesn't show that he attaches any special theological significance to it. Here it probably is strictly a temporal term referring to the appointed time for the Passover meal (Ex. 12:8; cf. Mk. 14:17).

<sup>2</sup>Conzelmann (p. 79) observes, "We almost have 'the impression of a ritual act', an impression later given by the Barabbas episode."

give to Jesus' death, but Luke's emphasis on Jesus' initiative in making preparation (Lk. 22:8 cf. Mk. 14:12) and Jesus' stress on "entering the city" in his instructions (Lk. 22:10 cf. Mk. 14:12) do have importance. The Lukan redaction of Mark which gives the initiative in the motive for the Passover preparations to Jesus<sup>1</sup> serves to set up a contrast between Satan entering into and influencing Judas for evil and Jesus actively commanding the disciples to do what the will of God requires.<sup>2</sup> It also is in harmony with Jesus' desire to take part with his disciples (22:8, *φάγωμεν* cf. Mk. 14:12, *φάγησιν*) in the Passover (Lk. 22:15). Jesus' initiative in the preparation shows his positive disposition toward the Passover.

The fact that they are to make preparations in the city of Jerusalem is taken over from the Markan account (Mk. 14:13/Lk. 22:10). It is in accord with Jewish custom based on the scriptural injunction to sacrifice and eat the Passover in the place of God's choosing, where he causes his name to dwell (Dt. 16:5-7). <sup>In New Testament times</sup> ~~After the building of Solomon's temple (3 Km. 8:29)~~ this was taken to mean Jerusalem (4 Km. 23:21-24; 2 Ch. 35:1).<sup>3</sup> Luke brings out the importance of this feature of the narrative by an implied contrast with Jesus' customary practice. Luke reports that during the days of his teaching ministry from the triumphal entry to the Passover Jesus never spent the night in the city (Lk. 19:47; 21:37, 38). Now by contrast he will abide the night in the city according to Passover custom. When the fact of this contrast is combined with the importance Luke places on Jerusalem as central to God's purposes in salvation-history,<sup>4</sup> especially as the scene of Jesus' "exodus" (9:31), we can see how Luke has even in the preparation given indications that this will be a Passover and an

---

<sup>1</sup>Finegan, p. 8, n. 1; cf. Lk. 11:1/Mt. 6:9.

<sup>2</sup>M. Rese, Die "Stunde" Jesu in Jerusalem (Rimbeck, 1970), p. 64.

<sup>3</sup>cf. SBK (IV:1, p. 42) for rabbinic references.

<sup>4</sup>See below, p. 493.

exodus like no other.<sup>1</sup>

It is difficult to see in the details of the preparation for the Passover a typological way of thinking. It is only by possible inference from the interpretation of the Passover which Jesus gives in his farewell discourse at the Last Supper table and from those discreet sign posts along the way such as  $\epsilon\chi\theta\omicron\varsigma$  (9:31) that Luke communicates to us the nature of the relation of Jesus' action to the OT. Is this indeed the second Moses giving commands about preparation as the first Moses had (Ex. 12:21)? At least, we may conclude with Grundmann that Jesus' miraculous foreknowledge in giving command about the preparation shows his prophetic authority.<sup>2</sup> If Jesus is not the king of Israel (1 Km. 10: 1-7), at least, he exercises the role of seer, who cannot perish outside Jerusalem (Lk. 13:33).

#### Old Testament Style

There are two sections in this area, vocabulary and grammar. In the first we deal with those words whose form or existence owes something to the OT. We do not pretend to wring theological significance from the particular results of this analysis, unless some pattern of usage has emerged in Luke which should be noted. The second section, dealing with grammar, has more importance for Luke's conscious use of OT style.

The time references to the Passover feast include both words that are distinctive to the LXX and phrases that have an OT stylistic coloring (22:1, 7, 8, 11, 13).  $\tau\omicron\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\alpha$  is an indeclinable transliteration of the Aramaic or the Hebrew (Aram.  $\tau\ \tau\ \tau$  or  $\tau\ \tau\ \tau$  for Hebrew  $\tau\ \tau\ \tau$ ) used in

---

<sup>1</sup>Rese, Die "Stunde," p. 65.

<sup>2</sup>Grundmann, p. 391; W. Manson (p. 23) and A. R. C. Leaney (A Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke, (Black's NT Commentaries; London, 1958), p. 238) see nothing necessarily miraculous in the incident. At the most, Jesus has taken precautions in the face of the plot against him.

the LXX.<sup>1</sup> It may refer to the single feast day (Ex. 12:43, 48; Num. 28:16) which preceded the seven day feast of Unleavened Bread, or in later Jewish common usage to the whole eight day festival.<sup>2</sup> Luke shows that he knows this customary usage when he edits Mark.<sup>3</sup> He overcomes the possible confusion in Mark's construction<sup>4</sup> by subordinating to the phrase "the feast of unleavened bread" the term "Passover" in an explanatory note for his readers.<sup>5</sup> In that way, he is also able to retain and explain πάσχα the foreign word which he takes over from Mark. Τὸ πάσχα may also refer to the lamb which was slain and eaten at the Passover meal (e.g. Ex. 12:21; Dt. 16:2; 1 Esdr. 1:1, 16). There is the possibility of confusion when the term is the direct object of ἐσθίω. It may mean to eat the lamb or the meal<sup>6</sup> (cf. 2 Ch. 30:18; 2 Esdr. 6:20f.). Lk. 22:11, 15 probably refer to the meal and not the lamb.<sup>7</sup> Luke takes over Mark which follows the OT usage θύειν τὸ πάσχα (22:7/Mk. 14:12). But he probably shows that this expression might be unfamiliar when he inserts ἐθε to signify that this is a prescribed part of the Jewish

<sup>1</sup>H. St. J. Thackeray, A Grammar of the OT in Greek (Cambridge, 1909), Vol. I, p. 32; a different transliteration πάσεκ (πάσεχ) occurs predominantly in 1 Ch. 30; 35; Jer. 38(31):8; cf. TDNT, V, pp. 896ff.

<sup>2</sup>cf. Josephus, Ant. XVIII:29, τὸν ἄστυμον τῆς ἐορτῆς... ἣν πάσχα καλοῦμεν cf. XIV:21; TDNT, II, p. 920.

<sup>3</sup>Lk. 22:1 does not show that Luke only knows one feast day as G. Bertram (Die Leidensgeschichte Jesu und der Christuskult (FRLANT, n.f. XV; Göttingen, 1922), p. 22) says; cf. Schürmann, I-Der Paschamahlbericht, p. 78; cf. Ac. 12:3; 20:6.

<sup>4</sup>Also he avoids pleonasm; cf. Schürmann, I-Der Paschamahlbericht, p. 78.

<sup>5</sup>Cadbury, The Style, p. 154; another foreign word which Luke does not explain since he has already introduced it in his narrative is σατανᾶς = ἡ σάβαν. The form of this term is also probably derived ultimately from the LXX; Swete, p. 451.

<sup>6</sup>C. K. Barrett, ("Luke xxii:15: To Eat the Passover," JTS, n.s. IX (1958), pp. 305ff.) says it means the lamb in OT and rabbinic evidence; TDNT (II, p. 693) says either is possible.

<sup>7</sup>Schürmann, I-Der Paschamahlbericht, pp. 7ff. presents arguments from the grammatical standpoint that in Lk. 22:15 it means the meal.

ritual (Lk. 22:7; cf. Ac. 18:21).

While Luke takes pains to explain this word, he adjusts the references to the feast of unleavened bread to make them accord with LXX style. So he changes τὰ ἄζυμα to ἡ ἐορτὴ τῶν ἁζύμων (22:1/Mk. 14:1) and omits τῇ πρώτῃ in a second instance, which yields ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν ἁζύμων (22:7/Mk. 14:12). The former change accords with LXX usage (Ex. 23:15; 34:18; Dt. 16:16; 2 Ch. 8:13), which is a translation of a hebraistic circumlocution, לַיּוֹם הַשֵּׁנִי. Luke is fond of such constructions and this one is probably modeled on the LXX.<sup>1</sup> Another example of circumlocution possibly for emphasis is Luke's editing in οὗτα ἐκ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τῶν δώδεκα (Lk. 22:3) for οἱ εἰς τῶν δώδεκα (Mk. 14:10). The construction οἱ εἰς is also poor Greek, which Luke may have wanted to improve stylistically by its replacement with the participial clause. Possibly Josh. 4:5 (κατὰ τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν δώδεκα) serves as a model.<sup>2</sup>

The term used for the place where Jesus and disciples were to eat the Last Supper, τὸ κατάλυμα, and the word ἐξομολογέω have been claimed by some to be employed in a way that depends on LXX usage. Hauck<sup>3</sup> saw the use of κατάλυμα in 1 Km. 1:18 and 9:22 to describe the room adjacent to a holy place where the sacrificial meal was taken, as an explanation for its use in Lk. 22:11. Although both places were to be used not merely as lodgings but as dining rooms, and both meals are taken within a sacrificial context, these correspondences are not strong enough to influence the more general meaning, "lodgings," which seems to be demanded in the NT context (cf. Lk. 2:7). Jesus' request specified the use of the room "where

<sup>1</sup>Plummer, p. 490; N. Turner (A Grammar of NT Greek by J. H. Moulton (Edinburgh, 1963), Vol. III - Syntax, p. 27) sees the use of the plural as an example of the practice in classical Greek writings and the koiné papyri of placing the name of a feast in the plural. However, the fact that we have a Hebrew equivalent for the LXX construction shows that this principle was probably not primarily at work in the coining of the LXX phrase, which seems to be the more immediate source for Luke's use.

<sup>2</sup>Schlatter (p. 135) compared Sifre Zuṭa Num. 69: לַיּוֹם הַשֵּׁנִי.

<sup>3</sup>Hauck, p. 261.

I am to eat the passover with my disciples" (22:11). This would be made a little redundant if τὸ κατέλυσεν meant primarily "dining room." We do not see any necessary LXX influence here.

K. Bornhäuser believes that we must look to the Biblical usage of ἐξομολογέω for our understanding of it in Lk. 22:6.<sup>1</sup> He observes that in the Bible the term means "to confess" or "to praise," but never "to promise" as in secular Greek and Josephus. Bornhäuser chooses "to confess" as the most likely meaning, for part of Judas' betrayal is his confession that Jesus had admitted and accepted the truth of Peter's confession that he was the Messiah. What Bornhäuser says about Biblical usage in general is admittedly true for Luke's use elsewhere (Lk. 10:21, "to praise;" Ac. 19:18, "to confess"). But neither of these meanings seems to fit the present context. If Judas' betrayal consists, in part, of his confession, testimony concerning Jesus, why is there no mention of him among the false witnesses at the Sanhedrin trial? Why does the passion narrative present his act of betrayal as the leading of a posse to arrest Jesus in a secret place? It may be that scribes with these Biblical meanings in mind as they copied Luke found that these meanings did not fit and so omitted the difficult detail.<sup>2</sup> Of the two meanings that the dictionaries assign to this occurrence of the word ("to agree" - Liddell and Scott; "to promise" - TDNT V:213) "to agree" seems to be more appropriate. Judas responds with agreement to their pact in which they will pay him for the betrayal. The special Biblical usage does not appear to play a part here.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>D. K. Bornhäuser, Die Leidens- und Auferstehungsgeschichte (Gütersloh, 1947), p. 45.

<sup>2</sup>Omitted by uncorrected X; C; a few old latin version mss; Eusebius; The omission may possibly be an assimilation to Mk. 14:11/Mt. 26:16.

<sup>3</sup>Two other terms that owe something to OT or Jewish background in their use, according to Lagrange (p. xcvi), are ὑπομνηματίζω and στυγαγωγός (22:2); Krenkel (pp. 289ff.) notes that the second term is found only in Luke-Acts in the NT but in both LXX and Josephus.

In the grammar section we discover that Luke's intention to imitate LXX style must cope with his desire to write in a clear and literarily pleasing style. We shall mention briefly examples of Luke's editing of Mark which show a tendency to transform the semitic element in Mark into more acceptable Hellenistic literary Greek. Luke often replaces a Markan  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  with  $\delta\epsilon$  (22:3, 7, 10, 13 cf. Mk. 14:10, 11, 13, 16; Lk. omits  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  at 22:12/Mk. 14:15).<sup>1</sup> Although there is great variation in LXX usage, the MT semitic syntax with its parataxis and coordinating conjunction  $\text{?}$  is faithfully translated in the LXX so that there is a preponderance of  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  to  $\delta\epsilon$ .<sup>2</sup> in coordinating conjunctions. It is true that Hellenistic style also employs  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  frequently so that Luke's preference involves more than an aversion to a semitic stylistic element. The frequent use of  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  would be acceptable according to contemporary literary practice,<sup>3</sup> though  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  should not occur too frequently. It is rather that Luke uses  $\delta\epsilon$  and  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  with careful discrimination to bring out contrast or continuity between the elements linked by these particles.<sup>4</sup> Each time  $\delta\epsilon$  is introduced for  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  by Luke in our passage, it is to emphasize a change of scene (22:7, 13) or actor (22:3) in the narrative, or speaker in the dialogue (22:10). Although Luke diminishes the number of  $\kappa\alpha\iota$ 's which connect clauses or sentences, that conjunction does play an important role in his style. Antoniadis observes that Luke uses  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  the most of all the synoptic writers in connecting a great number of details. We may cite for example from our passage the description of Judas' meeting with the Sanhedrin (22:4-6, five  $\kappa\alpha\iota$ 's in all).<sup>5</sup> This series of  $\kappa\alpha\iota$ 's

---

<sup>1</sup>Schlürmann, I-Der Paschamahlbericht, p. 76.

<sup>2</sup>cf. Turner (Moulton Grammar, III, p. 331f.) for statistical comparison.

<sup>3</sup>Cadbury, The Style, p. 142.

<sup>4</sup> $\kappa\alpha\iota$  -92X;  $\delta\epsilon$  -86X in Luke 22-24; cf. Schlürmann, I-Der Paschamahlbericht, p. 76.

<sup>5</sup>Antoniadis, pp. 299ff.

is not excessively repetitious for it employs the wide range of meanings for καί which stems from classical Greek. Yet the frequency of καί also imitates the naive style of a folk tale but more importantly the style of the LXX. It shows theologically that all actors in the salvation history, not just Jesus and his followers, have equal value and find their place in the same plan.<sup>1</sup>

Another semitic element which Luke appears to avoid is parataxis of two finite verbs in a main clause. There are instances in this section of this tendency (22:8, 10, 12, 13).

A final semitic feature in the general syntactical structure, which may indicate either semitic source or imitation of LXX style,<sup>2</sup> is word order. The normal word order for literary Greek in the Hellenistic period, as well as for Aramaic, is subject-object-verb.<sup>3</sup> The Hebrew arrangement is verb-subject-object.<sup>4</sup> E. Norden early observed that next to parataxis, placing the verb first was the surest semitism of the NT, especially when this positioning occurs in a series of clauses. Though this may be a semitic element it is an example of one for which it is difficult to determine its cause on the basis of the construction alone. Is it translation Greek? Is it simply the imitation of LXX style which is itself translation Greek? Is it merely "idiomatic Greek order"?<sup>5</sup> One will need to find other indications of editorial imitation of LXX style within the

<sup>1</sup>V88bus (p. 58) claims that the particle καί in Lk. 22:2 reflects a LXX construction but he doesn't explain.

<sup>2</sup>J. M. Rife ("The Mechanics of Translation Greek," JBL, LII (1933), p. 248) observes concerning word order: "Neither can one escape the impression that scriptural style was imitated by certain writers steeped in the LXX."

<sup>3</sup>Moulton, II, p. 417. This may be maintained in general if we make allowances for the tendency of Greek to place in the first position verbs of saying and the main verbs in subordinate clauses.

<sup>4</sup>Rife (JBL, LII, p. 247) also observes that colloquial Greek was tending toward the Hebraic word order.

<sup>5</sup>cf. Black, An Aramaic Approach, p. 50; Wilcox, p. 112.



immediate context to support the word order evidence. Norden said that Luke's consistent use of semitic word order was especially striking. Although in other respects his style inclines more to the Hellenic side, he shows in this area "a greater preference than the others [NT writers] for a flowing style of narrative, in which there was naturally more opportunity for this position of the verb."<sup>1</sup>

Schürmann identifies two instances of Lukan editing of Mark which create semitic or Biblical word order (22:7, ἡλθεν δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα, Mk. 14:12, καὶ τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ . . . λέγουσιν ; 22:11a, λέγει σοι ὁ διδάσκαλος , Mk. 14:14, οὗτός ἐστις ὁ διδάσκαλος λέγει).<sup>2</sup> It is likely that LXX style imitation is involved in both these cases. In the first case (22:7) Luke is describing the arrival of the Passover feast day. This is subject matter which it is appropriate to present in LXX style. The second case is part of editorial reworking based on OT formulas.<sup>3</sup>

In this section (22:1-14) the word order arrangement is predominantly semitic (verb-subject; main clause-5X; subordinate clause-3X; subject-verb; 2X). Since it is one of the few sections in our passion narrative which is generally recognized as having Mark as its basic source, it gives us one of the best opportunities to detect which pattern of sentence structure Luke prefers. We can see how Luke's editorial methods work on his sources to produce that word order. In each succeeding section we shall note word order and see if any pattern develops.

Another way of detecting a grammatical feature, which may indicate a foreign or semitic stylistic element is to look for features which appear to be redundant, which add nothing to the progression of the narrative.

---

<sup>1</sup>Quoted in Moulton, II, p. 417.

<sup>2</sup>Schürmann, I-Der Paschamahlbericht, pp. 77, 98; As with the use of δὲ and καὶ there is also evidence of Luke's desire to write literary Hellenistic Greek. He often reverses Mark's "verb-subject" word order to make it conform to more normal Greek word order; cf. Schürmann, I-Der Paschamahlbericht, p. 87.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 99.

Luke's tendency to remove parataxis by making one of a pair of finite verbs a subordinate participle<sup>1</sup> sometimes creates participles which appear to be redundant (e.g. 22:4, 13, ἀπελθών; 22:8, εἰπών; πορευθέντες). The degree of redundancy depends on the extent to which the original paratactical construction was itself pleonastic or redundant. Redundant participles usually describe a movement or an attitude which precedes a verb of action (e.g. ἐλθών; ἀπελθών; πορευθείς; ἀναστὰς; ἀρξάμενος).<sup>2</sup> They may be a verb of speaking accompanying a finite verb of speaking (e.g. λέγων).<sup>3</sup> The same construction occurs in the LXX<sup>4</sup> when that translation breaks up parataxis by the same method of participial subordination. We shall not deal with all the possible examples of pleonastic participles in this section. Only those which do not occur again in Luke 22-23 merit our attention (ἀπελθών; πορευθέντες).<sup>5</sup>

Of the ten occurrences of the participle of ἀπέρχομαι with a finite verb in the LXX every instance is the result of the LXX translation's break up of a paratactical construction (Gen. 21:14, 16; 29:7; 38:11; Ex. 5:18 (A-text); 12:21, 28; Dt. 17:3 (A-text); 24:2). In every case but one (Ex. 12:21) ἀπέρχομαι translates a form of יָצַא. Since we only have ten examples of this practice, it is difficult to establish that this particular pleonastic participial construction, ἀπελθών plus the finite verb, is characteristic of the LXX style and, hence, could be copied by another writer. What does seem clear, however, is that for both the LXX translation, in this case predominantly the LXX Pentateuch, and Luke the

<sup>1</sup>Cadbury, The Style, p. 133.

<sup>2</sup>Turner, Moulton Grammar, III, p. 154.

<sup>3</sup>Moulton, II, p. 452; Howard notes that it is often hard to tell when this is truly pleonastic, though the construction usually conveys a semitic flavor.

<sup>4</sup>Tabachovitz, p. 48.

<sup>5</sup>For a discussion of Luke's use of the participle of a verb of speaking to introduce direct discourse (such as εἰπών, 22:8) see below, P. 370.

use of a participle with a finite verb was a method of dealing with parataxis (cf. 5:14/Mk. 1:44; Lk. 19:32/Mk. 11:4). And the fact that the LXX shows evidence of the same method in its style may give us an additional factor in Luke's editorial practice. His replacement of parataxis with participle plus finite verb not only improves the Greek of his source, and preserves all the elements from the source, but also expresses an imitation of LXX style. Of added interest is the fact that this construction occurs twice in the LXX account of the first Passover preparation, as part of the command of Moses and the description of the command's execution (Ex. 12:21, 28). These particular OT passages, however, do not appear to have been imitated by Luke. Where he has the opportunity to introduce verbal agreement in his reworking of the command in Mark, he uses παρασκευάσαντες (Lk. 22:8/Mk. 14:12, 13), instead of ἀπελθόντες (Ex. 12:21, also in Mk. 14:12).<sup>1</sup> The other place where there is verbal agreement with Ex. 12:28, the execution of the command (Lk. 22:13), Luke simply edits Mark in accordance with his stylistic preference (Mk. 2:12/Lk. 5:25 cf. Mk. 5:10/Lk. 8:31), reproducing a phrase that he has used in an earlier parallel episode (19:32/Mk. 11:4). Thus, Luke's editing produces mixed evidence with respect to any attempt to see the Exodus 12 account as the model for the vocabulary and style of his narrative. The most that can be said is that Luke practices the same method of improving parataxis, which includes introducing pleonastic participles, as the LXX translation did.

A special form of parataxis, two imperatives, also is improved in the LXX through converting one into a participle (OT occurrences involving παρασκευάσαι (rendering ἰ, 7): Gen. 37:14; Ex. 5:11, 18; 3 Km. 14:7;

---

<sup>1</sup> Luke has no natural aversion to ἀπερχομαι since he inserts it at 5:25/Mk. 2:12; Lk. 8:31/Mk. 5:10; cf. Lk. 23:33.

4 Km. 2:16; cf. Gen. 27:13, the only instance in the LXX where the participle of πορεύομαι plus the imperative translates the identical construction in the Hebrew).<sup>1</sup> Luke has five occurrences of this construction with a form of πορεύομαι serving as the subordinate participle (7:22/Mt. 11:4; Lk. 13:32; 14:10; 17:14; 22:8 cf. Mk. 14:12, 13). Since in all the other occurrences Luke either agrees with his synoptic parallel or uses material peculiar to himself, it is difficult to tell in the case of Lk. 22:8 whether Luke is under the influence of another source or whether this is strictly his own editing. At Lk. 22:8 we incline toward the conclusion that Luke introduced this construction into Mark under the influence of another source or at least in accordance with what he believed to be the distinctive style of Jesus' speech. All of the other instances are in sayings of Jesus. These may be the primary factors. The agreement with LXX style is probably the result of a use of the same method by the LXX and Luke for converting paratactical imperatives into a more acceptable construction. We must, however, be careful not to be too quick to attribute all such stylistic improvement to Luke, especially where all his sources are not extant. Thus, whereas such pleonastic participles may be attributed to Luke in the cases of ἀπελθών (22:4, 13), we are less certain that Luke is originally responsible for πορευθέντες (22:8). Still in both cases a LXX stylistic element colors the narrative. That it is part of a pattern of LXX style imitation in this section is confirmed by the cumulative evidence of some other semitic elements which we must mention.<sup>2</sup>

One more semitic element in Lk. 22:1-6 is the use of a genitive articular infinitive with a finite verb (22:6, ἐς ἣ τέλ... τοῦ παραδόντας).

---

<sup>1</sup>There are altogether 23 occurrences of πορεύομαι as a participle with a finite verb in the LXX.

<sup>2</sup>A. B. Bruce (Expositor's Greek NT, I, p. 624) cites Dt. 7:13, τὰ βουκόλια τῶν βοῶν, as a LXXism parallel to the redundant construction, οἱ κοδοὶ πότῃ τῇς οἰκίας (Lk. 22:11); cf. Schürmann, I-Der Paschamahlbericht, p. 93.

Although this construction is possible in Greek (e.g. Herodotus I:86, εἴ τις μὲν δαιμόνων ῥέθεται τοῦ μὴ ἰῶντα κατακαυθῆναι), its frequency in the LXX to literally translate the finite verb followed by an infinitive with a prefix (ῥέθεται) qualifies it as a LXX stylistic element (e.g. Gen. 19:20; Eccl. 3:2-8; 2 Km. 12:10; Ps. 38(39):2; cf. 1 Macc. 5:39; cf. e.g. Gen. 2:15 where in accord with the more common Greek usage of the infinitive without an article following a finite verb, the ῥέθεται is not re-produced as τοῦ).<sup>1</sup> This construction is also a characteristic of Lukan style, which occurs throughout Luke-Acts (e.g. 1:9; 2:6; 5:7; 22:6, 15, 31; 24:16, 25, 29, 45; 24X in Acts; Luke inserts the construction into Mark, 4:42/Mk. 1:37; 8:5/Mk. 4:3, cf. Mt. 13:3).<sup>2</sup> It may be described as a feature of Luke's LXX style imitation. The purpose for Luke's use of this characteristic feature at Lk. 22:6 is probably variety. He has already anticipated the πῶς of Mk. 14:11 at Lk. 22:4 so he does not want to repeat it here. The normal "telic" sense of the genitival articular infinitive is probably to be understood here. This construction along with the consistent use of καί; the "verb-subject" word order and the pleonastic participle (22:4), all serve to maintain and extend the semitic, or should we say LXX style flavor of Lk. 22:1-6. At the same time Luke edits Mark to improve his rough style.

Several other semitic elements in Lk. 22:7-14 tend to confirm the view that Luke wrote with LXX style as his model. Luke often inserts the interjection ἰδοὺ or καὶ ἰδοὺ into his narrative.<sup>3</sup> In the LXX this translates mainly הִנֵּה, הִנֵּה הִנֵּה. Luke uses the interjection at Lk. 22:10 to point out a detail of the dialogue, the instructions given to the disciples. The interjection does call one's attention to that detail.

<sup>1</sup>Turner, Kilpatrick Festschrift, p. 16; Johnson, JBL, LVI, p. 340.

<sup>2</sup>Hawkins, Horae Synopticae, p. 48.

<sup>3</sup>Schürmann, I-Der Paschamahlbericht, p. 93.

But more, it makes a prophetic affirmation about the reality of the situation into which Jesus sends those who carry out his instructions (cf. other prophetic affirmations linked to Jesus' instructions, Lk. 10:3; 13:32; 18:31; 22:31; 23:29; 24:49 cf. Ac. 7:56; 20:22, 25; 27:24).<sup>1</sup> Just as on Palm Sunday the disciples have no knowledge of the way they are to make preparations and need Jesus' direction (19:30f.), so now Jesus prophetically foresees the details which will help them fulfill their mission. We might suppose that Jesus made prior arrangements and just informs the disciples of the details now.<sup>2</sup> However, the parallels which Luke draws with the Palm Sunday episode, in which he presents Jesus' miraculous foreknowledge in greater relief, show us that he intends his readers to see Jesus' instructions about Passover preparation as miraculous foreknowledge also. The OT background of the interjection *ἰδοὺ* also appears to cast Jesus' saying in the form of a prophetic utterance. If it were just a matter of pointing out the man with the water jar we might expect Luke to have placed the *ἰδοὺ* closer to that detail. Rather, the interjection stands at the head of the whole instruction. This is the comparable function which the interjection has among the prophets (e.g. Ex. 7:16; Am. 4:2; Jo. 2:19). They speak on the authority of a message from a God who acts in history, who calls men to notice what he is going to do, and to recognize and remember when it has happened that he has done it just as he said. Moses' word to Pharaoh as he announces the plagues contains *ἰδοὺ* functioning as *ἰδοὺ* does in the prophetic words of Jesus (Ex. 7:16). It is as if to say, "This is important. Look at this. Watch and see if this does not come true just as I have spoken it." The main difference, however, between the prophets' words and Jesus' word is that the "I" in the prophets' pronouncements

---

<sup>1</sup>P. Fiedler, Die Formel "Und sieh" im NT, (Stud. zANT, XX; München, 1969) p. 61f.

<sup>2</sup>W. Manson, p. 238.

represents God speaking. Jesus speaks for himself, though he is continually conscious that he lives under the will of God. This interjection, *δοῦ*, has other facets in its meaning and use in Luke which we will meet throughout the passion narrative. What we may call the "prophetic affirmation" use occurs here. It is important for placing Jesus' words in the proper context. His instructions may be based on miraculous foreknowledge, but it is not foreknowledge just to do magic to impress the disciples. It is in aid of accomplishing the will of God, of preparing the place to have Passover in Jerusalem from which Jesus will make his "exodus" (9:31).

Another adjustment in the wording of Jesus' instructions to make it accord with LXX style brings out their authority. The aorist imperative of Mk. 14:14a becomes a future indicative (22:11). This follows the form of the categorical injunctions and prohibitions in the legal language of the OT (e.g. Dt. 6:5; Ex. 20:1ff).<sup>1</sup> Luke makes the same change at Mk. 11:3/Lk. 19:31. There are Hellenistic Greek precedents for the future following an imperative and continuing to have the imperatival force. Thus, Luke might be seen to improve the Greek of Mark at this point by giving variety to an imperatival parataxis. But, the other instance of Luke's editing in which he replaces an imperative with a future indicative is not in parataxis. So with caution we may take over some of the significance of LXX style and see Luke portraying Jesus' command as having as much authority as an OT legal requirement. It seems reasonable to assume that the appropriateness of this heightened authority stems from the nature of the one who gives the command rather than the content of the command, which is in itself hardly an eternal truth. Other features of Luke's editing which indicate that he is

---

<sup>1</sup>F. Blass and A. Debrunner, A Greek Grammar of the NT and Other Early Christian Literature, trans. R. Funk (Chicago, 1967) ¶ 362; This is not normal in secular Greek, but cf. the example in ¶ 369:7 where the future follows an imperative in religious language.

emphasizing Jesus' authority are the reversal of verb and subject; the insertion of οτι ; and the fact that Luke retains the present tense of λέγω which is identical with the way he introduces authoritative Scripture.<sup>1</sup> This evidence adds support to the supposition that the use of the future in place of the imperative is modelled on the commandment form in the LXX.

We shall add briefly some semitic elements which may be imitation of LXX style but which do not contribute to the message of the passage save to give it a stronger OT flavor.<sup>2</sup> M. Black says that in Lk. 22:10 ἀνθρώπου fulfills the function proper to τις . In this case, Luke is reproducing Mark. The idiom may derive from Aramaic or Hebrew. Hence the translation Greek style of the LXX also contains it (e.g. Josh. 1:5, ἀνθρώπου for וְאֶחָד). Thus M. Black can say that the occurrence in Lk. 22:8 may be part of the LXX style imitation which Luke also manifests in his use of ἀνὴρ (cf. 8:41; 19:2; 23:50; Ac. 9:12; 10:30; 17:31).<sup>3</sup> Thackeray observes that letting ἀνθρώπου or ἀνὴρ serve the function of ἐκαστος or τις is also good vernacular Greek.<sup>4</sup> So it is hard to tell when such a usage really can be considered an element of LXX style. Frequency and the fact that in any given case the substitution is not significant for the meaning of the context will probably be the test of whether the construction generally should be seen as an evidence of a writer's imitation of LXX style. In our case, ἀνθρώπου plays an important part in the immediate context since it emphasizes the fact that the person carrying the water jug is a male and thus more easily identifiable in a crowd.<sup>5</sup> It then plays a meaningful

---

<sup>1</sup>Schürmann, I-Der Paschamahlbericht, p. 98f.

<sup>2</sup>cf. Moulton (II, p. 420), who says that θέλει plus a subjunctive is a semitism (22:9), but it does not qualify as a LXXism (cf. only Ex. 2:7); See below (p. 369), for a discussion of the possible LXXism, the partitive genitive with ἐκ, 22:3.

<sup>3</sup>Black, An Aramaic Approach, pp. 106, 107.

<sup>4</sup>Thackeray, I, p. 45.

<sup>5</sup>Leaney, p. 264.



role in the instructions. The part LXX style played in making the construction acceptable even desirable to Luke must thus be balanced with the part the word played in the sense of the context, the faithful use Luke made of his sources, and the fact that the construction could appear in secular Greek.

Luke removes the LXXism  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ <sup>1</sup> in favor of  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \kappa\epsilon\iota\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$  (Lk. 22:12/Mk. 14:15). This is to make the antecedent clearer. The demonstrative pronoun distinguishes the intended antecedent from the immediately preceding noun and points more definitely back to the man with the water jug.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>See below, p. 210.

<sup>2</sup>Schürmann, I-Der Paschamahlbericht, p. 100.

## CHAPTER II

## LUKE 22:15-38: THE LAST SUPPER AND THE FAREWELL DISCOURSE;

## SOME INTRODUCTORY OBSERVATIONS

While it will be necessary to study in detail the content of this discourse's sections separately (22:15-20; 21-23; 24-30; 31-34; 35-38), it is beneficial to view the discourse as a whole and notice the relationships between the various parts. Luke is fond of placing Jesus' teaching within the context of a meal.<sup>1</sup> Some would see this literary form as having its proper origin in the worship practice of the early church, especially with respect to a sermon which accompanies the celebration of the Eucharist.<sup>2</sup> However, there are historical precedents in the farewell discourses of the great men in the OT, in general, and in the practice of Passover haggadah,<sup>3</sup> in particular, which could serve as models for the literary form of this discourse. The historical probability that the content of this discourse was actually spoken by Jesus on the night in which he was betrayed rests on results of source and historical criticism. These will be considered as we study each section of the discourse. Our working hypothesis for the moment is that since Luke does represent the Last Supper as a Passover meal, we are justified in seeking aid from the literary forms of liturgical materials which surround the Passover as possible models for Luke's composition.

It is more helpful, however, to begin by looking at the more general literary form, the farewell discourse. From the content of Jesus' discourse we can readily see that he is giving some of his last instructions before

---

<sup>1</sup>Navone, pp. 11ff; cf. Lk. 5:29-39; 7:36-50; 11:37-54; 14:1-24; 22:14-38; see also 9:16; 10:38-42; 24:30.

<sup>2</sup>P. Borgen, Eschatology and History in Luke-Acts (Diss., Drew U.; Madison, N.J., 1957), p. 35; he compared Ac. 20:7ff.

<sup>3</sup>E. J. Tinsley, The Gospel According to Luke (Cambridge Bible Commentary; Cambridge, 1965), p. 192.

his death (22:15-18; 22:22; 28-30; 35-38). Out of the OT and Intertestamental literature comes a literary form, farewell discourse, which is distinctively influenced by the experiences of Israel as the covenant people of God.<sup>1</sup> The two essential elements, appropriate to discourses which stand at the transition point between generations, are a backward look to the older generation's past life and a forward look to the continuing life of succeeding generations. In the backward look the departing individual remembers and repeats the covenant promises which God has made to him and his generation (Gen. 48:3-4; Josh. 24:3-13; Dt. 1:6-8). He also reminds his generations of his irreproachable conduct before his contemporaries and God (1 Km. 12:3-5; Test. Reuben 1:5-10; cf. Gen. 49:3, 4, in this case we hear of a negative example and the punishment Reuben received). In the forward look the OT discourses pass on the promised blessing of the covenant to the next generation (Gen. 49; Dt. 31:1-8). And they also make that generation renew its allegiance to the terms of the covenant, the conditions for experiencing the blessing (Josh. 24:14-27; 1 Km. 12:14-25). Munck notes that the Intertestamental literature has a different attitude toward this second element. Their farewell discourses no longer seek to effectively transmit the covenant from generation to generation. They merely give moral advice within the terms of a long established and constantly remembered covenant.

The passover ritual also contains these two basic perspectives, a look to the past and a view to the next generation. The purpose of the celebration was the remembrance of God's saving act, the deliverance from Egypt, which was the foundation for his covenant with his people (Ex. 12:14;

---

<sup>1</sup>J. Munck, "Discours d'adieu dans le NT et dans la littérature biblique," Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne. Mélanges offertes à M. Maurice Goguel (Paris, 1950), pp. 155-170; Paris, e.g. Jacob (Gen. 47:29-49:27; Moses (Deuteronomy 1-3; 4; 31-34); Joshua (Josh. 23:1-24:32); Tobit (Tob. 14:3-11); Matthias (1 Macc. 2:49-70).

Ex. 20:1-the terms of the covenant follow). And this remembrance always stood at a transition point between one generation and another. The Passover haggadah had an educational purpose: "And when your children say to you, 'What do you mean by this service?' you shall say, 'It is the sacrifice of the Lord's passover, for he passed over the houses of the people of Israel in Egypt, when he slew the Egyptians but spared our houses.'" (Ex. 12:26, 27).

Evidence of these two literary forms, farewell discourse and Passover haggadah, in Luke's report of Jesus' farewell discourse comes in different ways. There is a limited Passover haggadah in Lk. 22:15-20 which takes up the main elements of customary Jewish haggadah and reinterprets them in the light of the fulfilment of the Passover hope for final redemption to be accomplished through Jesus' saving death. This reinterpretation, especially the words of institution (22:19-20), becomes the new covenant, the new Passover text on which a larger haggadah is developed, the remainder of the farewell discourse (22:21-38). Since this discourse does not take up systematically the words of institution it is not a matter of seeing Jesus offering a midrash on that text. Rather the text provides themes which are taken up in the rest of the farewell discourse. We will identify them as we discuss the key ideas of the discourse [e.g. covenant (22:20; 22:28-30) fulfilment in the kingdom (22:16-18; 22:28-30); the voluntary self-giving of Jesus (22:19; 22:27); his death as part of God's plan (22:15f.; 22:21-23; 35-38); faithfulness (22:19; 22:28, 31-34)]. The Passover haggadah as a literary form and practice gives us then a way of understanding the traditional role the words of institution played in the Last Supper as Passover. It also aids us in understanding how those words could have a further haggadah worked upon them in the rest of the farewell discourse and, hence, why the themes of that discourse are almost all found in Lk. 22:15-20.

Yet, it is the farewell discourse form which best explains the shape

and content of Jesus' Last Supper discourse in Lk. 22:21-38. Before describing how the elements in this literary form present themselves in Lk. 22:21-38, we must mention two important facts which alter the form. The act of salvation on which the covenant with its promised blessings and its obligations is established has not yet taken place. Jesus hasn't yet died and risen again. Hence, the farewell discourse is necessarily incomplete. We must wait until Lk. 24:44-49 and Ac. 1:1-12 before we find the renewal or transmission element fully given. There we have the charge to the disciples to be ministers of the new covenant. There we learn the full content and significance of that covenant.

Luke presents all the elements of an OT farewell discourse within the literary structure of a chiasmus. The discourse moves from a statement about the necessity of Jesus' death, the act which will establish the covenant (22:21-23), to two statements about the obligations and blessings of life within the new covenant (22:24-30; 31-34), back to a statement about Jesus' death (22:35-38). The blessings are based on God's promise mediated through Jesus' promise (22:28-30). Jesus presents himself as an example (22:27). The obligations of the new covenant are spelled out (22:24-26; 31-32; 35-36). A statement about the act of salvation which established the covenant, (i.e. Jesus' death), thus, begins and ends the discourse (22:21-23; 22:37), the blessings and obligations come between (22:24-30; 31-34, 35, 36). The transmission or renewal element is given only briefly in Lk. 22:28-30.

With these two literary forms, then, we have a way of understanding the farewell discourse (22:15-38) as a unit. We shall now study the discourse's various sections to see how Luke's use of the OT contributes to its individual contents as well as its unity.

## CHAPTER III

## LUKE 22:15-20: THE LAST SUPPER

## Introduction

Three interlocking critical questions demand our attention before we can consider the OT allusions, ideas, and stylistic elements of this section. (a) The text of Lk. 22:19b-20 is uncertain.<sup>1</sup> (b) This is the first section in the passion narrative where there is strong disagreement among scholars concerning Luke's literary sources. (c) The account raises the historical question: Is Luke's picture of the Last Supper as a Passover during which the words of institution for the Eucharist were first uttered correct?

(a) Of central importance to understanding the theology of Luke is the decision one makes concerning the textual problem of Lk. 22:17-20.<sup>2</sup> Since readings (3) - (6) are modifications of the longer or shorter form,<sup>3</sup> we may treat as our basic variant readings,

<sup>1</sup> Another text problem occurs at Lk. 22:16. The evidence is οὐ μὴ φάγω Alexandrian- p75<sup>vid</sup>; X; B; L; 1241; cop<sup>bo</sup>, sa; Caesarean- θ; f<sup>1</sup>; Western- it<sup>a</sup>; Byzantine- A; lectionaries; οὐκέτι οὐ μὴ φάγω; Alexandrian- 892; vg; Caesarean- f<sup>13</sup>; 565; geo; arm; syr<sup>pal</sup>; Origen<sup>lat</sup>; Western- syr<sup>c</sup>, s, h; many old latin mss; Diatessaron; Byzantine- C\*, <sup>2</sup>; X; K; P; W; Δ; Π; Ψ; 700; many minuscules; lectionaries; syr<sup>p</sup>; eth. Since the first reading is both attested by more ancient witnesses and is the shorter and more difficult reading from the point of view of style, and since the longer reading could be explained as a stylistic adjustment of the shorter reading, we take the shorter reading to be authentic; cf. B. M. Metzger's (A Textual Commentary on the Greek NT (London, 1971), p. 173) comment, "If the word were present originally, there is no satisfactory explanation to account for its absence from p75; ABL f<sup>1</sup> it<sup>a</sup> cop<sup>sa</sup>, <sup>bo</sup> al." Contrast Schürmann, I-Der Paschamahlbericht, p. 16, n. 75.

<sup>2</sup>(1) vv. 17-20; Alexandrian- p75; X; B; L; 892; vg; cop<sup>sa</sup>, <sup>bo</sup>; Caesarean- θ; f<sup>1</sup>; f<sup>13</sup>; 1071; syr<sup>pal</sup>; arm; geo; Byzantine- A; C; K; T<sup>vid</sup>; W; Δ; Ψ; Π; 1241; Western- it<sup>aur</sup>, c, f, q, r.

(2) vv. 17-19a (...τὸ σῶμά μου ): Western- D; it<sup>a</sup>, d, ff<sup>2</sup>, i, l. variant on the shorter readings:

(3) vv. 19a (καὶ λαβὼν . . . σῶμά μου ), 17, 18: Western- it<sup>b</sup>, e. variants on the longer reading:

(4) vv. 19 (omit διδόμενον ), 17, 18: Western- syr<sup>c</sup>.

(5) vv. 19, 20: Western- syr<sup>p</sup>.

(6) vv. 19, 20a (μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνῆσαι ) 17, 20b (τοῦτό μου τὸ αἶμα ἢ καὶ τὴν διαθήκην ) 18: Western- syr<sup>s</sup>.

<sup>3</sup>Metzger, Commentary, p. 174.

readings (1) and (2). The extrinsic probabilities show that geographical distribution and number of mss favor reading (1). The shorter reading occurs in only one text family, the Western.<sup>1</sup> The age of the witnesses to both readings is equally ancient. The fact that the process of harmonization of the short form with the other Gospels and Paul was already well developed by the time of the Old Syriac and Old Latin versions, represented in readings (3), (4), (6) means that the short form has its origin in the second and possibly the first century.<sup>2</sup> The Western text witnesses to the shorter reading, although normally it is an eclectic text with the fuller reading. Many scholars were convinced from this evidence that the shorter reading was authentic. The longer reading was an example of one of the inauthentic "Western non-interpolations" of Westcott and Hort.<sup>3</sup> However, the mass of mss which speak for the longer text make it extremely improbable that the shorter text is original. For to presume so "would be to assume that an identical addition to the text of Luke (22:19b-20) had been introduced into every text of the manuscripts with the exception of D, a, b, d, e, ff<sup>2</sup>, i, l, syr<sup>c</sup>, s."<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>P. Parker, "Three Variant Readings in Luke-Acts," *JBL*, LXXXIII (1964), p. 165; However, H. Chadwick ("The Shorter Text of Luke XXII.15-20," *HTR*, L (1957), p. 251) points out that within the Western family witness there is geographical distribution: the West- D; it<sup>b</sup>; Africa- it<sup>e</sup>; Syria- syr<sup>s</sup>, c.

<sup>2</sup>Chadwick, *HTR*, L, p. 251; Schürmann's ("Lk. 22, 19b-20 als ursprüngliche Textüberlieferung," *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien* (Kommentare und Beiträge zANT; Düsseldorf, 1968), pp. 160-171, conclusions, pp. 170ff.) extensive study of the variant witnesses, their inter-relationships and their connection with Marcion, Tatian, and Justin, has shown that the longer reading may very well have been the text-form of the original stages of the Western text family's development.

<sup>3</sup>Westcott and Hort (II, Appendix, p. 62) and the majority of scholars until the early 1950's when the consensus under the influence of J. Jeremias [*The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, translated from the 3rd German ed. by N. Perrin (NT Library; London, 1966)] and Schürmann (*Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*, pp. 159-197) began to shift in favor of the longer reading.

<sup>4</sup>Jeremias, p. 144.

That is, that at the early stages of the history of the text, Lk. 22:19b-20 was interpolated and only in the West did a non-interpolation copy come to be circulated.

Transcriptional probabilities are the real nub of the problem. Can an acceptable reason be found for the origin of the long or short text in the transcriptional practices and perspectives of the scribes? Those who see the short text as original do not have to seek far for an explanation of the longer reading. It, like all the other variant readings at this juncture, is an attempt to assimilate Luke to the other Gospels and Paul.<sup>1</sup> The task is much more difficult for those who defend the long text's authenticity. They need to find a reason for an excision of Lk. 22:19b-20 which creates a short text which comes to an abrupt end and leaves out a majority of the words of institution.

There have been at least five explanations for the transcriptional origin of the short text. The copyist may have been confused by the progression of the narrative, especially the order, cup-bread-cup, and the mention of two cups. It was not like the Eucharist liturgy he knew, therefore, he omitted the reference to the second cup.<sup>2</sup> Two variations on this explanation from confusion reason respectively from the criterion of the liturgical form the copyist knew and used and the criterion of Matthew and Mark's wording. In the first case, it is assumed that there existed two liturgical traditions in the early church, one which corresponded to the short form and one which corresponded to the long form. Copyists reproduced in their texts of Luke that form which was familiar to them.<sup>3</sup> In the second

---

<sup>1</sup> Rese, Die "Stunde," p. 84.

<sup>2</sup> Westcott and Hort (II, Appendix, p. 63) see this as the only explanation for omission and find it unconvincing since it would involve the intentional removal of the well known words of institution. Yet cf. Jeremias (p. 157) who notes that this explanation from concern over order does not account for the omission of 22:19b. Metzger (Commentary, p. 174) observes, "It is easier to suppose that the Bezan editor puzzled by cup bread cup sequence eliminated the second cup without being concerned about the inverted order it produced, than that the editor of the longer text version, to rectify the inverted order brought in from Paul the second mention of the cup while letting the first mention stand."

<sup>3</sup> A. J. B. Higgins, The Lord's Supper in the NT (SBT, VI; London, 1952), p. 40; Contrast Jeremias, p. 157.



case, it is noted that the omission breaks off during the words of institution where they begin to differ substantially from Matthew and Mark.<sup>1</sup> This indicates that the copyist wanted to avoid contradiction between the gospel parallels in these important words.

Two other explanations come from the liturgical practice of the early church and its relation to church discipline. The omission occurred at a stage in the development of liturgical practice, when the Eucharist had been effectively separated from the fellowship meal. Luke's reference to an intervening supper between the words of institution (22:20) contradicted the practice at that stage. Further, drunkenness at the Eucharist would be encouraged if the words of institution were retained in the Lukan context of the extra cup. Therefore, the omission comes where it does.<sup>2</sup> Since Luke implies by his placement of Jesus' announcement of Judas' betrayal that the betrayer partook of the Last Supper, to prevent the use of Luke's account as a precedent for unrepentant sinful people taking part in the Eucharist a copyist may have omitted the greater part of the words of institution.<sup>3</sup>

That the shorter reading may have arisen because of a scribal error involving a homoioteleuton caused by the repetition of *ὁπὲρ ἡμῶν* in vv. 19, 20 is not substantiated by the place where the shorter reading actually breaks off.<sup>4</sup>

The most probable explanation for the origin of the short form in the history of text transmission is disciplina arcani. To protect the words of institution from profanation and from the possible misunderstanding of

---

<sup>1</sup>A. George, "Le sens de la mort de Jésus pour Luc," RB, LXXX (1973), p. 193.

<sup>2</sup>Schürmann, Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen, pp. 187ff; Contrast Chadwick (HTR, L, p. 252), who is not convinced, because there is no comparable evidence of tampering in the text history of 1 Cor. 11:25.

<sup>3</sup>Rese, Die "Stunde", p. 85.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

blood sacrifice one or more copies prepared for general circulation had the words omitted.<sup>1</sup> Some may object that not all the words of institution are removed.<sup>2</sup> But, the possible misunderstanding of blood sacrifice helps to explain why all of Lk. 22:20 would be omitted while part of Lk. 22:19 could stand. Also, the presence of v. 19a serves as a pointer to the interested pagan that the Eucharist of which he may have heard, but into whose mysteries he had not yet been initiated, was first instituted by Jesus himself in a Passover setting just before his death. Thus, far from being an omission which creates a non-sensical piece<sup>3</sup> of liturgy, the short form delicately avoids the full description of the Eucharistic mystery while definitely indicating its presence.

While the task of positive proof for the proponents of the originality of the long text lay in finding the origin of the omission in the area of transcriptional probability, the task of positive proof for the proponents of the short form lay in the area of intrinsic probability. They must find reasons for Luke's non-inclusion of the liturgical formula of the longer reading. They argue from the long text's incompatibility with Luke's style and theology. Scholars who favor the short form usually point out that Lk. 22:19b-20 has literary affinities with 1 Cor. 11:24-25, while at the same time containing features which do not accord with Lukan style.<sup>4</sup> They also point out that Lk. 22:19a connects well with v. 21.<sup>5</sup> Luke's theological perspective, especially his lack of emphasis on the significance

---

<sup>1</sup>Jeremias, p. 157; Metzger, Commentary, p. 174.

<sup>2</sup>Chadwick (HTR, L, p. 255) observes that the Western text has Lk. 22:19a.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>G. D. Kilpatrick, "Lk. xxii. 19b-20," JTS, XLVII (1946), p. 50; P. Benoit ("Luc xxii. 19-20," JTS, XLIX (1948), p. 145) answers him.

<sup>5</sup>Hirsch, II, p. 252; Schürmann (Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen, p. 182) disagrees and says that form critically v. 19a demands v. 20.

of Jesus' death as vicarious atonement, explains why he would omit Lk. 22:19b-20.<sup>1</sup> These scholars must also search out a coherent understanding of the significance of short form, which they claim Luke originally wrote.<sup>2</sup> But even if such a coherent picture is half way convincing the final stumblingblock is always Lk. 22:19a and its abrupt ending. At most, they must either appeal to Luke's own practice of omission according to disciplina arcani<sup>3</sup> or to his misunderstanding of his sources. According to Chadwick, Luke does not realize that  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\alpha$  in Lk. 22:15 was meant to refer to the whole feast including the bread so he supplements his source by adding some words from Mark about bread. Thus, Luke "bluntly, perhaps even gauchely appended 19a adapted from the Marcan tradition."<sup>4</sup> However, the need to appeal to Luke's misunderstanding of the term  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\alpha$ , which he has used correctly in its various senses in the preceding context (22:1, 7, 8, 11, 13), reveals the weakness of the positive evidence from Luke for the short form. We shall save detailed discussion of Lukan style and theology for consideration when we treat particular examples of OT ideas and style. Stylistically, the character of the material, a liturgical formula which would have reached a certain fixity of expression in the early church, tends to preclude the total reworking of the wording according to Lukan style. We have not been entirely convinced that the degree of Luke's avoidance of the interpretation of Jesus' death as vicarious atonement is so great that it would demand the excision of a liturgical formula so central to the faith of the early church. More important, there is some

---

<sup>1</sup>A. Vööbus, "A New Approach to the Problem of the Shorter and Longer Text in Luke," NTS, XV (1968-69), p. 462; Contrast Jeremias, p. 157.

<sup>2</sup>e.g. W. Manson (p. 242), "On this view Luke's original text followed his Judean source, made the Supper a prophecy of the Messianic banquet and a symbol of the disciple's fellowship with Christ, but not a representation of his sacrifice or a channel by which the results of that sacrifice are communicated."

<sup>3</sup>Zahn, Lukas, p. 675f.

<sup>4</sup>Chadwick, HTR, L, p. 256.

evidence in the rest of the farewell discourse of themes developed from the content of Lk. 22:19b-20 (covenant, 22:28-30; Jesus' self-giving for the disciples, 22:27, 28-30).

We conclude that the long form is original. The short form is best accounted for by the production of a limited number of copies for circulation among pagans. The disciplina arcani necessitated the omission.

(b) The Last Supper account in Luke is the first section of the passion narrative in which source critics range themselves on one side or other of the question whether Mark or non-Markan material is the basic literary source. Those who see Mark as the basic source use analyses of literary style<sup>1</sup> and theological content<sup>2</sup> to show that Luke has taken Mark and expanded it according to his own theological purposes. H. F. D. Sparks applies his conclusions about the semitic element in Luke, namely that LXXisms are evidence of Luke's editing, to the source question here. He finds that this Lukan editing supports the hypothesis that Mark is the basic source which Luke has expanded.<sup>3</sup> While some may admit that Luke has used bits of independent tradition inserted into Mark,<sup>4</sup> most who see Mark as basic explain all of the differences as Lukan editing.

The approach, which sees an independent source or sources as what Luke basically used in Luke 22:15-20, maintains its position through a comparison of Luke's handling of Mark elsewhere in his gospel and through literary analysis. Luke normally does not expand Mark, introduce parallelism into its syntax, or transpose details or sections.<sup>5</sup> If Luke uses Mark alone here or as his basic source, he has done all of these things.

---

<sup>1</sup>Rese, Die "Stunde", pp. 69-82.

<sup>2</sup>Dibelius, p. 206f.; Leaney, p. 267.

<sup>3</sup>Sparks, JTS, XLIV, p. 138; cf. Jeremias (p. 161), who uses the same semitic elements as evidence of Luke's special source.

<sup>4</sup>e.g. Creed, p. 262.

<sup>5</sup>Schürmann, I-Der Paschamahlbericht, p. 1f.

Schürmann, especially, but also others have made a thorough literary analysis of Lk. 22:15-20. They find evidence for either Luke's special source,<sup>1</sup> or a combination of sources: the special source (22:15-18) and an independent liturgical tradition (22:19-20).<sup>2</sup> Some view the independent liturgical tradition as in fact Paul,<sup>3</sup> but the more recent studies under the influence of Schürmann's findings no longer view Lk. 22:19a/Mk. 14:23 or possibly Lk. 22:18/Mk. 14:25 as coming from Mark.<sup>4</sup> Two scholars take the nature of the meal portrayed as a key to the independence of the source from which the portrayal comes. R. Otto sees it as a Chaburah reported from a document which originally had vv. 17-19a directly linked with vv. 29, 30a.<sup>5</sup> K. G. Kuhn believes that Lk. 22:15-18 does report a Passover meal and has good historical value.<sup>6</sup>

Our own literary analysis of the text has led us to conclude that a non-Markan source is basic to Lk. 22:15-20. The influence of Mark may be seen in the insertion of the phrase, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὧμων ἐκχυννόμενον (22:20/Mk. 14:24). But, the similarities in wording at Lk. 22:18/Mk. 14:25; and Lk. 22:19a/Mk. 14:23 may be accounted for by the relative fixity of liturgical formulas, which appear in the various independent traditions.

Luke, not satisfied with Mark's presentation of the Last Supper probably because of its lack of emphasis on the Passover and eschatological themes, chooses to follow another source which has these emphases. Since this

---

<sup>1</sup>e.g. Easton, Luke, p. 322; Perry, p. 39f.

<sup>2</sup>Jeremias, pp. 99, 166; Taylor, The Passion Narrative, p. 57f.

<sup>3</sup>Hillmann, p. 232.

<sup>4</sup>Taylor, The Passion Narrative, p. 51.

<sup>5</sup>K. L. R. Otto, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, trans. F. V. Filson and B. Woolf (Lutterworth library, IX; London, 1943), pp. 268ff.

<sup>6</sup>K. G. Kuhn, "Über den ursprünglichen Sinn des Abendmahls und sein Verhältnis zu den Gemeinschaftsmahlen der Sektenschrift," EvTh, X (1950-51), p. 522f.

special source is not extant it is impossible to tell with certainty how much Luke has reworked it. However, we think it probable that Luke has worked on a special source rather than expanding Mark because the presumed expansion is not a logical extension and explanation of Mark. Luke's account involves a different perspective, an eschatological approach to the Last Supper, which is just hinted at in Mark (Mk. 14:25). Luke, then, having learned and possibly instructed others about what happened at the Last Supper table, reads his sources in the light of that knowledge, chooses his special source as the one which best represents the history of the event and is the most suitable vehicle for his theological themes. He uses it as his basis for telling his readers the story of the events of that night.

(c) Two main historical questions confront us: "Was Jesus' last meal a Passover?" "Do the words of institution (Lk. 22:19-20) have their roots in a Passover?" Since Luke of all the Synoptists portrays Jesus' Last Supper as a Passover, and since he seems to place the words of institution of the Christian Eucharist within the context of a Passover, these questions are important for understanding the relationship of Luke's theological themes to the history he reports. We shall sketch out the main objections which have been raised to viewing the Last Supper as a Passover meal. We shall view briefly other explanations which have been offered for the nature of the Last Supper as well as the origin of the Christian Eucharist. We shall draw some conclusions.

The main stumblingblock to the historicity of the Last Supper as a Passover is the matter of dating. Not only do the Synoptists and John disagree on the date of the death of Jesus and hence the date of the meal on the preceding night (Lk. 22:1, 7, 14; J. 18:28), but they describe the actions of the arrest party (Lk. 22:52), Sanhedrin (22:66-71), Simon of Cyrene (23:26), the women who had viewed the burial (23:56) which appear to contradict what is permissible on a Jewish feast day. Various attempts at harmonizing the dates and many explanations of the seeming contradictions of Passover law have been offered so that Jeremias concludes that at best

the question whether the Last Supper was a Passover from the standpoint of dating must remain open.<sup>1</sup>

Just as important as dating is the internal evidence given by the narrative of the Last Supper. Is it consistent with and does it positively demand a Passover context in order to be understood? The two contradictions of the Passover ritual in the Last Supper report are the use of ἄρτος and not ἄζυμος to signify the unleavened bread (22:19), and the circulation of a single cup (22:17).<sup>2</sup> A basic contradiction between the Jewish practice of Passover and the Christian practice of the Eucharist is that the Passover was celebrated once a year, the Eucharist was celebrated daily.<sup>3</sup>

The other inconsistencies are really based on arguments from silence. The description of the scene lacks some of the necessary elements of the Passover ritual (no lamb to be consumed; no midrash over the elements which remembers the Exodus; no report of four cups).<sup>4</sup> Since Lk. 22:15-20 does have more than one cup (22:17, 20) and possibly mentions the lamb,<sup>5</sup> this objection is usually supported by the source critical argument that Luke is expanding Mark, who has neither of these features.<sup>6</sup> Others, who grant that

---

<sup>1</sup>Jeremias, p. 26; cf. A. Jaubert's The Date of the Last Supper, trans. I. Rafferty (N.Y., 1965) recent attempt to harmonize the dates.

<sup>2</sup>H. Lietzmann, Messe und Herrenmahl (Arbeiten z. Kirchengeschichte, VIII; Bonn, 1926), p. 211; G. H. Box, "The Jewish Antecedents of the Eucharist," JTS, III (1902), p. 359; But Jeremias (p. 65) comments, ". . . there is no lack of direct evidence for the fact that the unleavened bread eaten during the feast of the Passover could be described as lehem or ἄρτος" (e.g. Dt. 16:3; Josephus, Ant. II:316); (implied by Pes. 10:2, 4, 7); SBK (IV:1, pp. 58, 76) shows that though individual cups are prescribed a common cup is permissible (Pes. 108<sup>b</sup>).

<sup>3</sup>Lietzmann, p. 211; Jeremias (p. 60) recognizes this difficulty and overcomes it by placing the Last Supper within the larger general context of eschatological or messianic meal fellowship which the earthly Jesus and the Risen Lord had with his disciples. The practice of daily repetition stemmed from his daily fellowship with them while on earth. The content of the Eucharistic words of institution, however, came from the Passover context of the Last Supper.

<sup>4</sup>Lietzmann, p. 211.

<sup>5</sup>cf. Barrett, JTS, n.s. IX, pp. 305ff.; See above, p. 119, n. 6, 7.

<sup>6</sup>Rese, Die "Stunde", p. 94; Dibelius, p. 210.

Luke used a special tradition in Lk. 22:15-18 which did portray the Last Supper as a Passover, still insist that since the words of institution (22:19-20) do not belong originally to that tradition or fit naturally into a Passover setting, they do not come from a Passover context.<sup>1</sup>

In addition to the satisfactory answers which can be given to the objections raised against the Last Supper as a Passover and the origin of the Eucharist in a Passover context, there is sufficient positive evidence for concluding that Jesus' last meal was a Passover and that in that context the words of institution were first spoken. This understanding of the relationship between Passover, Last Supper, and Eucharist is more satisfying than the alternative explanations of the origin of the Eucharist.

The behavior of the participants indicates that they are partaking of a Passover meal. The meal is at night (Mk. 14:17/Lk. 22:14; Luke's time reference is more general. Yet by marking out the commencement time as "the hour" he shows that the meal takes place at a special time). The meal is eaten in Jerusalem and Jesus did not leave its environs to go to stay the night outside the city, as was his custom (21:37).<sup>2</sup>

There are characteristics of the meal and Jesus' dialogue, including the words of institution, which are best explained by a Passover context. Wine was drunk, which was not part of daily table fellowship.<sup>3</sup> The words of institution were given from an eschatological perspective which is comparable to the perspective of the Passover haggadah.<sup>4</sup> Jesus' use of the

---

<sup>1</sup>H. Conzelmann, An Outline of the Theology of the NT, trans. J. Bowden (NT Library; London, 1969), p. 58; Dalman (Jesus-Jeshua, trans. P. R. Levertoff (London, 1929), p. 106) stands the argument on its head and says that the Passover context does apply to the words of institution because if the words had been inserted into a fabricated Passover setting, such a reworking would have connected the words of institution more directly to the Passover and Jesus. Probably Jesus' words and actions would have been connected with the Passover lamb. Therefore, the words of institution probably do find their natural setting in the Passover context presented.

<sup>2</sup>TDNT, III, p. 734; Jeremias, pp. 43ff.; See above (pp. 116ff.) for a discussion of the OT and Jewish background of the relationship of these details to the Passover.

<sup>3</sup>TDNT, III, p. 734.

<sup>4</sup>R. Le Déaut, La Nuit Pascale (Analecta Biblica, XXII; Rome, 1963), p. 318.



elements of the meal as the occasion for speaking an interpretation of his impending death corresponds best with the practice of Passover haggadah.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, the very content of the words of institution appears to correspond with, even demand a Passover setting. The salvation significance of Jesus' giving of himself in his death is the main thrust of his words and this is best understood in the context of the Passover celebration of Israel's great salvation through the Exodus (22:19, 20: "given for you; poured out for you").<sup>2</sup> The command to do this in remembrance (22:19) is best understood in the sense of a commemorative celebration, as the Passover was commemorative of the first act of salvation.<sup>3</sup>

The other explanations of the nature of the Last Supper and the origin of the Eucharist normally pick up one feature and emphasize it to the exclusion of other features in the narrative. The Kiddush, the Jewish ritual of sanctification before a holy day which involved benedictions over a cup and breaking of bread, explains to the satisfaction of some the nature of Jesus' Last Supper. One of the advantages that this explanation had, was that since such a ritual takes place before a feast, it could solve the difficulty over dating in favor of John's reckoning.<sup>4</sup> The Chaburah, a fellowship meal of religious brotherhoods including the Qumran sect, emphasized fellowship and eschatology. This may be comparable to the eschatological setting of the Last Supper and the Lord's distribution of the bread and wine to his disciples with the indication that these elements are his body

---

<sup>1</sup>Jeremias, p. 55f.: "Jesus announces his impending passion at the Last Supper by speaking words of interpretation over bread and wine. What led him to this altogether extraordinary manner of announcing his passion? I can see only one answer: interpretation of the special elements of the meal is a fixed part of the passover ritual."

<sup>2</sup>Jeremias, pp. 206f., 226.

<sup>3</sup>Goppelt, p. 133.

<sup>4</sup>Box, JTS, III, p. 360; Jeremias (p. 27f.) says this is not a likely explanation since the Kiddush was not a meal and did not involve sacrificial significance.

and blood, and the implication that to partake is to be united to him.<sup>1</sup>

However, the Chaburah was not sacramental and the historical detail indicated by the phrase "after supper" in the words of institution does not accord with the Chaburah ritual but does correspond to the Passover ritual.<sup>2</sup>

Some scholars contend that the words of institution and the sacramental act have their origin within the Christian community. They were developed by the early church as an interpretation and remembrance of the death of Christ. What was originally a communal fellowship meal characterized by joy, eschatological expectation, and the consciousness of the presence of the risen Christ became in Hellenistic circles a sacrificial meal in which Jesus' death was remembered.<sup>3</sup> This explanation, however, is not satisfactory. The words of institution probably do not have their origin in the Hellenistic community. In addition to the fact that semitisms predominate in the style of the words of institution, which would tend to indicate a Palestinian Jewish Christian, rather than Hellenistic provenance, the Last Supper with its Passover setting is the most likely occasion for the introduction of a rite which includes drinking of festival wine as well as eating daily bread.<sup>4</sup> The early church in its Palestinian branch may have had a yearly Passover ritual which contained the words of institution. Very early, these words and the cultic act were transferred to the end of the fellowship meal, which was repeated at more frequent intervals.<sup>5</sup> Possibly, the fellowship meal never existed independently at all, but rather, the command of repetition

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. Otto (p. 278), who sees this as the nature of the meal reported in Lk. 22:17-19a; Kuhn (EvTh, X, pp. 508-527) sees this as the nature of the meal at which the words of institution were first spoken; Jeremias (p. 30f.) is not convinced.

<sup>2</sup>P. Benoit, "Les récits de l'institution de l'Eucharistie et leur portée," Exegese et Theologie (Paris, 1961), Vol. I, p. 223.

<sup>3</sup>Bultmann, p. 266.

<sup>4</sup>Jeremias, p. 85f.; Schürmann, Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen, p. 187.

<sup>5</sup>E. E. Ellis, The Gospel of Luke (The Century Bible: new edition; London, 1966), p. 250.

and the practice of the Risen Lord in his resurrection appearances caused the cultic act to be an integral part of the fellowship meal from the beginning. The "after supper" notation in the liturgical formula (22:20) may indicate that a regular meal of fellowship replaced the Passover meal in the ritual practice of the early church. Only later did the cultic act become separated from the fellowship meal.

We conclude, then, that there is good reason to see the Passover context in which Luke presents the Last Supper as the true historical context for the meal and the words of institution of the Eucharist. The historical details accord best with a Passover meal. The significance attached to Jesus' death in the words of institution have their proper background in the practice and content of a Passover haggadah. The other explanations of the nature of the Last Supper fail to deal with all of the features in the narrative. The other explanations of the origin of the Eucharist within the early Christian community seem less probable than the simple explanation from the Last Supper.

#### Old Testament Allusion

Since Luke places the whole of the Last Supper explicitly within a Passover context (22:15), the main material allusion in this section is to the first Passover observance (Ex. 12:1-13:10). We shall study how Luke uses that first Passover and the Jewish ceremonial meal which remembered it, to further his purposes, after we have investigated the possible allusions inherent in the phrase in the word over the cup: "the new covenant in my blood" (Jer. 38(31):31; Ex. 24:8 (Zech. 9:11); Is. 42:6; 49:8). We must also consider the possible role of Isaiah 53 as the foundation for relating various theological concepts in the words of institution to the death of Jesus.

The Markan equivalent of the word over the cup contains a clear verbal allusion to Ex. 24:8 τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης (Mk. 14:24/ Mt. 26:28 with γὰρ after τοῦτο); Ἴδοὺ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης —

(Ex. 24:8) <sup>1</sup> A parallel passage in the OT (Zech. 9:11 - *ἐν αἵματι διαθήκης*) has been claimed as the original reference of the allusion, while any allusion to Ex. 24:8 in these words is a later sophisticated hermeneutical development which uses typology.<sup>2</sup> Since Zech. 9:11 may be dependent on Ex. 24:8, and since both have been connected with the Passover in Jewish exegetical tradition,<sup>3</sup> it appears that the Exodus passage with its closer verbal parallelism with Mk. 14:24 is to be preferred as the intended reference of the allusion.

Luke fails to reproduce this clear verbal allusion not because he has an aversion to its theological content. The liturgical formula in Lk. 22:20 contains the same content though expressed in different words. It may rather be the different perspective which the other possible allusions' original OT contexts provide, that makes him choose them over Ex. 24:8.

The alternative liturgical formula which Luke uses destroys all verbal parallelism with Ex. 24:8 by introducing the adjective "new" and placing "blood" in a prepositional phrase (*ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου* 22:20). The closest verbal parallel among "blood of the covenant" passages in the OT now is Zech. 9:11.<sup>4</sup> But is there enough distinctive verbal parallelism between the Zechariah phrase "in the blood of the covenant," and the Lukan phrase, "in my blood," to justify the identification of Zech. 9:11 as the object of clear verbal allusion by Luke? At best, it is a material allusion. To this we shall return when we consider

---

<sup>1</sup>France (p. 260) classifies this as a clear verbal allusion; Gundry (*The Use of the OT in Mt.*, p. 57) notes that Tg. Jonathan and Onkelos translate *וְיָצַק* as *וְיָצַק* which makes the verbal agreement via the Aramaic even closer.

<sup>2</sup>Lindars, p. 133; but France (p. 66, n. 88) notes the closer verbal parallelism between Ex. 24:8/Mk. 14:24.

<sup>3</sup>Tg. Zech. 9:11; Tg. Onkelos & Tg. Jer. I Ex. 24:8 cited in Dalman, *Jesus-Jeshua*, p. 165f.

<sup>4</sup>Tabachovtz, p. 68.

the role of Isaiah 53 in the passage.

The Lukan wording does introduce an allusion to Jer. 38(31):31 (Lk. 22:20 - ἡ Κόρυς διαθήκη; Jer. 38(31):31 - διαθήκη Κόρυς; cf. 1 Cor. 11:24).

Since there is not exact verbal agreement this allusion is often classified not as verbal but as material.<sup>1</sup> However, the lack of exact verbal agreement can be explained by the phrase's adjustment to its new syntactical setting. It might be argued that Ex. 24:8 fits better its NT context because that context was constructed about a conscious allusion to the Exodus text. But it should be noted that the words of institution probably derive their syntactical form from the ritual of Passover haggadah which would employ in its interpretive task the familiar midrashic form, "This is . . ." The wording of its parallel, the word over the bread (Lk. 22:19a/Mk. 14:22), has set the form for the word over the cup. The fact that Ex. 24:8 is able to show greater verbal parallelism with the word over the cup, especially Mark's form, than Jer. 38(31):31 is coincidental. A desire to verbally allude to the OT was not the controlling factor in the formation of this liturgical formula. If in the OT the phrase "new covenant" had originally been in the nominative and "blood of the covenant" in the accusative the resultant evaluation of their comparative definiteness of allusion would probably have been the opposite. It is important to note these influences on the formation of the liturgical formula since Schürmann has drawn conclusions about the relative place of these variant forms of the liturgical formula in the history of tradition

---

<sup>1</sup>France (p. 260) classifies it as a possible reference without verbal allusion; H. Schürmann, Eine Quellenkritische Untersuchung des Lukanischen Abendmahlsberichtes, 2nd ed. (NT Abhandlungen, XI:4; Münster, 1970), Vol. II - Der Einsetzungsbericht Lk. 22, 19-20; p. 100; Because of the closer verbal parallelism between Lk. 22:20 and Jer. 38(31):31 and the distinctiveness of the wording of Jer. 38(31):31 within the OT, Luke is more probably alluding to the Jeremiah passage with this phrase, than to Is. 42:6 or 49:8; cf. TDNT, II, p. 133.

on the basis of this evaluation.<sup>1</sup> He sees the Jeremiah material allusion as earlier than the more exactly parallel Exodus allusion. We prefer to see Jer. 38(31):31 as a clear verbal allusion in Lk. 22:20 and to explain the lack of verbal parallelism on the basis of adjustment to the NT syntax with its relatively fixed liturgical formula. To decide which allusion is original is not essential to our paper for while one or other may be the product of the editorial expansion of the Christian community, neither contradicts the other for they both have basically the same content<sup>2</sup> and may preserve the thought which Jesus originally expressed. In fact, Mt. with his phrase εἰς ἄφρον ἁμαρτιῶν (Mt. 26:28), which recalls Jer. 38(31):34 and his agreement with Mark with the phrase "blood of the covenant" (Ex. 24:8), may show that originally both allusions may have existed side by side. As the tradition was passed on the emphasis at various stages was placed on one or other of the allusions, while traces of the unemphasized allusion just barely remain.<sup>3</sup> In any case, the form which Luke used does not contain any essentially new content unique to him.

The text-form agrees with the LXX except in the matter of word order. Since the MT and the LXX agree at this point it is difficult to decide which was the basis of the Lukan text-form. At least for a Greek reader the text-form points readily to the LXX.

Luke chose this liturgical form over Mark probably because the original context and the content of the allusion is decidedly eschatological in perspective. Luke so composes his narrative of the Last Supper to bring out the new eschatological perspective in which the Passover and the Eucharist, which replaced it, are to be viewed. For while the future

---

<sup>1</sup>Schürmann, II-Der Einsetzungsbericht, p. 100.

<sup>2</sup>Goppelt, p. 134.

<sup>3</sup>cf. France, p. 94; but Schürmann (II-Der Einsetzungsbericht, p. 6) sees the phrase in Mt. as a secondary expansion since such an important phrase would probably not be dropped from the liturgical formula.

reference to fulfilment in the kingdom of God is still the same as in the Jewish Passover ritual (22:16, 18),<sup>1</sup> the historical act of salvation which is to be remembered in anticipation of the final redemption is different. It is no longer the Exodus redemption but the death of Jesus (22:19-20). Hence, a reference to the theological significance of Jesus' death as the establishment of a "new covenant" (Jer. 38(31):31) helps to bring out the contrast between the first act of redemption at the Exodus and the new decisive act of redemption, Jesus' death. This new redemptive act fulfills the old covenant, established on the basis of the Exodus, and at the same time renders that covenant obsolete.<sup>2</sup> Although Ex. 24:8 could have this future reference if it were understood typologically,<sup>3</sup> an allusion to Jer. 38(31):31 relies on an OT passage in which the future aspect is explicit.

When we speak of eschatological perspective we also mean that Luke intends to show that the End-time had actually begun in the life of Jesus (e.g. Lk. 4:21; 19:9, 10). It was most appropriate therefore to signal the establishment of the new relationship between God and man through the death of Jesus by an allusion to the prophecy of that spiritual renewal in the End-time, Jer. 38(31):31.<sup>4</sup>

Not only is this allusion appropriate to Luke's purposes and perspectives but those purposes and this use do not violate the original OT context. The original context commences with the prophetic introduction, "The days are coming" (Jer. 38(31):31). The content of the prophecy envisions

---

<sup>1</sup>See below, p. 165.

<sup>2</sup>G. Voss, Die Christologie der lukanischen Schriften in Grundzügen (Studia Neotestamentica, II; Paris, 1965), p. 102.

<sup>3</sup>France, p. 66.

<sup>4</sup>cf. E. Schweizer ("Das Abendmahl, eine Vergegenwärtigung des Todes Jesu oder eine eschatologisches Freudenmahl?" ThZ, II (1945-46), p. 99), who says that it is from the perspective of the victory of Easter that Luke is able to emphasize both the eschatological hope and present joy of fellowship in his portrayal of the Last Supper.

such a radical change in the spiritual life of men that it presupposes the new creation which will occur in the End-time. Hence from the introduction and its content, the context is forward looking and the fulfilment is not necessarily limited to an occurrence within the prophet's life-time.<sup>1</sup>

The one important difference between the use of Jer. 38(31):31 in its original context and in its NT application is the nature of the action designated as the cause of the spiritual renewal. In both cases it is God who inaugurates the covenant, although in Lk. 22:19-20 this must be inferred from the middle or passive form of the participles δεδομένον and ἐκχυσθένον. In Jeremiah, he gives his law into their minds and hearts; he declares himself to be their God and they to be his people (Jer. 38(31):33); and he forgives their sins. In Luke, Jesus' death, his blood poured out for his fellows, establishes the covenant. But this difference may be understood in terms of the difference between the effects of an act (the inner knowledge, the renewed relationship, and the offered forgiveness), and the act of salvation which makes those effects possible, Jesus' death.<sup>2</sup> Jer. 38(31):31-34 does not imply the necessity of the death of God's chosen one as the foundation for the new covenant. However to make such a claim in the NT context is to approach the matter from a perspective which Jeremiah does not have. Jeremiah only knows that God

---

<sup>1</sup>France, p. 94.

<sup>2</sup>cf. E. Lohse (Martyrer und Gottesknecht, 2nd ed. (FRLANT, LXIV; Göttingen, 1963), p. 126), who sees Jer. 38(31):34 as the basis for understanding the connection between "new covenant" and the description of Jesus' death as an atoning one. The way in which the "new covenant" is new and goes beyond the old is that unlike the blood of the covenant in the Sinai covenant, which was not propitiatory, Jesus' blood, his death, does atone for sins so that the "new covenant" is a covenant of the forgiveness of sins. Lohse does not mention that there was atonement for sins provided for under the old covenant. Nor does he recognize that there is no explicit statement in Jeremiah of how the act of establishing the covenant will effect forgiveness. He must build his case on the assumption that just as forgiveness is only possible through an atoning death under the old covenant so forgiveness as a characteristic of the "new covenant" will only be possible through an atoning death which establishes that "new covenant." This is more than Jeremiah says or even implies.



will establish the new covenant. He does not relate how he will do it.<sup>1</sup>

There is the possibility that the brief Jeremiah allusion in Luke points to other elements in the original context. This we may find to be so if we look at the rest of the farewell discourse. Since Jeremiah is describing the new relationship between God and man in the spiritual renewal of the End-time and Luke portrays Jesus' farewell discourse as the final instructions to his disciples for life without him, yet life under the economy of the kingdom, which is a foretaste of the End-time in their own community, we should expect to find some trace of the features of Jeremiah reflected in Luke. Two themes from Jeremiah, faithfulness and covenant, are bound together in a unique way in Luke. Jeremiah says that unlike Israel who did not remain in the first covenant (Jer. 38(31):32, οὐκ ἐνέμειναν), the "new covenant" people, because of their inner law, will remain the people of God. Jesus described his disciples as those who have remained with him in his trials (διαμεινόντες, Lk. 22:28). And because of that faithfulness he is able to covenant (διατίθεσθαι) with them an inheritance in the final kingdom (22:29-30).

In contrast to the fairly clear allusion to Jer. 38(31):31 in the phrase "new covenant" the succeeding phrases, "in my blood, which is shed for you," admit of no clear reference to one OT passage to the exclusion of others. There are three passages to which the liturgical formula which Luke is using may be referring: a material allusion to the sacrificed paschal lamb with his redeeming blood (Ex. 12:6, 7, 13<sup>2</sup>; cf. Zech. 9:11<sup>3</sup>); a material allusion to the blood sacrifice which established the Mosaic covenant (Ex. 24:8<sup>4</sup>; cf. Zech. 9:11<sup>5</sup>); a verbal allusion to the Hebrew

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. V. Taylor (Jesus and His Sacrifice (London, 1937), p. 71), who points out that "blood" is foreign to the Jeremiah account.

<sup>2</sup>G. Walther, Jesus, das Passahlamm des Neuen Bundes (Gütersloh, 1950), p. 38.

<sup>3</sup>Tabachovitz, p. 67.

<sup>4</sup>Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, p. 71.

<sup>5</sup>TDNT, II, p. 112.

of Is. 53:12.<sup>1</sup> Since Zech. 9:11 places the phrase "in the blood of the covenant" within the context of a future release of captives which reminds us more immediately of the function of the blood of the Passover lamb at the Exodus, than of the blood which confirmed the covenant at Sinai, it seems appropriate to see Zech. 9:11 as predominantly a reference to the blood of the Passover lamb.<sup>2</sup> The mention of "covenant" and "blood" in the same context also reminds us of Ex. 24:8. However, as we have noted, Luke's form of the word over the cup has closer verbal parallelism with Zech. 9:11 than with Ex. 24:8. Further, the Jer. 38(31):31-34 context contrasts the new covenant with the one made coming out of Egypt without, however, any special reference to Exodus 24. When we add these facts to the fact that the words of institution are spoken within a Passover context, it appears that the blood of the Passover lamb and not the blood of the covenant at Sinai is alluded to by the phrases which follow "new covenant."<sup>3</sup>

There are, however, difficulties in taking Lk. 22:20 as an allusion to Zech. 9:11 and Ex. 12:6, 7, 13 for the blood of the Passover lamb is never referred to in its original context as the blood of a covenant. If Zech. 9:11 is marshalled as support, this does not bring certainty for though it may seem to us more likely that both Zech. 9:11 and Jer. 38(31):31 refer more directly to the Passover, the fact still remains that the "blood of the covenant" ritual was performed during the Exodus and in response to the salvation of God in the Passover. Hence, the "blood of the covenant" ritual (Ex. 24:8), could be what is referred to in these general Exodus

---

<sup>1</sup>Lohse, Martyrer p. 124.

<sup>2</sup>cf. Tg. Zech. 9:11 which associates this new redemption with the Exodus; Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua, p. 165.

<sup>3</sup>Goppelt (pp. 134ff.) though attracted to this conclusion recognizes that it is by no means certain for it depends too much on the evidence of rabbinic interpretation while the OT text offers little support.

references in Jeremiah and Zechariah. However, in addition to the fact that Lk. 22:20 occurs in a Passover meal setting, the advantage in seeing these words as based in the Exodus Passover narrative is that the blood at the Passover functions to bring salvation, protection from the wrath of God, just as now Jesus' poured out blood on their behalf will bring them salvation.<sup>1</sup>

If Ex. 24:8 were to be taken as the basis of the blood reference then we would have to search elsewhere in the OT for the salvation significance of its pouring out on behalf of many. For, it is not explicitly stated in the Ex. 24:8 context that the blood used in the covenant consecration ceremony was an atoning sacrifice.<sup>2</sup> Rather, the blood was used in a ceremony which confirmed the union of the two parties in the covenant through the sign that they were linked by the same blood.<sup>3</sup>

The Isaiah 53 passage is most often referred to as the one from which the atoning significance of "the blood. . . shed for many" may have been developed. An allusion to Is. 53:12 is more readily detected in the wording of the Mt/Mk. liturgical formula than in the Lk./Pl. liturgical tradition.<sup>4</sup> Neither verbal parallel [ἐκχυσμός/μενεν] Mk. 14:24/Mt. 26:28/

<sup>1</sup>Dalman (Jesus-Jeshua, p. 168) comments, "The red wine in the cup turned the mind of Jesus to the past, when the blood on the doorposts of Egypt once wrought redemption, as well as to the near future, when His blood i.e. His own life, would be poured out."

<sup>2</sup>Lohse, Martyrer, p. 126, n. 4; But according to the Tg. Onkelos and Ps-Jon. Ex. 24:8, the sacrifice did make atonement for the people (M. McNamara, Targum and Testament, (Shannon, 1972), p. 129). This may be an indication that that sacrifice was interpreted in NT times as having atoning significance.

<sup>3</sup>TDNT, II, p. 155; B. W. Bacon ("The Lucan Tradition of the Lord's Supper," HTR, V (1912), p. 337) uses this idea of consecration in a blood covenant (1 Km. 20:13-17, 23) as part of his argument that the Last Supper was a Kiddush.

<sup>4</sup>France (p. 260) classifies it as a possible allusion in Mk. 14:24/Mt. 26:28 to Is. 53:10, 12.

Lk. 22:20=Is. 53:12 וַיִּשְׂקֵן (LXX παρεδόθη ); ὁ πῆρ πολλῶν Mk. 14:24;  
πρὸ πολλῶν Mt. 26:28; ὁ πῆρ ὕμῶν Lk. 22:20= וַיִּשְׂקֵן (LXX πολλῶν )]  
 can stand by itself but needs the confirmation of the other to certify it  
 as a distinctive parallel with Isaiah 53.<sup>1</sup> The assertion of a verbal  
 parallel between וַיִּשְׂקֵן (Is. 53:12) and ἐκχυννόμενον on the basis  
 of a claim that it reproduces the Hebrew more accurately than the LXX  
 cannot be convincingly maintained on the grounds of verbal affinity alone.<sup>2</sup>  
 The use of ἐκχυννόμενον in a construction which identifies Jesus' death  
 with a ritual act by equating the shedding of blood with the pouring of  
 wine may be explained more satisfactorily as a choice intended to meet  
 the demands of a description of death which would correspond to the  
 ritual act than as a choice under the outside influence of an OT passage.  
 The other verbal parallelism as it is found in Mt./Mk. ( πολλῶν = πολλῶν )  
 is much more striking. It is true that by itself the verbal parallelism  
 is not extensive or distinctive enough to indicate a conscious allusion  
 to Isaiah 53. Yet the material parallelism is distinctive for Isaiah 53  
 is the only place in the OT where God's chosen one pours out his life for  
 "the many."<sup>3</sup> Thus, ὁ πῆρ πολλῶν may serve as definite evidence that  
 the cup word contains an intentional allusion to Isaiah 53. The one  
 distinctive feature in the cup word which may not be accounted for by any  
 of the other passages we have considered is the representative nature of  
 Jesus' death. It is his life's blood shed for many (you). Though the  
 "new covenant" may involve forgiveness, it does not report the method by  
 which that forgiveness is made available. Though the blood of the Passover

<sup>1</sup>Gundry, The Use of the OT in Mt., p. 59.

<sup>2</sup>Hooker, p. 82; She points out that the true Hebrew equivalent in the OT for this Greek is וַיִּשְׂקֵן.

<sup>3</sup>H. W. Wolff, Jesaja 53 im Urchristentum, 3rd ed. (Berlin, 1952), p. 65f.

lamb poured out achieved salvation from physical death for the people, it did not explicitly atone for their sins by its sacrifice.<sup>1</sup> Only Is. 53:12, which describes the representative role of the Servant in giving over his life to benefit the many, is the appropriate source for this part of Jesus' understanding of his death.<sup>2</sup>

Luke in common with Paul does not have ὑπὲρ πολλῶν but ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν . The one trace of verbal parallelism is gone. The change may readily be explained as either an adaptation of the words of the tradition to their use as liturgical formulas in the cult,<sup>3</sup> or as a clarification of the wording, which might be misunderstood by a Gentile Christian, who would naturally take πολλοί in an exclusive sense, rather than in the semitic inclusive sense.<sup>4</sup> Though the wording is changed the theological substance is not changed. The strength of the formal allusion based on verbal parallelism may be diminished but the material allusion based on material parallelism is not.<sup>5</sup>

If we may take this brief formula ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν as a material allusion to Is. 53:12, what is its purpose in the NT context? As suggested above it provides a vital link between Jesus' death and the salvation of the "new covenant." It begins to explain from an objective standpoint through the vicarious sacrifice principle how Jesus' death can be salvific. As with Luke's reference to Jer. 38(31):31, in contrast to Mt. 26:28, it is the act of salvation and not its effects (the forgiveness of sins) which is in view. There are a few items from the larger context of Isaiah 53 which may be hinted at in the rest of Jesus' farewell discourse: the use of

---

<sup>1</sup>Contrast Goppelt, p. 134.

<sup>2</sup>Ellis, Luke, p. 251; See below, pp. 178ff.

<sup>3</sup>TDNT, VI, p. 543.

<sup>4</sup>Maurer, ZTK, L, p. 18.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

παρδιδωμεν (22:21-23: cf. throughout Isaiah 53); Jesus' description of himself as a servant [22:27; cf. God's description of the figure as *δ' υἱὸς μου* (Is. 52:13)]; the quotation from Is. 53:12 at the climax of the discourse in Lk. 22:37.<sup>1</sup>

We have already indicated at various points in our discussion the influence of the Passover meal context on this first section of the Last Supper discourse. Luke's reference to the blessing and distribution of two cups and bread and to a meal intervening between the distribution of the bread and the second cup enables us to place with some probability the actions and words of Jesus within the Passover ritual as it is reported in the Mishnah.<sup>2</sup> Much of what is reported in Lk. 22:15-20 does not appear to grow immediately out of the Passover ritual or the original Passover context. We leave the discussion of those details which are influenced by the OT until our OT ideas section. However, the words of institution (22:19-20) do owe much significance to two features of the Passover meal, the Passover lamb sacrificed and eaten (Ex. 12:7-8), and the meal's commemorative purpose (e.g. Ex. 13:3, 9). Also, Jesus' statement about the fulfilment of the Passover in the kingdom both indicates an eschatological perspective in common with current Jewish expectation and raises the question of how Luke saw the relationship of these two events, the Passover meal and the feast in the kingdom.

The words over the bread come after the Passover haggadah, which is not reported in any of the synoptic accounts. They accompany the blessing and distribution of the bread which commences the main meal. The words about the unleavened bread as the "bread of affliction" (Dt. 16:3) and the sign of the swift deliverance of God by his own might (Ex. 13:3, 7, 8) have already been spoken over the bread in the Passover haggadah. Jesus'

---

<sup>1</sup>For further discussion of Luke's of Isaiah 53 in his passion narrative see below, pp. 278ff.

<sup>2</sup>Jeremias, pp. 85ff.

reinterpretation of the bread now in combination with his word about the cup uses the Passover lamb as his point of reference. Jesus' body will be broken and his blood will be shed in order to bring salvation. "This is my body given for you" should be understood as spoken with the sacrificial lamb in view.<sup>1</sup> Again, the cup symbolizing blood poured out, reminds us of the sacrifice of the lamb and its redemptive consequences. Also, the cup is a sign of rejoicing, the appropriate reaction to the protection of the blood on the door. Since flesh and blood signifies the whole man Jesus is saying in these two words of institution, "I am the true body, the true blood, the true Passover lamb."<sup>2</sup>

Whether this identification by material allusion should be viewed as the result of a typological understanding of the OT in Luke is questionable. It is true that Luke more than the other synoptic writers emphasizes the Passover nature of the Last Supper but he does not do it in such a way that the typological identity of Jesus with the Passover lamb is borne out in every detail. For example, Jesus does not, as in John, die at the same hour when the Passover lamb is being sacrificed (J. 19:14). Luke's use is typology only in the sense that the OT pattern of redemption is appropriated and used in describing God's decisive act of salvation. The OT Passover account does not predict a fulfilment of the deliverance or the meal beyond the successful possession of the land and the continued commemoration of the event with an annual meal in the land (e.g. Ex. 12:25). The Exodus and the commemorative meal were given a future reference in Jewish exegesis, so that it was the model for the redemption and the festive celebration of the End-time.<sup>3</sup> Luke following Jesus' own thinking could

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 200.

<sup>2</sup>cf. M. Barth, Das Abendmahl (Theologische Studien, XVIII; Zürich, 1945), p. 16.

<sup>3</sup>Le Déaut, pp. 122ff.

interpret this material allusion as fulfilled in the establishment of the covenantal basis for the End-time. However, the instituted Eucharist is not interpreted as the fulfilment of the Passover in the sense of being the final eschatological meal. This is yet to be (Lk. 22:16-18; 29-30). Probably we should view the relationship of the words of institution to the Passover lamb as purely interpretative without any promise and fulfilment scheme implied. They simply explain with the use of the historical pattern of the death of a lamb whose blood protected and delivered Israel and led to the establishment of a covenant in the desert, how the death of Jesus is related to the establishment of the "new covenant."<sup>1</sup>

In concert with the Pauline tradition Luke includes the command at v. 19- *Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν* (cf. 1 Cor. 11:24, 25). This corresponds with the emphasis in the institution of the Passover that it was to be celebrated from generation to generation in remembrance of God's deliverance in the Exodus (Ex. 12:14; 25-27; 13:3, 9, 14; Dt. 16:3). The suggestion that this phrase should be translated, "Do this that God may remember me"<sup>2</sup> cannot be maintained on the basis of evidence from the OT and NT use of *εἰς ἀνάμνησιν* and *εἰς μνημόσυνον*.<sup>3</sup> The use of these terms is "so common . . . and so basically flexible that ordinarily, some precise indication must be given of its meaning where the context does not make it obvious."<sup>4</sup> Most commonly the context indicates one man's remembrance of another. In each case where God is the one who is to do the remembering he is usually specifically named. Where he is not, he has either been mentioned previously in the immediate context or in the original

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. Rese (*Alttestamentliche Motive*, p. 209), who also concludes that Luke uses the OT less in a promise and fulfilment scheme than as a hermeneutical tool for understanding God's dealings with men.

<sup>2</sup>Jeremias, pp. 237-255.

<sup>3</sup>D. Jones, "*ἀνάμνησις* in the LXX and the Interpretation of 1 Cor. XI.25," *JTS*, n.s. VI (1955), pp. 183-191.

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 189.



use of the phrase which in subsequent use has become a technical expression for divine remembrance (God specifically mentioned as the one who remembers: Lev. 24:7; Num. 10:10; Ex. 28:12, 29; 30:16; Lev. 2:2, 9, 16; 5:12; Num. 5:15, 18; 31:54; Is. 23:18; Mal. 3:16; cf. Tob. 12:12; Sir. 50:16; Technical usage where God is not specifically mentioned but is implied from the background of the phrase - Ps. 37(38):1; 69(70):1; Ex. 36:14; Lev. 23:24; Num. 5:26; Is. 66:3; cf. Sir. 35:6; 38:11; 44:9). From this evidence it is apparent that the OT writers were aware how unusual was the use of the phrase "in remembrance" to mean God's remembrance.

The use of the phrase in this sense at the Last Supper is further excluded by the fact that it serves no real purpose. It is not the Christian form of the prayer at Passover that God would remember his Messiah and send him with the eschatological victory of the End-time. God has already remembered his people in that way by sending Jesus.<sup>1</sup> The more appropriate Passover meal analogy is the command to repeat the meal in remembrance of the salvation that God had wrought. So now not just Jesus' death but its salvation significance is to be remembered in a repetition of the meal.<sup>2</sup>

Like the Passover lamb the function of this allusion is also basically explanatory. It sets aside the Passover meal as the feast which should be used to remember God's salvation, by using the same principle of remembrance to institute the Eucharist which replaces it. What is common to the two meals of remembrance is that they both commemorate a saving act of God. This is the significance which is transferred from the Passover to the Eucharist when this command to remember is inserted.

Luke reports that Jesus said he would not eat the Passover meal<sup>3</sup> until

---

<sup>1</sup>H. Kosmala, "Das tut zu meinem Gedächtnis," NovT, IV (1960), p. 88.

<sup>2</sup>Barth, p. 15.

<sup>3</sup>This is the best meaning for the immediate context although it is uncertain whether the antecedent of the noun to which this clause is subordinate, το αρνιον (v. 15) means the lamb or the meal (Schürmann, I-Der Paschamahlsbericht, pp. 8, 19).

it was fulfilled<sup>1</sup> in<sup>2</sup> the kingdom of God (22:16). The idea that the Passover meal would be fulfilled in the Messianic meal of the End-time was part of the eschatological hope which the Passover ritual and Jewish exegetical tradition manifested. Dalman cites Seder Rab. Amran Gaon: "This year here, in the coming year as free men!"<sup>3</sup> In addition to the rabbinic commentary on various sections of the Pentateuch, which mention the Passover and link it to the final redemption,<sup>4</sup> the poem of the Four Nights (creation, Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac, Passover, and final redemption) attached to the targum of Ex. 12:42 shows that the Passover night and its commemorative meal were seen from an eschatological perspective.<sup>5</sup>

Jesus took up this perspective and Luke brings it out much more clearly than Mark. But how did he understand the fulfilment? What was being fulfilled? In what future action was the fulfilment to occur? For Luke, normally, it is the words of Scripture which in the prophetic sense are fulfilled in the life and ministry of Jesus (4:21; 24:44; Ac. 3:18; 13:27).

---

<sup>1</sup>M. Black ("The 'Fulfilment' in the Kingdom of God" ExpT, LVII (1945-46), p. 25) takes the passive as internal so that "kingdom of God" becomes the main subject and the meaning is "I will not any more eat thereof, until there be a fulfilment in the kingdom of God." But since Jewish literature does not speak normally of the kingdom of God being fulfilled, this understanding of the verb is less likely (Schürmann, I-Der Paschamahlbericht p. 21, n. 102).

<sup>2</sup>Dalman (Jesus-Jeshua, p. 130) suggests ". . . the fulfilment 'in' the Kingdom of God is not essentially different from the fulfilment 'through' it; for it is itself fundamentally the fulfilment of the Passover, as it brings into fruition, in the most perfect measure and finally, the transition from bondage to freedom, and the consummation of the people of God." Yet elsewhere, the phrase "in the kingdom of God" has a locative sense (Lk. 7:28; 13:28, 29; 14:15; 22:30) and so it should be taken in this way here (cf. Schürmann I-Der Paschamahlbericht, p. 22).

<sup>3</sup>Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua, p. 183; cf. Jeremias (p. 36), who refers to the eschatologically significant portions of the Hallel as the source of Jesus' thought (Ps. 117(118):25-29).

<sup>4</sup>See Higgins' (p. 47) listing: Ex. R. 15:1; 18:11, 12; Mek. Ex. 12:42.

<sup>5</sup>Le Déaut, p. 318; Contrast the non-eschatological perspective of Akiba in Pes. 10:6.

There is only one other instance where an event is described as being fulfilled in the prophetic sense and that interestingly enough is the "exodus" which Jesus is about to fulfill or complete in Jerusalem (9:31).

It may be that Luke interprets this description of the completion of an OT event and the ritual which grew out of it within a typological framework. The first Passover meal and deliverance was the type of the greater deliverance which will issue in the messianic feast of celebration.<sup>1</sup> Since as we have pointed out the Exodus and Passover celebration do not present themselves in the OT as events that are prophetic or that need completion, such a typological approach derives its suitability from the fact that it does not violate the original meaning or historical intention of the OT passages.

It does not appear that Luke uses this allusion to the Passover meal and its relationship to an event in the future simply as an explanation of the Last Supper's significance. The verb of fulfillment indicates more than that. Yet, the lack of a prophetic orientation for the OT presentation of the Passover and Exodus events prevents us from clearly identifying an OT prophetic promise which will be fulfilled. Hence, it is difficult to say that Luke places this OT event firmly within a promise and fulfillment scheme as he does with Jer. 38(31):31/Lk. 22:20. He may have some other understanding of fulfillment.

Just as a prophetic word is incomplete until the event of which it speaks occurs and fulfills it, so an event which is intended to interpret God's salvation is incomplete as long as that event does not assure full deliverance. Only when God acts again for man's full salvation and accomplishes it, may a new commemorative meal of celebration take place and the old commemorative meal, the Passover, may be said to be completed and

---

<sup>1</sup>Creed, p. 265; Rengstorff, p. 244.

fulfilled by it.<sup>1</sup> The participants would be able to celebrate in full joy the redemptive acts of God because that redemption had now fully taken place. Thus, we take fulfilment here not in a basically prophetic sense but in the sense of completeness. Any prophetic fulfilment which is involved is the accomplishment of prophecy which Jesus himself makes (22:30; cf. Lk. 13:29). Jesus' prediction corresponds with current Jewish expectation, but it also makes a unique adjustment of it. By stating his desire to eat before he suffers (22:15), and then going on to say that he will not eat the Passover until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God, Jesus implies that his death will come in between the present Passover meal and the time when it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God. But more importantly he implies that there is some connection between his death and that fulfilment. The rest of the account, especially the words of institution in which Jesus uses the saving death of the Passover lamb to explain the saving significance of his death, brings out the fact that Jesus' death will be the means of creating the final salvation. This will complete the work of salvation which will enable the new Israel to celebrate the Passover meal in its fulfilled, completed form as the messianic meal in the kingdom of God.<sup>2</sup> What is being fulfilled, then, is the Passover meal and that which fulfills it is the messianic feast at the parousia in the

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. C. F. D. Moule ("Fulfilment Words in the NT: Use and Abuse," *NTS*, XIV (1967-68), p. 309), who classifies this usage among those which show a distinctly Christian application indicating "an achievement by God himself in Jesus Christ, of the covenant-promise in terms of a fully personal relationship which, through its long history, has been struggling toward fulfilment" (p. 320); Miller (*JSJ*, II, p. 80) questions Moule's analysis.

<sup>2</sup>E. Klostermann, *Das Lukasevangelium*, 2nd ed. (*Hdb.*, V; Tübingen, 1929), p. 208; cf. H. A. W. Meyer (*Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Gospels of Mark and Luke*, translated from the 5th German ed. by R. E. Wallis (KEKNT; Edinburgh, 1884), Vol. II, p. 306), who thinks it will be an actual Passover.

kingdom of God.<sup>1</sup> Though the allusion is used in more than just an explanatory manner, the fulfilment envisaged is not within 'a prophecy and fulfilment scheme.

Typology might be a good way to describe the understanding of the relationship but the difficulty with that way of thinking is that though the pattern of events is the same in the OT and NT, the OT and NT patterns are not simply related as type and anti-type. The relationship in NT thought between the one Last Supper; Jesus' saving death; the Eucharist, which remembers that death in a meal; and the hope for a messianic meal and final redemption corresponds with the pattern in OT thought. There we find the first Passover meal; deliverance through the blood of a slain lamb; the annual Passover ritual, which remembers that deliverance; and the hope for a messianic meal and final redemption. The Last Supper plays a different role in the two patterns. In the OT pattern it is one of the annual Passover feasts which remembers the salvation which followed the first Passover. In the NT pattern of salvation and commemoration it is that initial meal which precedes the act of salvation and serves as a model for the further commemorative meal, the Eucharist. Thus to see Jesus' statement concerning fulfilment as pointing to an overarching typology which runs from the commemorative Passover celebration directly to the fulfilment meal in the kingdom is to disregard the complexity of relationships in which the Last Supper is involved. For, the Last Supper simultaneously holds different positions in the OT and NT patterns. Luke by emphasizing, on the one hand, the fact that

---

<sup>1</sup>Some see the Eucharist which Jesus instituted as the fulfilment of the Passover meal (cf. B. Cooke, "The Synoptic Presentation of the Eucharist as Covenant Sacrifice," Theol. Stud., XXI (1960), p. 24; W. R. F. Browning, The Gospel According to St. Luke (Torch Bible Commentaries; London, 1960), p. 157). However, Luke's use of the phrase "in the kingdom" when referring to the eschatological feast always places it after the parousia in the End-time. Then and then only could one claim that the salvation was finally consummated and as a consequence the feast celebrating that salvation necessarily completed or fulfilled. The present Eucharist is a stop-gap measure serving the same purpose as the Passover celebration. It remembers the act of salvation, as well as portrays the close communion believers have with the exalted Lord (Hauck, p. 263). However, it is not the fulfilment of the Passover meal but simply the replacement of it.

the Last Supper was a Passover celebration and stressing, on the other hand, that it was the inaugural meal of the "new covenant" shows that he understands the correspondence of the OT and NT patterns in terms of an identity of function between the first Passover meal and the Last Supper. Both occupy the same position in the pattern of salvation history.

Whether it is typological thinking which led him to adopt this pattern we still aren't sure. The term "fulfilled" describes the fact that what is only partially complete now will reach its completeness in the future. The term signifies a perception of the Last Supper and the death of Jesus as part of the pattern of God's saving acts which move to completion. There is no thought of seeing any relationship of type and anti-type between Passover and Last Supper or Passover/Last Supper and the messianic meal. We may take, then, this material allusion to the Passover and its fulfilment as another use of the OT patterns as interpretational devices for understanding the saving significance of NT events.<sup>1</sup>

Luke 9:31, however, keeps us from being fully satisfied with this explanation for all these material allusions whether they be to Jesus as paschal lamb whose blood is shed; the command to repeat, which is comparable to the commemorative nature of Passovers; or the prospect of the fulfilment of the meal in the kingdom. This verse shows us that we should at least leave the door open for some sort of organic typological relationship between the first Passover meal and the Last Supper. For Luke seems to indicate that as far as he was concerned Jesus was making an "exodus" at Jerusalem and possibly Jesus' Last Supper was a re-enactment of the first Passover.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. R. Bultmann ("Ursprung und Sinn der Typologie als hermeneutischer Methode," *ThLZ*, LXXV (1950), col. 209), who describes the NT understanding of the relationship of the Last Supper to Passover not as anti-type to type, but as parallels seen in a salvation history perspective.

<sup>2</sup>cf. J. Manek ("The New Exodus and the Books of Luke," *NovT*, II (1957), p. 13), who sees Luke's passion narrative as constructed on the model of the Exodus.

This section then has three OT passages to which it alludes; Jer. 38 (31):31; Is. 53:11, 12; Ex. 12:1-13:10. The first passage is alluded to verbally and is interpreted within a prophecy and fulfilment scheme. The other two passages are alluded to materially. They are used in an explanatory fashion to interpret God's act of salvation in the death of Jesus. There may also be some typological thinking behind the material allusions to the first Passover. The source of these three allusions is pre-Lukan, although Luke's compilation of material from his sources has brought them into a relationship which promotes emphases which are distinctly his own. We have found good reason for viewing the content of the report as basically historical. The originator of the various allusions then is, as Luke presents it, Jesus.

#### Old Testament Idea

The OT ideas in this section are predominantly OT vocabulary which adds its special coloring to the dialogue only at this point. Because the subject matter is unique and presented in liturgical formulas, very few of the ideas are part of theological themes which occur throughout Luke. Our evidence clusters about vv. 16-18, the vow of abstinence; v. 19, the word over the bread, and v. 20, the word over the cup.

In Luke's special material Jesus twice indicates that though he desires to eat the Passover and partake of the cup he refuses to do so until the Passover meal is fulfilled in the kingdom of God and until that kingdom comes.<sup>1</sup> In the OT a vow of abstinence (vv. 16-18) may be undertaken for several reasons: to show irrevocable resolution (Gen. 24:33; Num. 30:3; Ps. 131

---

<sup>1</sup>The question whether Jesus' renunciation included the Last Supper or not is answered by scholars both in the negative (J. Schmid, Das Evangelium nach Lukas, 4th ed. (Regensburger NT, III; Regensburg, 1960), p. 322) and more commonly in the positive (Jeremias, pp. 209ff.). But whether the terminus a quo is from immediately after the meal or includes the meal itself does not appear to alter the sense of the renunciation. The fact that Jesus directs the disciples verbally to commence eating at each stage speaks for the fact that he did not eat since the normal sign to begin a portion of the meal was the action of the head of table in eating first (Jeremias, p. 209).

(132):2-5); to dedicate oneself to the service of God or to perform the priestly office (Num. 6:3; Lev. 10:9; Ezk. 44:21); to ensure the hearing of a petitionary prayer (Ps. 60(61):6; 2 Km. 12:15-23). The second reason best accords with the purpose to which Luke would put such a vow. Luke wants to show that the suffering which Jesus is about to endure is a task to which he has dedicated himself. He will only be released from that vow when the salvation is fully won (cf. Lk. 12:50). This is one aspect of the Lukan theological theme: Jesus' conscious submission to, and active carrying out of God's plan. Luke takes up the common practice in the OT and Jewish piety which his tradition says that Jesus adopted and through it he emphasizes Jesus' obedience.

Unless one is going to depend on the special significances attached to the first<sup>1</sup> or the fourth<sup>2</sup> cups (cf. Mk. 14:25) in the Passover ritual, it is difficult to determine what OT ideas Luke may be intending to allude to by the simple mention of a cup distributed to the disciples (v. 17). Some have suggested that the mention of the cup and the command to share should be seen against the background of the OT symbol of the cup of salvation and blessing (Ps. 115:4(116:13); cf. 15(16):5).<sup>3</sup> But there is nothing in the simple statement about the cup which would indicate this and we find nothing in the use of *τὸ ποτήριον* in the rest of Luke which takes up these meanings. Besides, the emphasis is on Jesus' not partaking of the fruit of the vine. The significance of wine for the Passover meal was that it was a sign of the joyful celebration of the victory of salvation which God had wrought for their fathers in the Exodus (e.g. Ps. 103(104):15).<sup>4</sup> Wine was also an important

---

<sup>1</sup>SBK, IV:1, p. 75; cf. Pes. 10:2.

<sup>2</sup>D. Daube, The NT and Rabbinic Judaism (London, 1956), p. 330.

<sup>3</sup>Otto, p. 286f.; cf. Rose (Le Psautier, p. 306), who relates this significance to the cup of Lk. 22:20.

<sup>4</sup>Barth (p. 37) believes this joyful significance is also attached to Lk. 22:20, which also qualifies Lk. 22:19, so that the disciples in drinking wine are encouraged to rejoice in the "new covenant" which Jesus' death establishes.



part of the produce of the land of Israel. God's victory was complete when Israel possessed the land and was blessed by God through abundant harvests, which included wine (Dt. 28:4, 11; Ps. 4:8). The blessing over the wine in the Jewish ritual recognizes that it is only through God the creator that the wine is provided.<sup>1</sup> It is this recognition of the continuing maintenance of the victory of God, which the joy of wine and the provision of wine signifies, and which Jesus must renounce for himself. For not only is he dedicating himself to the service of God but he is also reminding his disciples that the victory of God of which the Passover speaks will only be complete when the kingdom of God finally comes (22:18). Then it will be appropriate to take the cup and rejoice in the complete triumph of the reign of God.<sup>2</sup>

The contribution which the ~~vow~~ of abstinence (22:16, 18) makes to the Lukan understanding of the kingdom of God is that it links the passion of Jesus to the coming of the kingdom. The statement about his passion (v. 15) when understood in connection with the vow of abstinence, whose duration is from the Last Supper to the kingdom's coming, implies that the suffering comes between this meal and the final triumph. This description of the arrival of the eschatological reign of God ( $\eta βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἐλθῇ$ , 22:18) is not one of Luke's favorite phrases (elsewhere in Luke at 11:2/Mt. 6:10; 17:20; he avoids it at Mk. 11:10/Lk. 19:33; Mk. 9:1/Lk. 9:27). However, his use of it here makes clear that he views the fulfilment in the kingdom eschatologically. The OT background of the use of the verb  $\epsilonρχομαι$  to describe the arrival of eschatologically decisive days, a very common use in

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. SBK (IV:1, p. 62) quoting Pes. 103a, 20; 106a, 15, 18, "Blessed art thou, Lord our God, King of the World, who createst the fruit of the vine!" This is said over the first cup.

<sup>2</sup>See below, p. 229 (22:28-30); cf. Daube, p. 331; F. F. Bruce (This is That, p. 23) notes that the possible connection between the Passover and the kingdom or kingship of God in the OT must be mediated through the common concept of victory. The song of Moses rejoices at the victory at the Red Sea through the mighty acts of God, which manifest his kingship (Ex. 15:1, 11, 18; cf. Dt. 16:1).

the Psalms and the prophets, aids us in seeing that Luke used this expression eschatologically (e.g. Ps. 95(96):13; 117(118):26; Jo. 3:4; Is. 13:9; Jer. 38(31):31).

Luke includes an explanatory phrase after the identification of bread<sup>1</sup> with Jesus' body, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὡμῶν δίδόμενον (22:19; cf. Mk. 14:22). This is paralleled by τὸ ὑπὲρ ὡμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον (22:20; cf. Mk. 14:24). We have already discussed the probability that this phrase is a material allusion to Isaiah 53.<sup>2</sup> We postponed until now a discussion of the relationship between these phrases as an allusion to Isaiah 53 in particular, and the general OT idea of vicarious atonement. We have already seen how the parallelism of body and blood in interpreting the bread and wine are based on an identification which Jesus makes between himself and the Passover lamb. The question is what is the proper context of OT thought in which to view the explanatory phrases "given for you" and "shed for you?" The two parts of each phrase for which we need to find an OT context are the participle and the prepositional phrase.

The participle δίδόμενον<sup>3</sup> may be understood in either a sacrificial or martyrological context.<sup>4</sup> In the sacrificial context with the passive voice

<sup>1</sup>M. Barth's (p. 36) proposal that Jesus used bread because in the OT it is a symbol of God giving life to man (Ps. 103(104):14), and in current Jewish thought it was part of the role of the Messiah, does not appear to be in fact the OT background to the significance which Luke reports that Jesus gives to the bread (Schürmann II-Der Einsetzungsbericht, p. 119). Rather, the interpretative words about the bread as his body only extend as far as saying that his body will be given, sacrificed on their behalf. They do not point to the life-giving consequences of such an act. Nor does Luke's use of the term "bread" in his gospel or Acts make such an association (cf. J. 6:35ff.).

<sup>2</sup>See above, pp. 158ff.

<sup>3</sup>Although not in Paul (1 Cor. 11:24) δίδόμενον should probably be taken not as a secondary addition to the tradition but as an original part of the Pl./Lk. tradition; (Schürmann, II-Der Einsetzungsbericht, pp. 17-24).

<sup>4</sup>Schürmann, II-Der Einsetzungsbericht, p. 23.

of the verb we should probably understand God as the agent of the action. The passage where God institutes the principle of blood sacrifice making atonement for sin has the verb in the active: ἐγὼ δέδωκα αὐτὸ ὑμῖν ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου ἐξελάσκεσθαι περὶ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν (Lev. 17:11; cf. Ex. 30:14; Lev. 23:38; 1 Km. 1:11). The identity of Jesus with the paschal lamb; the separation of body and blood in the parallelism of the liturgical formula which accords with the separation of flesh and blood in ritual of sacrifice, leads us to see that διδόμενον does make sense understood from a sacrificial context.

In the martyrological context the passive as well as middle voice of the verb is appropriate. In the passive voice, the participle may indicate that Jesus according to the will of God is given over for the benefit of the many (you). Again God would be the agent understood. The middle voice with its active sense would indicate that Jesus voluntarily gives himself over for others. In Luke-Acts this phrase is not used again to describe the death of Jesus, so we have nothing but the immediate context as our guide to whether Luke meant the passive or middle voice.<sup>1</sup> Unless we are going to conclude that "body" stands for Jesus himself,<sup>2</sup> then the grammatical sense of the syntax demands that a passive meaning be accepted.<sup>3</sup>

Isaiah 53 is the one passage in the OT which describes the giving of a human life on behalf of the people. This may be the OT basis for Jesus' declaration understood within a martyrological context. However, some have tended to see the Intertestamental development of martyrological thinking

<sup>1</sup>Voss (p. 103) claims that in NT usage, διδόναι and παρὰδιδόναι are synonymous but their interchangeable use is governed by this rule: παρὰδιδόναι is used for διδόναι in the active sense but never is διδόναι used for παρὰδιδόναι in the passive sense. Therefore it must be middle with an active sense here since if the meaning were passive then παρὰδιδόναι would have been used. But the syntax of the immediate context should govern the matter.

<sup>2</sup>Cooke, Theol. Stud., XXI, p. 25; Schürmann II-Der Einsetzungsbericht, p. 22.

<sup>3</sup>Popkes, p. 214.

as the more immediate source of NT thinking.<sup>1</sup>

Schürmann's argument that the martyrological context should be taken as basic, since the NT presents Jesus' death as a "ransom" and not as a sacrificial offering, is not totally convincing. He wants to see Is. 53:10ff. as the basis for the martyrological presentation of Jesus' death here, but he does not take into account the sacrificial offering concepts that occur throughout the chapter and that section (Is. 53:4-6; 10, 12). If the evidence of Lk. 22:18-20 shifts the balance between these two alternative contexts in any direction it is probably toward the sacrificial rather than the martyrological. For, though formally the phrases do agree with the way a martyrdom is described, the fact that it is the paschal lamb with which Jesus identifies himself, and the fact that both participles, "given" and "shed," are in the passive voice point to a sacrificial context. One final observation is that martyrdom understood as vicarious atonement derives its soteriological significance from the theological principle of vicarious atonement first established in the sacrificial system. It is, therefore, a feature these contexts have in common. Only the concept of "self-giving," of voluntary sacrifice of oneself, uniquely expressed in Isaiah 53 (MT) and developed in the martyr theology of the Maccabees, is distinctive to martyrdom. But the passive participles make that thought less clear here. The participle, *διδόμενον*, should probably be viewed in a sacrificial context.

In the OT the other participle, *ἐκχυνόμενον*, does not have clear associations with a sacrificial context. The "shedding of blood" or "pouring out of blood" in the OT sacrificial context usually describes the disposal of the remainder of the blood at the base of the altar after the

---

<sup>1</sup>Schelkle (p. 72), 1 Macc. 2:50; Popkes (p. 254) argues against Isaiah 53 as the source of the thought both from the ambiguous nature of the evidence of Isaiah 53 (the MT presents the Servant as giving himself for the many, while the LXX translates it as his being given (by God) for the many), and from the fact that the NT does not directly allude to Isaiah 53 in any of the places where it speaks of Jesus' self-giving or being given for mankind.

ritual dipping or sprinkling has been performed (e.g. Lev. 4:7, 12, 34; cf. Dt. 21:7-9 where the shed blood of an animal expiates for the shed blood of the innocent person, whose murderer is unknown).<sup>1</sup> Its most normal use is to describe a violent death usually murder (e.g. Ps. 13(14):3; Pr. 6:17; Is. 59:7; Gen. 9:6).<sup>2</sup> This is probably part of the intended significance in Lk. 22:20. It harmonizes with the identity of Jesus as the Passover lamb whose shed blood was used as the protective, redemptive sign. Since the word is not used to describe martyrdom in Maccabees (but cf. Ac. 22:20 for a description of Stephen's martyrdom) and since again the passive voice is used, it seems best to take this participle also in a sacrificial and not martyrological context. "The violent death foreseen by Jesus is consciously accepted and thus becomes an act of supreme self-sacrifice superior to all other offerings."<sup>3</sup> We have already seen that it is not possible to present a convincing argument for a verbal allusion to Is. 53:12 in this participle plus prepositional phrase, although we must note that the idea of a violent death on behalf of others is present in Is. 53:4, 5, 8, 10, 12.

The important question now is how we are to understand the prepositional phrase ὕπὲρ ὅμων which accompanies the participles.

The two basic ways in which we may take this prepositional phrase are in a general and a sacrificial, context. The general context simply translates the phrase as it is used in secular and LXX Greek, "for the

---

<sup>1</sup>Ex. 24:6 uses ἐνέχεεν and προσέχεεν to describe the ritual act of pouring blood toward God and toward the people in confirmation of the covenant. But this action is not alluded to in Lk. 22:20 either by the phrase relating covenant and blood or by this participle because there is no sacrificial significance in such an act which would lead to the thought that Jesus' blood would be poured out for the benefit of mankind (TDNT, II, p. 468).

<sup>2</sup>Though this meaning occurs in secular Greek (Aeschylus, Eum. 653, μητρὸς αἵμ' ἀμείνων ἐκχέας πέδου; cf. Ditt. Syll. 3rd ed. 1181: 5, 3rd cent. B.C., ἐκχέοντες αὐτῆς τὸ ἀντίστον αἶμα), its frequency in the LXX as the translation of וַיִּשְׁפֹּךְ gives us reason to view it as a phrase characteristic of the LXX.

<sup>3</sup>TDNT, II, p. 468.

benefit of."<sup>1</sup> The use of the preposition in the rest of Luke-Acts corresponds with this general meaning, "on behalf of, for the sake of" (Ac. 9:16; 15:26; 21:13). In each instance there is a certain antithetic parallelism with Jesus' words. Early Christian missionaries and Paul in particular are willing to die "for the sake of, on behalf of" Jesus' name. Since Luke apparently does not emphasize the soteriological significance of Jesus' death, especially through the vehicle of an understanding of it as vicarious atonement, some would be content to see Luke's view of Jesus' death simply as a portrayal of a martyrdom, where Jesus performs a final act of service for his own as he dies that they might be benefited,<sup>2</sup> (cf. 4 Macc. 6:28; 1 Macc. 5:33). However, even if we took Jewish martyr theology as the basis for Luke's understanding, where it does speak of the martyr dying on behalf of, for the benefit of the nation, it does so against the background of sacrificial concepts (4 Macc. 6:28, ἵνα γενοῦ τῷ ἔθνει σου ἄρκεσθεῖς τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν δίκῃ). In every other place which describes the martyrdom as giving one's life, it is never for the people or the nation but always for some symbol of God's authority or will such as "the law" or "the covenant" (1 Macc. 2:50; 2 Macc. 6:28; 7:9; 4 Macc. 6:22). Thus it appears that if Jewish martyrological thought is the model for Luke's portrayal of Jesus' death, it must still be understood within a sacrificial context.<sup>3</sup>

Where ὑπὲρ is used in a sacrificial context it may have as its object either sin or the sinner. In the first instance it has the simple causal meaning. A sacrifice is offered because of the presence of sin

<sup>1</sup>Schelkle, p. 134; cf. Judg. 9:17; 1 Km. 10:2; 2 Km. 8:10; 10:12.

<sup>2</sup>Voss, p. 129f.; Dibelius, p. 201f.

<sup>3</sup>TDNT, VIII, p. 511.

( Mi. 6:7; 2 Esdr. 6:17; cf. 1 Esdr. 7:8) and the preposition *πρός* which is interchangeable with *ὑπέρ*, is much more common (e.g. Ex. 32:30; Lev. 7:37; Is. 53:10). In the second instance, the preposition retains its positive force because a sacrifice is offered not "because of" or "concerning" sin, but "on behalf of, for the benefit of" a person (2 Esdr. 6:17, *πρός ἀμαρτίας ὑπὲρ πάντων Ἰσραήλ*; cf. 1 Esdr. 7:8). Luke, then, could be saying in Lk. 22:19, 20 that Jesus offers himself as a sacrifice "for the benefit of" the *ὑμῶν*. And the OT pattern of sacrifice and atonement would explain it. There is, however, one prohibition in the sacrificial system which places a flaw on this relationship. Several times in the OT the point is made that human sacrifice and the possibility of one man's death atoning for another man are explicitly ruled out (Dt. 24:16; 4 Km. 14:6; Mi. 6:7). Each man must die for his own sin or find the appropriate way to make atonement for it. Thus, although the sacrificial system gives a pattern of blood sacrifice to atone for sin on behalf of the people, it does not really open the way for Jesus to declare himself as a vicarious sacrifice. We are driven then to the choice between finding Jesus' and Luke's understanding of Jesus' death in Jewish martyr theology and discovering it in the passage, which most clearly of all the OT could serve as the basis for Jesus' statement, Isaiah 53. We should recognize that both Isaiah 53 and Jewish martyr theology seem to disregard the OT prohibition against vicarious atonement in the form of human sacrifice.

As we have noted there is no verbal parallel to this prepositional phrase in Isaiah 53. The material parallel consists not so much in the idea conveyed by the phrase, for that is found in the sacrificial context in general. It is in the one who speaks it and consequences of his death. He is a servant of the Lord who voluntarily gives his life as a vicarious atonement for sin and in order to benefit "the many" (Is. 53:11, 12). Although there is continuing debate over whether Jesus' death is viewed by Luke as vicarious atonement, we believe there is sufficient evidence that

Luke did view Jesus' death in this way and that Isaiah 53 is the source of his thought (22:37; 23:47; Ac. 8:32ff.; 13:27-29; 20:28; cf. references to Jesus as the Servant, Ac. 3:13, 26; 4:27, 30).<sup>1</sup> Luke 22:20 is one of the most explicit statements in Luke that Jesus' death was a sacrifice on behalf of others (cf. Ac. 20:28). We see Is. 53:11, 12 as the source of this thought and not Jewish martyr theology or the OT idea, vicarious atonement, because only Isaiah 53 contains this distinctive combination of ideas: a man gives himself as an atoning sacrifice in a decisive act of salvation according to God's will (Is. 53:11) and that sacrifice is uni-

---

<sup>1</sup>Stonehouse, p. 170; cf. I. H. Marshall ("The Resurrection in the Acts of the Apostles," Apostolic History and the Gospel, ed. W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin (Exeter, 1970), p. 105), who, though he argues for Luke's acceptance of the theory of Jesus' death as a means of atonement, does not believe Luke uses the suffering Servant as the means through which to express it. Those who argue against a Lukan understanding of Jesus' death as a vicarious atonement normally cite as their evidence Luke's removal of Mk. 10:45; the absence of the "atonement" interpretation of Jesus' death in the shorter and what they consider to be the authentic reading, Lk. 22:15-19a; the lack of such an interpretation of Jesus' death in the preaching in Acts; and the ability to interpret without reference to vicarious atonement the soteriological statement in Ac. 20:28, which supposedly clearly presents Jesus' death as an atonement (e.g. Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts, p. 280; Conzelmann, Theology of Luke, p. 201; R. Zehnle, "The Salvific Character of Jesus' Death in Lucan Soteriology," Theol. Stud., XXXI (1969), pp. 438ff.). Those maintaining this position dispute the place of Isaiah 53 in Luke's soteriology as the source for his interpretation of Jesus' death as vicarious atonement. They point out that Luke's choice of material to quote from Isaiah 53 (Lk. 22:37; Ac. 8:32ff.) shows a studied avoidance of the explicit references in Isaiah 53 to the Servant's making atonement by his death (e.g. Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts, p. 280; Rese, Alttestamentliche Motive, p. 98; W. E. Pilgrim, The Death of Christ in Lucan Soteriology (ThD. Diss., Princeton Theol. Seminary; Princeton, 1971), p. 153). In answer to these objections we may point out that the omission of Mk. 10:45 was on grounds other than a desire to avoid mentioning Jesus' death as redemptive for "the many" (Lohse, Martyrer, p. 113); the preaching in Acts is presented in the summary form of reported proclamation, not expanded dogmatic reflection (Stonehouse, p. 140); on other grounds than theological outlook we have seen why it is reasonable to take the longer reading (Lk. 22:19b-20) as authentic (See above, p. 143); Ac. 20:28 contains a mixture of images from the world of commerce, πρεσβυτέριον and the sacrificial cult, διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου, and thus is not an altogether clear indicator of vicarious atonement as part of Luke's thought. But it does not stand alone and is enlightened by clearer references such as Lk. 22:19, 20. With regard to the Isaiah 53 quotations it should be noted that each may function to support the basic objective facts, e.g. the innocent Jesus suffering a transgressor's death, which would later have their theological significance presented as vicarious atonement. We may well recognize that Luke does not emphasize a soteriological interpretation of Jesus' death



versally efficacious ("for the many," Is. 53:10-12).<sup>1</sup> Luke with his reference to "new covenant" also conveys the thought that Jesus' death is not just another martyrdom, which may make a limited atonement for Israel in a current crisis. Rather, it is the act which establishes the "new covenant," the spiritual economy of the End-time. Its significance is not limited temporally or nationally. It is a death for all. This Luke communicates through his use of an unconditioned "you." The martyr-ological context cannot fully account for these features. The prepositional phrase and the accompanying participles then find their appropriate OT reference as a material allusion to Is. 53:11-12 with the OT idea of atonement understood within a sacrificial context as background.

Two other OT ideas are possibly at work in the word over the cup. The turn of phrase in the OT which called grape wine the "blood of the grape" (Dt. 32:14; Gen. 49:11; cf. 1 Macc. 6:34; Sir. 39:26; 50:15) may have influenced, though remotely, the equation of the cup and blood.<sup>2</sup> A more likely candidate for OT idea influence, which may form part of a theological

---

as vicarious atonement (cf. Lohse, (Martyrer (p. 188-190); see Schneider (p. 188) for reasons based on the possible lack of understanding of Luke's audience and more importantly Luke's theology which sees God's salvation accomplished in the resurrection). But this should not lead us to conclude that Luke rejects this interpretation of Jesus' death. Rather, to do justice to Lk. 22:19-20; the connection which Luke continually makes between man's salvation through repentance and faith in the name of the Messiah and the fact that this Messiah suffered, died and rose again (24:44-48; Ac. 5:30-31; 26:22-23; 2:36-38; 3:13-19); and his presentation of Jesus' Passion as the innocent suffering of the one numbered with transgressors, it is necessary to recognize that Luke, although presenting the fact implicitly, believes that Jesus' death brings salvation because he dies vicariously to make atonement for others. All other explanations of the main thrust of Luke's theology of Jesus' death whether it be as exemplary martyrdom (e.g. Talbert, p. 73); martyrdom transformed into the saving death of the Christ of God (e.g. Schneider, p. 187); participation in the divinely ordained pattern of suffering issuing in the glory which conquers death (e.g. Voss, p. 129); or as just an interruption in the triumphal progress of Jesus into glory (e.g. Barrett, Luke the Historian, p. 60), must leave out of account either the explicit references to vicarious atonement in Luke or the evidence in Luke's passion narrative which points to his composition of it on the theme of the fulfilment of Is. 53:12. The way the death of Jesus, portrayed as an innocent sufferer, relates itself most readily to the salvation of men is through understanding that portrayal as Luke's objective presentation of the facts which could best be interpreted as vicarious atonement.

<sup>1</sup>Lohse, Martyrer, p. 222.

<sup>2</sup>Dalman, Jesus-Jeshua, p. 159.

theme, is the metaphorical significance given to "cup." We have already mentioned the possible salvation significance of the term in connection with vv. 17, 18. The "cup" may also signify one's destiny under the will of God (cf. the prophets' experience, Is. 51:17; Jer. 32(25):15; Ezk. 23:31-33).<sup>1</sup> It is uncertain whether Luke favored this OT idea in relation to Jesus' own destiny for he removes one reference to it when he fails to take over a section from Mark (Mk. 10:38/Mt. 20:22) and yet he retains the image at Lk. 22:42/Mk. 14:36. Although Luke may have preferred the liturgical formula that explicitly points out the equation between cup and blood because he wanted to avoid the Gentile offense concerning blood sacrifice and drinking blood,<sup>2</sup> yet, the result is that the term "cup" is brought into close connection with Jesus' description of the significance of his death. "Cup" understood as destiny could then play a complementary role. The one thing which the presence of "cup," however, does do for Luke's presentation of Jesus' death is that it places Jesus' destiny in a positive light, expressing what benefit will come from Jesus' taking the cup. This corresponds with the way Luke portrays the way Luke portrays the whole Passion and especially Jesus' prayer in the Garden. Jesus knows the cup will be bitter to take but he also knows to take it is according to God's will. In obedience he willingly accepts God's will. By emphasizing that the "new covenant" salvation for all is "the cup" Luke helps prepare his readers for understanding why Jesus took the cup which meant his death.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

## Old Testament Style

We have no LXX vocabulary to consider in this section because distinctive OT use of the terms in Lk. 22:15-20 has been considered under the allusion and OT idea headings. The grammatical elements which may show LXX influence are mostly verbal in nature.

The general structure of this tightly worded and evenly balanced section reveals nothing in Lukan editing which would indicate an attempt to copy LXX style. There is a network of καί's which binds the four main parts of the dialogue together in two units (22:15-18; 19-20) each with two parallel members (22:15-16; 17-18);<sup>1</sup> (22:19, 20). Each of the four members begins with καί. The first καί (22:15) Jeremias views as a semitism, characteristic of Palestinian Jewish historical writing and therefore from a source and not Luke.<sup>2</sup> It is difficult to judge whether Luke is taking this over from a source and retaining it because it is LXX style or simply in order to preserve a parallelism with v. 17. For that matter, the fact of the parallelism could explain why the καί exists at all. Then it would cease to be a useful determinant of sources. The features of word order and parataxis reveal only one example of possible Lukan editing. In Lk. 22:19 the καὶ εἶπεν of the liturgical tradition, an example of which we have in Paul (1 Cor. 11:24; cf. Mk. 14:22), is changed to a participle λέγων to avoid a compound parataxis.<sup>3</sup> This is again an example of Luke's moving away from the paratactical structure which characterizes much of LXX narrative style.

Two pleonastic constructions, which may indicate Luke's imitation of LXX style are the verb accompanied by its cognate (ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα, 22:15) and the participle λαβών (22:19). The verb with a dative of its

---

<sup>1</sup>Turner (Moulton Grammar, III, p. 155) sees λάβετε ... καὶ διαμερίσατε (22:17) as an example of parataxis.

<sup>2</sup>Jeremias, p. 185.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid. cf. also Lk. 22:20; 1 Cor. 11:25- λέγων with Mk. 14:24, καὶ εἶπεν. See below (p. 233) for a discussion of post-positive μου (22:19, 20).

cognate is one of the five ways in which the LXX translates a finite verb plus infinitive absolute (e.g. Gen. 2:17; 31:30; Ex. 21:20; Dt. 7:26).<sup>1</sup> Although the construction is possible in Greek (cf. γάμω γαμέειν "to be truly married"),<sup>2</sup> its frequency in the LXX as a method for translating, and then not literally, the infinitive absolute construction gives us reason for classifying it not as a Hebraism but as a Septuagintalism. It is not an Aramaism.<sup>3</sup> Examples of the construction in the Lukan writings (Ac. 4:17 (E ms); 5:28; 16:28; 23:14; 28:10; Lk. 23:46/Mk. 15:37) are spread throughout the book of Acts so that the probability that this is an example of Lukan LXX style imitation is increased. We can add to this evidence constructions which exhibit in one way or another redundancy for the sake of emphasis (finite verb plus cognate accusative: Lk. 2:8, 9; at Mk. 4:41/Lk. 8:25 Lk. removes the construction; finite verb plus participle Ac. 5:4; cf. Lk. 6:8; use of words that are etymologically related: Lk. 8:5/Mk. 4:2; Lk. 23:48; cf. Lk. 11:46; 7:29; 17:24/Mt. 24:27). This information, however, gives us no clear guidance for deciding whether Luke introduced this construction at Lk. 22:15 or took it over from his source.<sup>4</sup> We find only that Luke appears to remove the construction once from Mark (Mk. 4:41/Lk. 8:25), while retaining it in tradition he has in common with Mt. (Lk. 17:24/Mt. 24:27). Luke's use of ἐπιθυμία and ἐπιθυμεῖν shows that these terms cannot be called part of his favorite vocabulary. The one other occurrence of ἐπιθυμία in the synoptic tradition is removed by Luke as he takes over Mk. (Lk. 8:14/Mk. 4:19). The verb occurs once in Acts (Ac. 20:33) and in material peculiar to Luke in the gospel (15:16; 16:21; 17:22; Lk. removes it from tradition he has in common with Mt., Lk. 10:24/Mt. 13:17). This leads us to conclude that the verb was probably taken over from Luke's special source. In view

---

<sup>1</sup>Thackeray, I, p. 47.

<sup>2</sup>BDF, ¶ 198:6.

<sup>3</sup>Wellhausen, p. 21.

<sup>4</sup>Perry, p. 65; Easton, JBL, XXXIX, p. 177.

of the presence of the construction in all parts of Acts, we are inclined to see Luke's editorial hand at work here also.<sup>1</sup> The argument that since the construction is impossible in Aramaic it arose in the tradition after Jesus, does not automatically mean that it should be assigned to Luke himself.<sup>2</sup> It may be an example of the septuagintalizing style which characterized a source which Luke used. From the care Luke took in his reproduction of the words of Jesus, we are inclined to see this construction as original with Luke's source.

In either case, the significance of the construction is to emphasize the action of the verb.<sup>3</sup> Here it is the longing which Jesus has to eat the Passover with his disciples. This emphasis has been used to prove that Jesus did not partake of the Passover either because he was arrested before it took place<sup>4</sup> or because he denied himself the opportunity.<sup>5</sup> The reason for the strong desire is not however determined either by the historical circumstances, which prevent his partaking of the meal, or by his own vow of abstinence. It is not the pressure of the desire against its lack of fulfilment that is emphasized so much as Jesus' knowledge that when this Passover comes his life is at an end (22:37). He is on the brink of his final struggle with and victory over the powers of darkness. This meal also means he has the opportunity to institute the Eucharist for his disciples as a continuing sign that the victory is accomplished.<sup>6</sup> Luke has been skillfully building up to the climax of his gospel with a travel narrative which sets Jesus on his way to Jerusalem (9:51-19:44). At points

---

<sup>1</sup>Schürmann, I-Der Paschamahlbericht, pp. 5ff.

<sup>2</sup>cf. Lagrange, p. ci; Sparks, JTS, XLIV, p. 138.

<sup>3</sup>It is not an allusion to Gen. 31:30 as Dalman (Words, p. 35) thinks.

<sup>4</sup>F. C. Burkitt and A. E. Brooke, "St. Luke xxii, 15.16: What is the General Meaning?" JTS, IX (1908), p. 569f.

<sup>5</sup>Jeremias, p. 208f.

<sup>6</sup>D. G. Miller, Saint Luke (The Layman's Bible Commentary; London, 1960), p. 151.

Luke reminds us of the constraint of the will of God under which Jesus labored (9:51; 12:50; 13:31-35). Now Jesus approaches the consummation and his desire is quickened. Luke thus portrays Jesus as earnestly, eagerly entering the final struggle. The Last Supper shows that he desires the struggle and the glory not for himself alone but for all (22:19, 20). It is his confidence that his suffering will issue in salvation that makes his desire strong. The finite verb with its cognate substantive helps emphasize Jesus' emotion and purpose.

Luke's avoidance of parataxis by the use of the participial form λαβών (22:19) creates a pleonasm, which is characteristic of LXX style. Originally, the pleonasm is the result of the use of Πῆλ in semitic style as an auxiliary verb which "describe(s), in a way which is cumbersome and superfluous for our idiom (the Greek), a movement (or attitude) which is preparatory to the action on which the stress lies."<sup>1</sup> Both the LXX and Luke avoid parataxis by changing the finite form of the verb meaning "to take" into a participle. Both willingly allow a pleonasm to exist in order to preserve every word from their source (e.g. Gen. 3:6; 39:20; Ex. 24:6, 8; Lev. 8:29; e.g. Lk. 20:29/Mk. 12:20; Lk. 22:19/cf. Mk. 14:22; 1 Cor. 11:23; other examples of a pleonastic λαβών in a meal scene: Lk. 6:4, Lk. inserts the participle cf. Mk. 2:26; Lk. 9:16/Mk. 6:41; Lk. 24:30; 43; Ac. 9:19; 27:35; in other contexts Lk. inserts the participle at Lk. 19:15 cf. Mt. 25:19; Lk. 13:19, 21/Mt. 13:31, 33; Ac. 9:25; 16:3).<sup>2</sup> Luke's editing then accords with LXX translation practice. It is an avoidance of parataxis through an imitation of LXX style. The fact that he feels free to insert such a pleonasm elsewhere and use it in contexts other than meal scenes throughout

---

<sup>1</sup>Jeremias, p. 175.

<sup>2</sup>Schlürmann, I-Der Paschamahlsbericht, p. 57; His analysis of this pleonastic usage is too closely tied to the synoptic tradition's almost stereotyped description of meal scenes. He fails to take into account Luke's editing for stylistic reasons with a view to preserving the material from his source as a more general explanation of why λαβών is retained here.

his two works leads us to see the occurrence as not simply a matter of following a stereotyped pattern for meal scenes inspired by Eucharistic liturgical practice. It is, rather, LXX style imitation. The other parts of the description of the initial stages of the meal: the absolute use of κλᾶν and δίδοναι and the paratactical construction in which they are found, while having semitic analogies in rabbinic writers,<sup>1</sup> do not occur frequently enough in the LXX to warrant their classification in Luke as LXX style imitation.

The rest of the semitic elements, which may be examples of LXX style imitation, have to do with the use of verbs. Our passage contains one of the three occurrences in Luke of the construction πρὸ τοῦ plus the infinitive (22:15; cf. Lk. 2:21; Ac. 23:15; Mt. 6:8 is the only other synoptic occurrence). The construction occurs in classical and Hellenistic Greek but its frequency in the LXX to translate לִפְנֵי or לְפָנַיִם (e.g. Gen. 2:5; Ex. 12:34; Josh. 3:1; Lev. 14:36; Ps. 89(90):2; Is. 42:9) makes it a characteristic of LXX style.<sup>2</sup> Because this construction is an example of a favorite verbal construction of Luke's, the preposition followed by articular infinitive, it is tempting to see this particular example as the result of Lukan redaction.<sup>3</sup> However, we have no other clear evidence of Luke's insertion of this particular construction. We find ourselves with less assurance than in the case of the verb and its cognate substantive. It is probably from Luke's source which has already included the introductory καί and possibly ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα in its style. The significance of the use is that it further adds to the LXX stylistic character of the introduction to and the opening words of Jesus' farewell discourse (καί ; εἶπεν πρὸς ; ἐπιθυμία ἐπεθύμησα ; πρὸ τοῦ plus the infinitive).

---

<sup>1</sup>Jeremias, p. 176f.

<sup>2</sup>Turner, Moulton Grammar, III, p. 144.

<sup>3</sup>Schürmann I—Der Paschamahlbericht, p. 12f.

We are alerted that something of theological significance is about to be said and done. We are about to read dialogue and narrative which is as theologically important as what is recorded in the OT.

Two verbs with which prepositions are used to introduce the indirect or direct object may indicate LXX style imitation. The use of *πρός* with a verb of speaking is enough of a characteristic of LXX style and Luke's style that it is possible that here (22:15) we have redactional activity of Luke in the imitation of the LXX.<sup>1</sup> The question of its theological significance must also be asked for it has been suggested that this particular construction is reserved for divine address in some NT writers, Mark, Matthew and Paul, while in others, Luke and John, it is merely used in a secular sense.<sup>2</sup> In this farewell discourse this construction only occurs here at the very beginning. In the rest of Luke 22 it occurs two more times as a description of Jesus' addressing the arresting party and the Sanhedrin audience (22:52, 70). In both it is at the climax of the scene, when he has something theologically significant to say. This usage leads us to suppose that, though Luke may use the term in an ordinary secular sense elsewhere, and even Lk. 22:52 and 70 might be taken that way, yet the placement of the construction at these key points in the narrative means that he is using this stylistic device to point out theologically significant material. It may also mean that Luke is helping his readers to see that the content which follows is divine revelation, for it concerns either instructions for the continuing life of the church (22:15-38), or teaching about the nature of Jesus' death (22:52-53) and his person (22:70).

The use of the preposition *ἐνώπιον* after *πρόσω* (22:18) is probably an example of semitic influence.<sup>3</sup> Though it is possible in Greek (cf.

---

<sup>1</sup>Turner, Kilpatrick Festschrift, p. 15; Schürmann, I-Der Paschamahlbericht, p. 5; See below, p. 445.

<sup>2</sup>TDNT, VI, p. 724.

<sup>3</sup>Vogel, p. 22; cf. Schürmann (I-Der Paschamahlbericht, p. 37), who calls it Aramaic influence which Luke has corrected.



Theognis, Elegiacus (6th cent. B.C. ) 959, ἐπίνων ἀπὸ κρήνης ; but cf. also 962 without ἀπὸ ), the frequency with which πίνω + ἐκ or ἀπὸ occurs in the LXX to render יָדַל מִן הַיַּיִן (e.g. Ex. 7:18, 21, 24; Num. 20:17; cf. Jer. 28(51):7, ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴνου οὐ τῆς ἐπίουσαν , 4 Km. 18:31), qualifies the construction as a LXX stylistic feature. At Lk. 22:18 the construction with ἀπὸ may be seen as either translation Greek of a semitic gospel source or as possibly LXX style imitation.<sup>1</sup> It may be an attempt to correct a translation Greek Aramaism which may have originally used ἐκ . πίνω ἐκ would have been confusing Greek for ἐκ normally signifies the container from which the liquid is drunk (e.g. Herodotus IV:172, ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς διδῶναι πίνειν ), whereas here the preposition functions as part of a partitive genitive construction. Luke to avoid misunderstanding, write acceptable Greek, and yet preserve all of the elements in his tradition may correct his source according to LXX style (Jer. 28(51):7, is the main LXX example). When this construction is combined with the other semitic element, "fruit of the vine," which is reproduced by the LXX in various forms (Dt. 22:9, τοῦ γενήματος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνός σου ; cf. Hab. 3:17; Is. 32:12; the Hebrew - פְּרִי לֵבֶן ), LXX style imitation can be seen guiding the editing of the translation Greek of semitic gospel sources at this point.

We should note briefly four other semitisms. Their form may imitate LXX style. Their content has already been dealt with when we considered OT allusions and ideas. They are the emphatic double negative οὐ μή with which Jesus declares he will not eat the Passover until the kingdom of God comes (22:16, 18);<sup>1</sup> the passive of παύω (22:16), which may be a circumlocution out of respect for God who acts; another possible circumlocution for God's action which personifies his reign is the phrase "the kingdom of God comes" (22:18); and the instrumental dative introduced by ἐν (22:20).<sup>2</sup> Because of an inability to distinguish between Luke's sources and his editing where these elements occur, the most we can say is that since

<sup>1</sup>See below, p. 432.

<sup>2</sup>Jeremias, pp. 161, 162, 177; Tabachovitz, p. 67.

these do not occur in the Markan tradition, Luke did prefer the tradition which contained them. He took them over and let them express Jesus' words in a semitic way which is in accord with LXX style.

## CHAPTER IV

## LUKE 22:21-23: JESUS FORETELLS HIS BETRAYAL

## Introduction

This brief announcement by Jesus of his betrayal occurs after the institution of the Eucharist and not before it as in Mark. When we combine this fact with the uneven distribution throughout the narrative of words which Luke has in common with Mark, the possibility is raised that Luke is using non-Markan material as his basic source.<sup>1</sup> The words common to Mark and Luke occur predominantly in v. 22, which may be viewed as an insertion from Mark<sup>2</sup> or as the independent source's formulation of an important saying which would be little altered in the tradition.<sup>3</sup> The transposition of the account from before to after the Supper could be explained as an alteration of Mark on theological and stylistic grounds. Luke did not want the solemn meal to begin this way<sup>4</sup> and he did want to place all Jesus' sayings within a literary unit, a farewell discourse, which would follow the words of institution. However, the fact that v. 21 follows on to v. 23 very well and that there is a real difference in content (the disciples do not ask Jesus but ask among themselves) leads us to conclude that there is a non-Markan source which is basic here, into which a Markan saying has possibly been inserted.

There are no quotations in this section. Mark contains an allusion to Ps. 40(41):10/Mk. 14:18 and a general reference to Scripture in connection

<sup>1</sup>Taylor, The Passion Narrative, p. 59f.; F. Rehkopf, Die lukanische Sonderquelle (WUNT, V: Tübingen, 1959), pp. 7-31; Contrast H. Schürmann, Eine Quellenkritische Untersuchung des Lukanischen Abendmahlsberichtes (NT Abhandlungen, XX:5; Münster, 1957), III - Jesu Abschiedsrede Lk. 22: 21-38; pp. 3-20.

<sup>2</sup>Taylor, The Passion Narrative, p. 60.

<sup>3</sup>Rehkopf (pp. 13-21) sees the differences as translation variants; cf. Plummer, p. 499.

<sup>4</sup>Hirsch, II, p. 255; but cf. Rehkopf (p. 30), who says that Luke's order is the more original and that Mk. and Mt. are secondary, having transposed in order to avoid the scandal of the portrayal of a betrayer who participates in the Last Supper; Contrast Rese, Die "Stunde," p. 68f.

with "the Son of Man being handed over" (Mk. 14:21). Luke does not take these over. We need to account for these non-allusions and to consider the question whether any historical detail narrated in the words of OT Scripture finds its origin in the OT. The OT ideas which remain in these non-allusions should be considered as well as some terms whose meaning depends on OT usage: ἰδοὺ; ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ (22:21); παρεύεται used absolutely; οὐαί (22:22). Besides some of these OT ideas which qualify in form as LXX style, there are some other elements of LXX style imitation: καὶ αὐτοί; ἡρξάντο plus the infinitive (22:23).

#### Old Testament Allusion

It is fairly well accepted that the phrase by which Jesus designates his betrayer, ὁ ἐσθίων μετ' ἐμοῦ (Mk. 14:18) is an allusion to Ps. 40(41):10 ὁ ἐσθίων ἄρτους μου.<sup>1</sup> Although Luke presents the same idea, that one of Jesus' table fellowship will betray him, he does not retain the wording which agrees with the psalm.<sup>2</sup> Explanations for Luke's non-allusion usually focus on his literary methods or his theological purposes. As part of the simple explanation that Luke's choice of sources eliminated this allusion,<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>France (p. 260) classifies it as a possible verbal allusion; Dittmar (p. 78) calls it a quotation in a wider sense; cf. 1 QH 5:23-24, יְהוֹשֻׁעַ יֵשֶׁת לִפְנֵי הָאֵלֹהִים and 4th cent. LXX papyri 2013, 2050, ὁ ἐσθίων ἄρτους μου μετ' ἐμοῦ; DeWaard (p. 65f.) observes that possibly the LXX reading goes back to a Hebrew text tradition of which the Qumran reading is an example; this makes the allusion in Mark even clearer and gives a slight basis for seeing the retention of some sort of an allusion in Luke; cf. J. 13:18 with its quotation of Ps. 40(41):10.

<sup>2</sup>A. Stöger (Das Evangelium nach Lukas (Geistliche Schriftlesung, II; Düsseldorf, 1966), p. 231) however, calls it an echo of Ps. 40(41):10; G. W. H. Lampe ("Luke," Peake's Commentary on the Bible, ed. M. Black and H. H. Rowley (London, 1962), p. 840) believes that Luke's rewording of Mark here was to clarify Mark and may have been influenced by Ps. 40(41):3. This is not the only occurrence of the phrase "to deliver into the hands of" (especially enemies) in the Psalms (Ps. 105(106):41; cf. 26(27):12; 73(74):19; 118(119):121; 139(140):9 in which though the term "hand" is not used, the idea is the same). This is also one of the common uses of παράδιδόναι in the rest of the OT. Therefore, Ps. 40(41):3 is not necessarily an influence on Luke's choice of words, nor does his choice of words necessarily create an allusion to that OT passage.

<sup>3</sup>Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, p. 111.

there is the fact that his choice of sources was based on a preference for an abbreviated account. This account does not see as essential the inclusion of a saying of Jesus, which functions primarily as an allusion. This brevity contributes to the purpose to which Luke puts dinner scenes in his gospel. He normally uses them as a setting for the teaching of Jesus. According to Luke in contrast to Mark, Jesus alone is the initiator of conversation at the Last Supper table. The disciples only speak in response to Jesus' statements and then only when Jesus has addressed the disciples directly (cf. 22:33; 38). In Lk. 22:23 unlike Mark (Mk. 14:19) Jesus is not addressed and the words of the disciples' response, as they converse among themselves, are not given. The Markan account includes the give-and-take of dialogue, especially in the narrative about the betrayer. Luke may have desired to emphasize the words of Jesus. Thus, he chose the source which contained an abbreviated account of the announcement and then inserted the Markan word about the divine necessity of Jesus' betrayal and death into the middle of it. The words of Jesus were not then interrupted by the concern of the disciples.<sup>1</sup>

The theological reasons why Luke may have omitted this allusion are that it conflicted with the way he wanted to present the fulfilment of Scripture in Jesus' mission, and that it created a difficulty concerning the free will and responsibility which Judas had in his action.<sup>2</sup> The

---

<sup>1</sup>Schmid (p. 325) explains that Luke omits the allusion because he has regrouped Markan material and as a result the disciples are now no longer eating. Schmid, however, does not take into account either the retained reference to being at the table or the abrupt transition from the words of institution to this word (22:21), which does not assume that the meal is over but rather that it is continuing.

<sup>2</sup>cf. S. Brown's (Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke (Analecta Biblica, XXXVI; Rome, 1968), p. 93f.) view that Luke does not view Judas' betrayal as part of the determinate will of God as prophesied in Scripture, since it could not at the same time be an act of free will. This view is not supported by the rest of the evidence in this brief passage, which seems to place side by side the divine necessity of Jesus' going and the decision of the betrayer over whom a woe may be pronounced for his deed (22:22-23).

indications which Luke gives that Scripture is being fulfilled in the life and death of Jesus seem to come in general statements which emphasize the necessity of God's will working itself out (e.g. 22:22; the use of δεῖ e.g. 9:22; 22:37; 24:7, 26, 44). They also stress that all the Scriptures are being fulfilled in Jesus' mission (e.g. 18:31-34; 24:25-27; 44-46). An allusion to a specific passage does not appropriately express either this perspective or this emphasis. It would slow the dynamic of the unfolding plan of God as it is being acted out, by referring us to the promise when Luke wants us to experience the fulfilment. And by pointing to a specific passage, the general claim for all the Scriptures is diminished in power. A more effective way to make his point is to turn the specific OT allusions he encounters into themes. This is what we shall be able to see in the OT idea area: Jesus is the Righteous Sufferer, betrayed even by those who sit at table with him.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Otto (p. 271) proposes that Obadiah 7 is the OT basis for what he considers to be an interpolation into an account of the Last Supper (22:21-23). But there is no verbal parallelism or even close similarity in thought which would establish Obadiah 7 as the passage alluded to; Schürmann (III - Jesu Abschiedsrede, p. 19, n. 88) also is not convinced; Boismard (II, pp. 379, 386) contends that the wording of this pronouncement, the promise of a feast in the kingdom (22:28-30), and the prediction of Peter's betrayal (22:31-34), all echo the episode in David's life where he is betrayed by Mephibosheth during Absalom's rebellion (2. Km. 9:7-13; 16:1-4; and chapter 15). Though the relationship of 2 Km. 15 to Lk. 22:31-34 has received some support (see below, pp. 244ff. ), Boismard appears to be alone in his contention for the connection of Mephibosheth and Judas. The verbal parallelism consists only in ἐὰν ἦς παρὰ ἐμέ which serves two different functions in the OT and Luke. In the OT it signifies the provision of the king while in the NT the emphasis is on table fellowship (cf. TDNT, VIII, p. 212). Further, this verbal parallelism is based on a phrase which is by no means unique to the Mephibosheth episodes (cf. 3 Km. 13:20; Ezk. 39:20), although it is used quite frequently there (2 Km. 9:7-13; 19:29). The material parallelism must ultimately be based on an identification of Jesus as the Davidic Messiah, who experiences what David experiences, for Mephibosheth's action and its consequences do not really coincide with Judas'. Mephibosheth's betrayal does not further Absalom's rebellion. Although Luke does present Jesus as the Son of David (1:32; 2:4, 11; 18:38, 39/Mk. 10:47, 48; cf. 19:38/Mk. 11:10/Mt. 21:9), there are not enough indicators from the immediate context of Lk. 22:21-23 that he wants to allude to a Davidic incident there. If Luke had not inserted his Markan Son of Man saying (22:22/Mk. 14:21), possibly a case could be built for the wording of Lk. 22:21-23; 28-30; 31-34 being a kind of midrash on 2 Km. 15-17. Possibly Luke's special source used tradition which had been developed that way (cf. Selwyn, Oracles, pp. 349ff.). But Luke through his emphasis on the Passover and his insertion of Markan interpretation ignores any allusion to incidents from the life of David.

The other non-allusion to the OT occurs when Luke during his insertion of Mk. 14:21 changes καθὼς γέγραπται to κατὰ τὸ ὁρισμένον (Lk. 22:22) and eliminates the direct connection between the Scriptures and the departure of the Son of Man through betrayal. Because Luke especially emphasizes that the death of Jesus was according to the Scriptures, it is important to discover why he makes this change. Those who explain the change from his choice of sources merely push the explanation one step backward. They no longer seek to explain why Luke changed Mark. Instead they must explain why he chose another source over Mark.<sup>1</sup> Luke's use of the verb ὀρίσκειν shows that it is probable that he introduced it at this point (cf. in the NT except for Ro. 1:4; Hb. 4:7, ὀρίσκειν occurs only in Luke: Ac. 2:23; 10:42; 11:29; 17:26, 31; cf. also Luke's use of the substantive participle after κατὰ: Lk. 2:24, 27; Ac. 23:31).<sup>2</sup>

The reason for Luke's change of wording here may be sought either in his understanding of the OT background of the phrase "the Son of man goes . . . but woe to that man by whom he is betrayed"<sup>3</sup> or in his general approach to the role of the OT in the life and ministry of Jesus. Luke may not have known an OT text which he believed was a prediction of that action. On the other hand, it may have been more than one OT passage which Luke thought of so he made the Markan statement more general.<sup>4</sup> To explain the change from Luke's general approach to the relationship of the OT to the mission of Jesus is to see that Luke "interprets the meaning in a way

---

<sup>1</sup>e.g. Rehkopf's (p. 17) explanation that Luke used a source that came out of a Hellenistic circle and not a Jewish-palestinian one, does not really account for the change any differently than those who say that Luke expressed Mark's thought in Hellenistic terms (e.g. Bertram, p. 21).

<sup>2</sup>cf. Rese, Die "Stunde," p. A45, n. 17.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 98.

<sup>4</sup>Hooker, p. 99, n. 1; However, she builds her argument on the fact that Luke prefers to use γέγραπται with definite quotations; But there are exceptions (cf. Lk. 24:46).

which reflects his own understanding of Scripture, based on the idea of God's plan which emerges from redemptive history."<sup>1</sup> Since Luke can make general statements about scriptural fulfilment using *ἐξ ὧν*, the explanation from Luke's general approach to Scripture and not his lack of knowledge of a particular proof-text seems to be more reasonable here. Yet, it is not so much Luke's understanding of the relation of salvation history to Scripture, which made him change the wording, as it is the perspective from which he wants his readers to view that history. He, again, wants them to watch the events dynamically unfold as the determined plan of God realizes itself. There may also be a shift in focus from the attention which "written concerning him" gives to Jesus to a focus on Judas' act which the more general statement yields.<sup>2</sup>

The reference to the OT figure, the Son of Man, in Jesus' prediction of his betrayal introduces us to a portion of Luke's Christology, which relies heavily on OT and possibly Jewish thought. In the passion narrative we have examples of a Son of Man saying which predicts the Son of Man's death and resurrection (22:22, 48) and a saying which describes the Son of Man in eschatological glory (22:69).<sup>3</sup> Our current saying (22:22) is an example of a Son of Man saying which predicts the Son of Man's suffering and resurrection (9:22; 9:44; 18:31-34; 22:22, 48; 24:7). We shall attempt to characterize this group as Luke presents it and see the contribution which Lk. 22:22 makes to it. At the appropriate place we shall deal with the saying that places

---

<sup>1</sup>Conzelmann, Theology of Luke, p. 158; cf. S. Schulz (ZNW, LIV, p. 115) who sees this as an example of Luke's adjustment for his Gentile audience of the proof from Scripture approach to understanding the mission of Jesus. Now the determined will of God is central. Scripture becomes identical with the divine foreknowledge and plan; cf. Ungern-Sternberg (p. 288) who sees this as an instance of Luke's change from the early approach to the relationship of the OT and the mission of Jesus, which stressed fulfilment through clearly, though naively cited proof-texts. Now the OT became the source of the mysterious texts of a Christian gnosis.

<sup>2</sup>cf. Maurer ZTK, L, p. 9; cf. Schürmann (III - Jesu Abschiedsrede, p. 4), who says it probably serves to bring out the significance of the divine determination of the event.

<sup>3</sup>F. Hahn, The Titles of Jesus in Christology, trans. H. Knight and G. Ogg (Lutterworth Library; London, 1969), pp. 21ff.



the Son of Man in an eschatological context.

Before we look at Luke's concept of the suffering Son of Man, we need to understand his use of the term in general and the probable OT context from which he takes it. As in the other Gospels it is Jesus alone who uses the term Son of Man. Though there is a dispute whether Jesus actually did use the term to refer to himself,<sup>1</sup> it is clear that the gospel writers understood the term as a self-designation for Jesus. Luke does not differ markedly from the other gospel writers in his concept of Jesus as the Son of Man.<sup>2</sup> It is the messianic title of Jesus during his earthly ministry when his messianic glory is hidden. It both conceals and reveals Jesus' true identity as the Messiah (9:20-22; 22:67-69).<sup>3</sup> It does this in such a way that Jesus is able to avoid the Jewish misconceptions of the messianic role which had come to be attached to the other messianic designations such as ἐχριστός. The paradoxical nuance given by a self-designation, whose basic meaning points to one's solidarity with mankind, one's humanity, but whose OT use points to the supernatural nature of a heavenly being, one like a son of man (Da. 7:13), perfectly suits Jesus' purposes in bearing witness to himself in his earthly ministry. Luke reports that Jesus uses it in sayings which declare his authority on earth now to call men into a saving relationship with God (e.g. 5:24; 19:10; cf. 12:8; 9:26). He also uses it to speak of his authority in the End-time when he comes in his full glory (e.g. 9:26; 12:40; 18:8; 21:27). The

---

<sup>1</sup>I. H. Marshall, "The Synoptic Son of Man Sayings in Recent Discussion," NTS, XII (1965-66), pp. 327-351.

<sup>2</sup>Tsat, p. 108.

<sup>3</sup>J. C. O'Neill, The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting (London, 1961), p. 141; France, p. 138; R. Maddox ("The Function of the Son of Man According to the Synoptic Gospels," NTS, XV (1968-69), p. 72) suggests that the title signifies for the synoptic writers Jesus' function as eschatological judge. But this is only part of his role as Son of Man (cf. 19:10; 24:7).

events which link the Son of Man's earthly mission with his return are his suffering and death through which he enters the glory with which he will return (cf. the suffering Son of Man sayings and 24:26).

Daniel 7 (Da. 7:13) appears to contain most of the elements which characterize the Son of Man in the Gospels. Luke reports that Jesus clearly alludes to Daniel 7 (Da. 7:13), when he describes the glorious coming of the Son of Man (21:27; contrast 22:69/Mk. 14:62). This should probably be taken as the basic OT context in which to understand the essential meaning of the term Son of Man in Luke.<sup>1</sup> The figure of one like a Son of Man coming with clouds to the Ancient of Days, who in turn delivers to him a kingdom which lasts forever, contains the theme of this figure's humanity and vulnerability as well as the theme of his glory and authority. The humanity or vulnerability of the Son of Man is manifested by his placement in contrast with the powerful beasts who have just preceded him in the vision (Da. 7:3ff.), and from the use of the term in the OT to signify the frailty of humanity (Ps. 143(144):3; 11(12):2, 9; 89(90):3; Ezk. 31:14). These themes are all taken up in the categories of NT usage as we have described them.

One special problem which arises when we propose to see Daniel 7 as the OT source of the NT use of Son of Man is that Daniel 7 does not appear

---

<sup>1</sup>Dalman, Words, p. 255; F. H. Borsch (The Son of Man in Myth and History (NT Library; London, 1967), p. 400) suggests that Son of Man means the Adamite one, who has been represented by many figures in the history of Israel, e.g. David, Enoch, Jonah, Elijah, Moses. This general typological approach to the title does not do justice to the consistent presence of the themes of authority and eschatological glory in the gospel use of the term; Tabachovitz (p. 121f. ) proposes that the use of Son of Man in Ezekiel is the proper OT background. Though the affinities between Ezekiel and Daniel should be noted and any explanation of the term's use in Daniel should not ignore the influence of Ezekiel (cf. A. Feuillet, "Le Fils de l'Homme de Daniel et la Tradition Biblique," RB, LX (1953), pp. 182ff.), the main OT context for NT usage should be recognized as Daniel; Hoskyns (Mysterium Christi, p. 85) suggests Psalm 8 as the possible OT background. Again the eschatological context is not clear.

to describe the suffering of the Son of Man.<sup>1</sup> The two most generally accepted theories concerning the proper OT source for the OT idea of a suffering Son of Man are either to see it as a concept which combines the roles of the Son of Man with the Isaianic suffering Servant<sup>2</sup> or to find it in the persecution of the saints of the Most High, of whom the Son of Man is a representative (Da. 7:21, 25).<sup>3</sup> The difficulty with the first explanation is that it does not tell us satisfactorily why the combination of ideas took place. It does not indicate what it is in the Daniel 7 context which might suggest a link with Isaiah 53. Rather the argument seems to be based on a process of elimination. Since no other OT context provides the theme of suffering connected with one who is God's appointed Servant then Isaiah 53 must have been creatively connected with the term.<sup>4</sup>

The other view demands that we make a logical inference from the experience of the saints of the Most High to the experience of the Son of Man. Since the saints of the Most High suffer then it is logical to assume that the one who represents them also suffers.<sup>5</sup> This might be the simple solution if the equation of Son of Man and saints of the Most High were clearer. The literary structure of Daniel 7 presents a vision followed

<sup>1</sup>H. H. Rowley, The Servant of the Lord and Other Essays on the OT (London, 1952), p. 62, n. 2.

<sup>2</sup>V. Taylor, The Gospel According to St. Mark, 2nd ed. (London, 1966), p. 542; though he admits that Da. 7:21 may be a reference to such suffering; cf. J. Muilenberg ("The Son of Man in Daniel and the Ethiopian Apocalypse of Enoch," JBL, LXXIX (1960), p. 206), who maintains that none of the apocalyptic books which use the term Son of Man, present him as a suffering figure.

<sup>3</sup>C. F. D. Moule, "From Defendant to Judge and Deliver," SNTS Bull., III (1952-53), p. 45f.; N. Porteous (Daniel: A Commentary (OT Library; London, 1965), p. 111f.) agrees with C. H. Dodd (According to the Scriptures, p. 117) that a Christian understanding of Son of Man which combined Psalms 8, 79(80) and Daniel 7 could yield the idea of a suffering Son of Man. He maintains, however, that the writer of Daniel does not even hint at a "vicarious atonement" significance for that suffering.

<sup>4</sup>F. F. Bruce, This is That, p. 29f.

<sup>5</sup>Moule, SNTS Bull., III, p. 45.

by an interpretation. The four beasts (Da. 7:3ff.) are explained as four kings who reign over successive kingdoms (Da. 7:17). The one like a Son of Man (Da. 7:13) is not explicitly explained as the collective body, the saints of the Most High, but rather the interpretation simply states that the saints receive the kingdom (Da. 7:18; cf. 7:13). If the interpretation had been explicit then the equation would be beast = king, having a kingdom; one like a Son of Man = saints of the Most High, having a kingdom.<sup>1</sup> In that case the symbol of one like a son of man just as the symbol of the beast would function in the vision only as a visual representation of the saints of the Most High. It would not be accorded any independent existence of its own so that it would be meaningful to attribute to it other experiences which the saints had. It would have no more content than what is explicitly given to it in the vision: it would symbolize only the saints receiving the kingdom. However, the interpretation does not make such a symbolic identity. Thus, the figure of the Son of Man functions in an ambiguous way in relation to the saints of the Most High. He has an independent existence over against them. Yet, he is in a representative fashion likened to them. Through the structure of vision and interpretation what is acted out in heavenly visual terms (beasts and one like a Son of Man) occurs also on earth in history (kings and saints of the Most High). However, the interpretation of the vision (Da. 7:18) does not explicitly identify the Son of Man receiving the kingdom as the saints of the Most High receiving the kingdom. Thus it does not restrict the identification of the Son of Man with the saints of the Most High only in their glorified state.<sup>2</sup> The way is open for attributing to the Son of Man other experiences, especially the suffering experiences of the saints.

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. T. W. Manson ("The Son of Man in Daniel, Enoch and the Gospels," BJRL, XXXII (1949-50), p. 174), who sees it as a symbol or name for the godly remnant in Israel, but who also says that we must continually reckon with oscillation between seeing the social unit as a collection of individuals and a corporate personality, so that Son of Man could come to be viewed as a corporate entity embodied par excellence in an individual, Jesus (p. 191).

<sup>2</sup>Contrast Rowley, p. 62, n. 2.

And because he has an independent existence it may be supposed that he experiences that suffering in history.<sup>1</sup>

The way is then left open by the OT context to make the logical inference without the aid of other Scriptures, that the Son of Man does suffer. We need to look at the Lukan suffering Son of Man sayings to see how this inference was established. One of the unique features of Luke's suffering Son of Man sayings is the explanation that the disciples did not understand the OT prophecy concerning the suffering Son of Man, because the meaning was hidden from them (9:45; 18:34). Another feature is the emphasis on the fulfilment of Scripture in the Son of Man's suffering (18:31). Luke stresses that "everything that is written of the Son of Man by the prophets," must be fulfilled. Indeed, Luke consistently points out the need for taking into account everything which is prophesied about the Messiah or Son of Man, especially the necessity of his sufferings (18:31; 24:25-27, 44; Ac. 3:18; 13:29; cf. Lk. 21:22; Ac. 3:24; 10:43). This may indicate, aside from an anti-Jewish apologetic against the view that the Messiah is only a triumphant victorious leader, that it was difficult to establish at first glance the OT basis for the suffering of the Messiah or the Son of Man. One had to be careful to take into account all which the prophet had spoken about the messianic figure.

The verb which occurs most frequently in the Lukan suffering Son of Man sayings is παράδοσθαι. While this has been seized upon immediately by some as an indication that the Isaianic suffering Servant has provided

---

<sup>1</sup>Feuillet, RB, LX, p. 191f.; cf. De. 8:17. C. K. Barrett ("The Background of Mark 10:45," NT Essays: Studies in Memory of T. W. Manson, ed. A. J. B. Higgins (Manchester, 1959), pp. 14ff.) emphasizes the martyrological context in which the visions of Enoch and Daniel are placed as further evidence that suffering may be inferred for the Son of Man. Contrast R. T. France, "The Servant of the Lord in the Teaching of Jesus," Tyn. Bull., XIX (1968), p. 47f.

the suffering content for the saying,<sup>1</sup> there is a use of παρὰ δόνα in Da. 7:25 which is much closer in meaning to its use in the Lukan suffering Son of Man sayings. In Isaiah (Is. 53:6, 12) the emphasis is on God or the Servant voluntarily handing over the Servant's life for others. Nothing explicit is said about the means by which this handing over, death, takes place. Death is described as a relinquishing of one's control over oneself, of handing oneself over to the power of death. In Daniel and the gospel sayings, the emphasis is upon the power under whose sway the saints or the Son of Man now come when they are handed over (into the hands of men (9:44/Mk. 9:31); the nations (18:32/Mk. 10:33); hands of sinful men (24:7 cf. Mk. 14:41); Da. 7:25 - into the hands of the little horn). It seems more appropriate then to take Daniel 7 as the proper OT background for the use of παρὰ δόνα with the Son of Man.<sup>2</sup>

We may call Lk. 22:22, 23 an allusion to Da. 7:13, 25 only in the sense that this is the only OT passage which materially refers to the saints of the Most High and by implication the Son of Man being handed over. We might better call it an OT idea. Luke's removal of the second Son of Man (Mk. 14:21), which made the connection in Mark even closer, is the result of stylistic considerations, the avoidance of repetition.<sup>3</sup> It probably shows that neither a verbal nor material allusion to Daniel 7 was intended by Luke. The method by which the allusion/idea is applied to the NT situation is promise and fulfilment (ὑποσχεθέν; cf. 18:31, τελεσθῆσεται). Since Da. 7:25 is part of the interpretation of a vision of things yet to be, such an application does not violate the

---

<sup>1</sup>Selwyn, Oracles, p. 377; See above, p. 114, where we have noted that παρὰ δόνα does not necessarily always serve as a pointer to Isaiah 53.

<sup>2</sup>Contrast Popkes (p. 224f.), who rests his case on the lack of such an interpretation in Jewish apocalyptic literature, but he fails to give a positive solution for how παρὰ δόνα and Son of Man came to be associated.

<sup>3</sup>Rehkopf, p. 20f.

intention of the original writer. We have already seen how the grammatical sense of Da. 7:25 with its reference to the suffering of the saints might be understood as possibly applicable to the Son of Man. This application in the NT should not be deemed as necessarily a violation of grammatical sense. Rather it is a matter of extending the role of the Son of Man in Daniel to be a representative figure not only of the glory but also of the suffering of the saints. It is part of an interpretation which desires to explain all that is written concerning him. As far as the appropriateness of applying this interpretation to Jesus is concerned we may note several similarities of circumstances. Both Jesus and the saints suffer unjustly. (It should be noted that also in Daniel's view the saints of the Most High as part of rebellious Israel are not sinless. They suffer captivity and persecution as judgment for their sin (e.g. Da. 9:8). Their saintliness is manifest in their confession of their sin and the sin of the whole nation (e.g. Da. 9:20; 12:10). While this understanding of suffering is present in Daniel, it does not show itself in Daniel 7. Since God judges the oppressing nations (Da. 7:26), the suffering which the saints endure at their hands (Da. 7:25) appears to have been to some extent unjustified.) Both are delivered over by God in his permissive or active will. Both are given into the hands of a supernatural power of evil which works through the instrumentality of sinful men.

It is the failure of the Jews and the disciples to see that the Son of Man must suffer as well as receive the glory of the kingdom which is part of the reason why Luke reports that Jesus employs this OT idea at this point in his farewell discourse. Luke portrays Jesus as one who constantly tries to communicate to his disciples that his mission involves suffering as well as glory (9:20-22; 9:43b-44; 18:30-31). Jesus claims that the Scriptures validate this path of his messianic mission. It is to keep in balance both sides of the equation, the glorious Son of Man

must suffer and the suffering Son of Man will be glorified, that Luke includes in his passion narrative two references to the suffering Son of Man (22:22, 48) and one to the glorified Son of Man (22:69). The Son of Man will be betrayed and handed over. This is as it is appointed. It is to overcome the unthinkable-ness of this event, rather than to emphasize the authority of the Son of Man who miraculously knows his own destiny and resolves to act sovereignly,<sup>1</sup> that Luke refers to the divinely determined nature of the Son of Man's going and his betrayal. Besides this negative function of the idea, to guard against a misunderstanding of Jesus' suffering, there is also a positive function. The betrayal of Judas, as at Lk. 22:3, is again placed in proper perspective and its full significance is revealed. He is not betraying just a potential political revolutionary who failed to live up to his followers' expectations. He is betraying the Son of Man, God's Chosen One. Hence Judas' act and his responsibility is of cosmic importance and his guilt is all the greater.<sup>2</sup> Judas is the means through which the Son of Man is handed over to the forces of evil. In this saying the purely secular meaning of *παράδοσις* "betrayed" is thrust into the background. The use of the passive, along with the antithetical parallelism in which this saying is placed with the statement about the Son of Man going as it is appointed, show that Luke intends to bring the theological meaning to the fore.<sup>3</sup> Judas is simply the human agent of an action which originates in the determined will of God. Through the use of a word which can have this range of meaning Luke may move easily from Lk. 22:21 where the

---

<sup>1</sup>Tödt, p. 187.

<sup>2</sup>cf. Maddox, *NTS*, XV, p. 72; Lk. 22:48.

<sup>3</sup>Popkes, p. 280.



meaning "to betray" predominates to Lk. 22:22 where the meaning "to be handed over" (to the powers of evil according to the will of God) comes to the fore.<sup>1</sup> And it is the use of *παράδοσιν* to describe the fate of the saints of the Most High of whom the Son of Man is representative, which serves as the basis for this special nuance of meaning here. The original source of this allusion/idea is pre-Lukan. He takes the statement over from Mark. Since the early church did not seem to make much use of the title Son of Man, it is probable that the allusion's ultimate origin is, as Luke reports it, Jesus.<sup>2</sup>

On the historical question whether Judas did share the Last Supper with Jesus, the lack of the allusion (Ps. 40(41):10/Mk. 14:18) in Luke may show either Luke's false confidence in the historicity of a detail whose true origin was the OT, or Luke's use of that historical detail as an essential element in his narrative. There is nothing historically inconsistent in the narrative. It is most likely that Judas would keep close to Jesus and his party both to observe their movements and to disguise as long as possible his treachery. The datum of the supernatural precognition of Jesus cannot be tested by the scientific historical critical method and its presence does not depend on the OT. Though the fact that Jesus predicted this betrayal is not essential to the basic thread of the narrative, it does exist in at least three independent traditions (Mt./Mk.; Lk.; J.), which vary in the degree to which they relate it to the OT. Though at a later stage in the tradition the detail may have been preserved because of that connection with the OT, that it originated in history should not be ruled out. Since there is no Jewish exegetical tradition which interprets this

---

<sup>1</sup>Contrast Voss (p. 103f.), who argues that v. 22 should be seen not in opposition to but in agreement with the "voluntary self-giving" of Jesus signified in the words of institution. In view of v. 21 which explicitly makes Jesus the subject of betrayal, it is difficult to see any active sense of Jesus' voluntary handing over of himself in v. 22.

<sup>2</sup>See below, p. 418.

psalm messianically, Strauss concedes that the allusion arises ex eventu.<sup>1</sup> However he is not willing to admit that the event is anything more specific than the death of Jesus, the scandal of which must be explained from the OT. To say that the early church developed an explanation on the basis of the OT which introduces a traitor from Jesus' own group and then also places him at the Last Supper table because the OT so prophecies, seems to attribute to the early community an unnecessary amount of creativity. They produce more than the task of explaining the scandal of the death requires of them. The simple causal chain which begins with the historical details is more plausible.

The OT then influences the handing down of the detail in the tradition. It may be expressed in the words of the OT, which it fulfills. The simple fact that the detail is preserved may be due to its value as an event which fulfills OT prophecy. Luke does not allude to the OT with this detail and by this he shows that the origin and original functioning of the detail could have been independent of the OT.

#### Old Testament Idea

Luke uses the OT meaning of four terms as he develops the theological themes of this section: ἰδοὺ, ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ (22:21); πορεύεσθαι meaning "to pass away, to die"; οὐαί (22:22). We have already encountered the use of ἰδοὺ in the speech of Jesus.<sup>2</sup> It has the same function here. The interjection calls the readers attention to a fact which is known to Jesus by prophetic foreknowledge. By introducing the prediction this way Luke is again saying to the reader, "Look at this; watch and see whether it does not happen." Interestingly Luke introduces the episode which fulfills this prediction with the same interjection (22:47; cf. Mk. 14:43).<sup>3</sup> This is not

---

<sup>1</sup> Strauss, p. 630.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 128.

<sup>3</sup> cf. Fiedler (p. 65), who sees this use as well as 22:31 (cf. 9:38; 10:19; 13:16, 32) as a literary device to draw both narrative and dialogue under one theme; the activity of Satan.

Luke's practice in the presentation of the fulfilment of other predictions, which he has introduced with ἰδοὺ (22:10; 31; cf. 22:13, 54-62). The OT prophets are again the model for this interjection. Though there is more of a tendency for Luke to introduce the interjection into narration than into the words of Jesus (cf. 6X in narration; 4X in Jesus' speech), we do not rule out the possibility that Luke has introduced it into his non-Markan source at this point. Since there is no accompanying finite verb in the statement introduced by ἰδοὺ, it is more likely that Luke found the sentence in that form in his source. Presumably, if he introduced ἰδοὺ into a sentence which had no verb at all, he would also have introduced a finite verb.<sup>1</sup> In either case, this frequent LXXism in Luke-Acts is an integral part of his style and has its own theological significance. It is a pointer to the events which God will bring to pass as Jesus the prophet foretells them.

Most common in the writings of the OT is the use of a part of the body to stand as a circumlocution for the whole person. The expression, "hand of" someone (ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ = αὐτοῦ) which is "with" another person (2 Km. 3:12; 14:19) or "against" him (1 Km. 24:11), conveys the strength of the friendship or the opposition.<sup>2</sup> The circumlocution is also used when either the performer of a deed is to be stressed (Num. 33:1; 2 Km. 21:22), or the performer of the deed is only an instrument of another, a ruler or God himself (e.g. 2 Km. 3:18; 10:2). The second use would allow for the relationship of Satan and Judas to be implied in Luke's use (22:21). Judas is Satan's instrument (cf. 22:3).<sup>3</sup> More probable, however, is the use of "the hand of"

---

<sup>1</sup>Rehkopf, p. 10f.; Contrast Schlürmann (III - Jesu Abschiedsrede, p. 16), who sees it as a Lukan insertion as part of his reformulation of Mk. 14:18, 20 which he allows to retain a semiticizing flavor.

<sup>2</sup>Rehkopf, p. 11; Rehkopf suggests that this is the significance of the ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ here. The traitor is in closest fellowship with Jesus at the table.

<sup>3</sup>Rese, Die "Stunde," p. 98.

to emphasize the treachery of the betrayal. The betrayer is capable of being present, undetected, at the table. The hand of the one handing me over is with me. This corresponds with the dramatic force which Luke gives to the plot against Jesus when more than once he describes in graphic language the desire of the conspirators to lay their hands on Jesus (20:19; 22:53). This element of LXX style has probably been taken over from Luke's source. It was originally just translation Greek of this saying of Jesus. This element of LXX style contributes to the gravity and authority of Jesus' words, as well as brings out the treachery of the deed.

In the OT the verb יָצַח was used euphemistically to describe death (e.g. Hos. 13:3; Ps. 77(78):39). The usage probably originated as an imitation of the description of death in the Pentateuch. There the dead were gathered to their fathers (Gen. 15:15; 49:29, 33; 25:8). The LXX used πορεύομαι to translate this meaning for יָצַח. Luke uses πορεύομαι in the same way (22:33; Ac. 1:25). Though πορεύομαι may signify the act of dying in secular Greek (cf. Plato, Phaedo 115a: οὕτω περιμένει τὴν εἰς Ἅιδου πορείαν ὡς πορευόμενος ὅταν ἡ ἐμαρμένη καλῇ)<sup>1</sup> its frequency in the LXX may have had some influence in Luke's choice of it as he edits Mark. Also the similar usage in secular Greek probably influenced Luke's choice of πορεύομαι for the sake of clarity. Secular Greek does not use ὑπάγω in this special sense.

There is a difference from the LXX, however, in Luke's usage. "... the NT does not share the OT view of this as expressed in resignation and lamentation. Jesus as the earthly Son of Man regards His going to death as the way which God has divinely appointed for Him for the saving of man."<sup>2</sup> Another OT idea which may be the basis for this difference is the Exodus

<sup>1</sup> cf. TJNT, (VI, p. 567), which comments that secular Greek uses πορεύομαι in descriptions of the dead mostly to denote their movement in Hades, οὐ κατὰ πορεύομενοι.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

motif which Luke has expressed with this verb (9:51, 53; 13:33).<sup>1</sup> The fact that the statement is made in a Passover context and that Luke uses the verb elsewhere to describe Jesus' exodus may mean that he intends to remind us of his appointed departure through suffering to glory. But as Navone points out the "transcendent reality of Jesus' departure, expressed by the concepts of the exodus and analempsis, is not explicit here."<sup>2</sup> At the most we have Lukan stylistic editing for clarity, which happens to coincide with one of his theological themes.

The pronouncement of "woe" (ὠαί) in Luke occurs solely in Jesus' words. The pronouncement may come as a judgment over those who do evil. This carries with it an explicit or implicit warning of punishment to come (e.g. 6:24-26; 11:42-47; cf. Mt. 23:23-29). It may be a prophetic exclamation over the sufferings of those who will experience God's judgment in the End-time (Lk. 21:23/Mk. 13:17). Both of these uses have parallels in the LXX (e.g. Hos. 7:13; Is. 5:20; Zeph. 2:5; Ezk. 7:26). A unique combination of these two meanings occurs in the employment of ὠαί at Lk. 22:22 and 17:1 (cf. Mt. 18:7). The paradox of the necessary coming of the judgment of God, which is at the same time the result of God's retributive punishment of sinful men, could easily be destroyed by a rationalization which excuses man's responsibility. This would be all the more true in the case of Jesus' death since it has been determined by the will of God not for man's punishment but for his salvation. However, the pronouncement of "woe" over Judas' act preserves the paradox and even increases the seriousness of Judas' guilt and impending punishment in accordance with the theological significance of his crime. The basis for maintaining Judas' responsibility is the OT moral framework, which pronounces "woe" on those who flout God's moral laws. God's moral order will be vindicated in coming judgment.

---

<sup>1</sup>Torrey, Our Translated Gospels, p. 133; Navone, p. 67.

<sup>2</sup>Navone, p. 67.

Judas' act, though one which helps accomplish the determined will of God, is still committed within the suzerainty of God's moral order. Since it flouts God's laws, it is an act which will be punished and over which "woe" may properly be pronounced. Since the one betrayed is the Son of Man, the "woe" is all the more heavy.

There is also a gracious side to the warning. It shows how earnestly Jesus wanted Judas to repent of his action. Both here and in the garden (22:48), by making Judas aware of the seriousness of what he is doing, Jesus constantly gives him opportunity to repent and be forgiven. In the same way the OT prophets' warnings were with a view to the people's repentance (e.g. Is. 1:4, 16-20, 24).

#### Old Testament Style

One transliteration from the Hebrew which accords with the LXX (οὐαί , 22:22) and two semitic constructions (καὶ αὐτοῖς ; ἤρξαντο plus the infinitive, 22:23), in addition to the stylistic elements which we have already looked at as OT ideas (ἰδοὺ , ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ , 22:21), need to be considered. Although οὐαί occurs in secular Greek (Epictetus III:19:1 οὐαί μοι ) and could be classified as a Latinism for vae, in the NT it is probably an adoption of the LXX transliteration of אֵי ; אֵי.<sup>1</sup> Luke also uses the LXX transliteration form of this Hebrew term.<sup>2</sup>

There is no overall LXX coloring to the syntactical structure of this short section. Word order is not semitic (subject - verb - object, 2X; cf. the word order of the relatively fixed title, ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ). There is only one καί coordinating conjunction (22:23).

The introduction to v. 23, καὶ αὐτοῖς ἤρξαντο plus the infinitive, exhibits semitisms which are acceptable in Greek and also are characteristics of LXX style.<sup>3</sup> The use of an emphasized and unemphasized καὶ αὐτοῖς —

<sup>1</sup>BDF, ¶ 4:2.

<sup>2</sup>Creed, p. lxxxix.

<sup>3</sup>W. Michaelis, "Das unbetonte αὐτοῖς bei Lukas," Stud. Theol. IV (1951-52), pp. 88ff.; Tabachovitz, p. 24.

occurs throughout Luke (e.g. unemphasized - 17:13; 19:2,<sup>1</sup> emphasized - 5:1, 14; 6:20; 22:23, 41).<sup>2</sup> Though the unemphasized and simple emphasized uses do not occur in Acts (cf. Ac. 8:13; 24:16), the fact that Luke inserts these into his sources in his gospel allows us to understand this feature as an element in his style (cf. 5:1; 5:14/Mk. 1:44; 9:36/Mk. 9:8; Luke also removes some unemphasized *καὶ αὐτός* constructions from Mark - Mk. 3:13/Lk. 6:13; Mk. 4:38/Lk. 8:23, yet cf. Lk. 8:22/Mk. 4:36).<sup>3</sup> The emphasized and unemphasized *καὶ αὐτός* is also a feature of LXX style, rendering a little more than one half the occurrences of *וְאֵלֶּיךָ* (e.g. 1 Km. 4:18; it is also inserted for explanatory purposes, either with emphasized (1 Km. 17:42; Is. 3:14), or unemphasized (Gen. 32:7; Lev. 22:15) force). The presence of *καὶ αὐτός* in Lk. 22:23 could be explained as the result of Luke's editing of Mark to avoid asyndeton.<sup>4</sup> It is more likely, however, that the non-Markan source continuing from Lk. 22:21 contained these introductory words for they are necessary both for emphasis and to point out the change of speaker. The use is in accord with general Greek usage of an emphasized *αὐτός*, but the form is septuagintal and helps maintain the OT flavor of the account.

A possible LXXism is the construction *ἀρχόμενος* plus the infinitive (22:23).<sup>5</sup> Luke may be responsible for the construction at this point, being

<sup>1</sup>E. Schweizer, "Eine hebraisierende Sonderquelle des Lk?" *ThZ*, VI (1949-50), p. 168.

<sup>2</sup>Michaelis, *Stud. Theol.*, IV, p. 88.

<sup>3</sup>Contrast Schweizer (*ThZ*, VI, p. 170) and Schramm (p. 98); The former sees this feature as part of the evidence for one of Luke's sources; the latter is convinced that the lack of instances in Acts shows that it is not part of Luke's style.

<sup>4</sup>Rehkopf, p. 22f. cf. Schürmann (III - *Jesu Abschiedsrede*, p. 9), who says it is Luke's editing of Mark to avoid the vulgar expression *εἰς καὶ εἰς*.

<sup>5</sup>Tabachovitz (p. 24) contends it is not an Aramaism (cf. Dalman, *Words*, p. 27) or a feature of *koiné* but from its frequency in the LXX and NT is properly a LXXism. In the LXX *ἀρχόμενος* regularly translates the *hiphil* of *וָרָא* and *וָרָא*; See below, p. 447.

under the influence of Mk. 14:19. The purpose of the construction here is to emphasize the strength of emotion and concern with which the inquiry is undertaken (cf. 5:21; 19:37, 45; 23:3). It may also as it does in other places, draw attention to the theological significance of the action described by this reminiscence of OT style (e.g. Ac. 1:1). It is the Son of Man who is being betrayed. The inquiry is therefore all the more urgent. This theological perspective in this instance, however, seems to be more in the background for the construction primarily serves to emphasize the disciples' search.

The elements of LXX style imitation are fairly evenly distributed throughout this brief section. There is a slight concentration at the beginning of the perikope which may be intended to create a setting for the section and emphasize the theological importance of Jesus' words.



## CHAPTER V

## LUKE 22:24-30: PLACES IN THE KINGDOM

## Introduction

We now enter a part of the farewell discourse (22:24-38) which has very little corresponding material in Mark. The similarity of Lk. 22:24-27 to Mk. 10:41-45 and Lk. 22:28-30 to Mt. 19:28 has led the proponents of a strict two document source hypothesis to conclude that Luke has transferred these sayings from their positions in Mark and Q to this place in the Last Supper.<sup>1</sup> Linguistic analysis, however, shows that the differences between Mark and Luke may not all be explained from Luke's editing.<sup>2</sup> There is also a difference in material content between the two passages. Further a radical change in Luke's method of using Mark must be assumed if the two document source hypothesis approach is correct. These differences are only satisfactorily explained when it is concluded that Luke does not depend on Mark.<sup>3</sup>

The radical change in method, which the practitioners of the two document source hypothesis must attribute to Luke consists of the removal of a perikope from one section of Mark and transferring it many chapters later into a totally different context. This is, however, unprecedented in Luke.<sup>4</sup>

Linguistic analysis and observations concerning what is consistent with Luke's handling of his sources can go a long way to establishing a non-Markan source as basic for this section. But, we also have the added external

<sup>1</sup>e.g. Leaney, p. 269; Finegan, p. 13.

<sup>2</sup>cf. Schürmann III - Jesu Abschiedsrede, pp. 65-92; The agreement of Mark and Luke is only 31% (21/67 words), "a proportion not unduly high when it is remembered that independent versions must have much in common, and that verses 24, 26b, and 27 owe little, if anything, to Mark" (Taylor, The Passion Narrative, p. 62).

<sup>3</sup>cf. Creed, p. 267; Grundmann, p. 400; Schürmann III - Jesu Abschiedsrede, p. 64.

<sup>4</sup>Schürmann, III - Jesu Abschiedsrede, p. 64.

evidence from the Johannine account of the Last Supper: Jesus' washing the disciples' feet, acting as their servant (J. 13:4-20). This gives us reason to accept that the Lukan report of the dispute and the saying about service (22:24-27) has the Last Supper as its proper historical context.<sup>1</sup>

The proper original context of the saying in Mt. 19:28 cf. Lk. 22:28-30 is more difficult to determine, since the Matthew saying appears to be inserted into Mark (Mk. 10:29). However, linguistic analysis indicates that the differences are great enough to show that these sayings should be judged as independent of each other and not as both dependent on Q.<sup>2</sup> The argument that Lk. 22:28-30 is not appropriate to the Last Supper context because it follows the announcement of the betrayal<sup>3</sup> does not appreciate the fact that the form of the saying provides for that situation by indicating that it is faithfulness which is rewarded (22:28). The fact that the disciples prove themselves faithless by fleeing from Jesus at the arrest (Mk. 14:50) doesn't make Jesus' promise meaningless and unsuited for the setting of a supper which immediately precedes. The disciples' action shows neither a complete breakdown of faith (cf. Lk. 23:49; 22:31-34), nor an action which could not

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. J. A. Bailey, (Traditions Common to the Gospels of Luke and John (Suppl. to NovT, VII; Leiden, 1963), p. 36), who notes the connection between the footwashing and Lk. 22:24-27 but still sees the Lukan passage as taken from Mk. 10:41-45. His objection is that it is difficult to conceive of a quarrel of the disciples over rank following the institution of the Eucharist and the prophecy of the betrayal which had caused such a shocked reaction on their part (p. 35). But the seeds of the dispute are precisely in those two sayings of Jesus. His reference to the kingdom of God coming turned the disciples' minds to the banquet in the kingdom and where they would be placed with him (cf. Caird, p. 239). The announcement of betrayal excited protestations of loyalty from the disciples, cf. Peter's response to Jesus' announcement of his denial (22:31-34). It was an easy step from talk about who was the most loyal to who would receive the greatest honor in the kingdom. The washing of the disciples' feet and the interpretive words about service in John seem to be an antidote to a dispute which is mentioned in Luke (cf. P. H. Boulton, "Διακονία and its Cognates in the Four Gospels," Studia Evangelica, Vol. I; ed. K. Aland et. al (TU, LXXIII; Berlin, 1959) p. 416). These traditions complement each other and point to the historical reality behind them.

<sup>2</sup>Taylor, The Passion Narrative, p. 64.

<sup>3</sup>J. Dupont, "Le Logion des douze trônes," Biblica, XLV (1964), p. 359.

be forgiven (cf. 22:31-24). We conclude that Lk. 22:24-30 should be considered as coming from a non-Markan source and not dependent on Mk. or Q. Luke changes the focus from the immediate future to the near and distant future in this section. He uses OT ideas to describe mutual relationships in the community of the "new covenant." OT ideas also express the rewards that await the disciples when that kingdom comes in its fullness. It is probable that OT images and OT style rather than OT allusions are the main vehicles of these theological themes.

#### Old Testament Allusion

The three OT figures, the Son of Man, the suffering Servant, and the Davidic Messiah, which we have already encountered in the farewell discourse, may be alluded to in this section.

The proposed allusion to the suffering Servant passage is Lk. 22:27 (ὡς ὁ δακνέων cf. Is. 53:12).<sup>1</sup> It is not a verbal but a material allusion which builds on a correspondence between the service which the Servant renders for the many and the service which Jesus claims he is doing in his ministry. Normally, the literary relationship between Mk. 10:45/Lk. 22:27 is assumed and the clearer allusion to Isaiah 53 in the term "the many" strengthens the case for the verb δακνέω as an allusion to the suffering Servant's work.<sup>2</sup> However, the allusion to Is. 53:12 in Mk. 10:45 has been questioned.<sup>3</sup> Even accepting that Mk. 10:45 does not allude to Is. 53:12 some continue to contend that Luke understood Mark this way when he used it at Lk. 22:27.<sup>4</sup> Leaving aside the question of literary dependence, there are factors in the saying's content and the immediate context which

---

<sup>1</sup>Burkitt, pp. 140ff.; Contrast W. Manson, p. 244.

<sup>2</sup>Burkitt, pp. 140ff.; cf. TDNT, V, p. 709f.

<sup>3</sup>Barrett, NT Essays, pp. 1-18.

<sup>4</sup>Rese, Alttestamentliche Motive, p. 164.

make it unlikely that it is intended as an allusion to Isaiah 53. The aspect of service which Jesus attributes to himself and commends to his disciples is humility towards one's fellows. This is expressed with substantive participles, which emphasize the act of serving as opposed to the relationship between servant and master (Lk. 22:26, 27; contrast Mk. 10:43, 44). The term "servant" used of the suffering Servant always carries this second emphasis. It stresses that the Chosen One is a servant of God (cf. Is. 52:13). The saving work which he performs on behalf of the many is not described as a service, except perhaps in the LXX of Is. 53:11 which translates <sup>1</sup> by δουλεύοντα. While the "servant" idea from Isaiah 53 does not serve as the basis for Jesus' description of himself, there is the possibility that Jesus' saying as Luke portrays it does reinterpret the service which the Servant of the Lord does. His title and his obedience no longer primarily relate to his relationship with God. Rather, that obedience in the saving act is service for the many. Luke may have understood this from the LXX interpretation of Is. 53:11. His choice of διακονέω to express it shows the change in emphasis<sup>2</sup> more clearly than even Is. 53:11. Thus, Luke's presentation of Jesus' service, which is a fulfilment of the suffering Servant's mission, emphasizes his

---

<sup>1</sup>But here again the significance of the "good service" seems to be seen within the context of the Servant's relationship and obedience to God.

<sup>2</sup>Contrast Boulton (*Studia Evangelica*, I, p. 420), who claims that there is no significant difference between διακονέω and δουλεύω in the NT. This view does not appreciate the difference in usage in the LXX and Luke of these two word groups (διακονέω group emphasis: "to do service" - cf. Esth. 1:10; 2:2; 6:3, 5; cf. e.g. Lk. 4:39; 8:3; 10:40; Ac. 6:2; δουλεύω group emphasis: relationship of master and servant - cf. Josh. 24:30(29); Gen. 25:23; 2 Km. 7:25; 4 Km. 14:25; Lk. 16:13; 7:2-8; 2:29; 12:37-47); Hinderlich (p. 230) explains Luke's use of διακονέω at Lk. 22:27 as an avoidance of δουλεύω which from his pagan background would have only the negative connotations of tragedy and bitterness. She fails to recognize the positive use of δουλεύω at Lk. 2:29; 1:38, 48.

relationship to men. This new perspective on the word "service" reinterprets Isaiah 53.<sup>1</sup>

From the more explicit allusions to Daniel 7 in the other two NT presentations of multiple thrones in the End-time (Mt. 19:28, *οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, cf. Da. 7:13; Rv. 20:4, *καὶ κρίμα ἔδοθη αὐτοῖς*, cf. Da. 7:22), it is often reasoned that Daniel 7 is the proper background for Jesus' words about multiple thrones in Lk. 22:30/Da. 7:9.<sup>2</sup> However, if Luke is consulted alone we discover that the relationship to Daniel 7:9ff. is much less certain. The two elements in common are "thrones" and "the act of judging." However, the relationship between the thrones and judgment is decisively different in Daniel and Luke. In Daniel, the thrones are set up at the beginning of a legal session. The occupants of the thrones are not identified but their function as a legal tribunal is spelled out (*καὶ κριτήριον ἐκάθισεν*, Da. 7:10). The terms of judgment, then, are used in the precise legal sense (Da. 7:22, *τὴν κρίσιν ἔδωκε τοῖς ἁγίοις*). The saints of the Most High are the recipients of the benefits of the judicial decision. They don't give the judgment. In Luke, the thrones are occupied by the people of God (the equivalent of the saints of the Most High) and they are those who judge the twelve tribes of Israel. Yet, in the sequence of events of the End-time described by Luke this judging takes place after the eschatological meal and thus it appears that the more general meaning of the verb *κρίνω*, "to govern," as we find it in the OT is appropriate.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The relationship which Otto (p. 291) proposes between Lk. 22:29 and Is. 53:11 is too tenuous to be taken as an allusion. At the most it is OT thought background for the concept of solidarity between Jesus and the disciples as they share in the rewards of his redemption. The OT images which are more immediately at hand are those of the End-time reign of the Davidic Messiah or the Son of Man.

<sup>2</sup>Dupont, *Biblica*, XLV, p. 380; cf. G. B. Caird's (*A Commentary on the Revelation of St. John the Divine* (Black's NT Commentaries, London, 1966), p. 252) comment, "But John seems to rather stand in a Christian tradition of exegesis (cf. Mt. 19:28f; Lk. 22:29; 1 Cor. 6:2) which argued that, since Daniel spoke of thrones in the plural, they must be occupied by a plurality of judges or assessors."

<sup>3</sup>Dupont, *Biblica*, XLV, p. 381; *TDNT* (III, p. 923, n. 4) points out it is not a very great privilege to be placed on thrones to pass judgment on fellow Israelites; See below p. 230.



at this point. The allusion could point to either.

There seems to be little in the immediate context, which shows that Luke wants us to know that Jesus intended to allude to the OT. Still the fact that this OT material is part of a prophetic promise of Jesus makes a conscious allusion plausible (cf. 23:30). By echoing the OT Scripture Jesus and Luke following him, could lend authority to the promise. He could also show its continuity with the OT promises. The psalm itself is not prophetic. Yet, its praise of Jerusalem mentions the conditions which will prevail when the kingdom of the Davidic Messiah finally comes. To assign the thrones to the disciples does not violate the original meaning since the psalm does not identify their occupants. In fact, Jesus, like the rabbis, is interpreting the psalm by providing the identify of the throne occupants. The difference is that he does it in the context of prophetic promise not traditional exegesis. In all, it seems appropriate that this phrase should be viewed as a material allusion to Ps. 121(122):4-5.

The interpretational method which appears to be at work is the prophetic appropriation to the kingdom of the Davidic Messiah of what is descriptive of David's reign. The difference is that the promises are personally taken up by Jesus and applied to himself as the Messiah. He interprets them and fills them with a specific content. But they still remain promises under a scheme of prophecy and fulfilment, awaiting their time of accomplishment. The function of this allusion in the larger context of Luke's work is to form part of Luke's christological presentation of Jesus as the Davidic Messiah. None of its specific content figures prominently again. There is very little evidence that Luke intends to point to the larger original context with the allusion. Only τῶν ἰδελῶν μου (Ps. 121(122):8) is a verbal parallel in Luke's immediate context (22:32).<sup>1</sup> From our analysis

---

<sup>1</sup>See below, p. 251.

of literary sources we have seen that the historical context in which these words of Jesus are presented is probably the correct one.<sup>1</sup> The allusion probably originates with him.

#### Old Testament Idea

Our allusion inquiries have begun to uncover the wealth of OT ideas which are contained in these promises of Jesus. We have already seen the OT background of his use of *διακονέω*. Aside from the OT background of *Πειρασμός*, the majority of OT ideas are found in Jesus' promise to the disciples about their place in the kingdom of God when it comes.

After Jesus has settled the dispute over who was the greater by giving the example of himself as one who serves in their midst (22:27), he makes a promise to them. The disciples will inherit the kingdom because they have remained with Jesus in his trials. This principle of suffering preceding glory, faithfulness in trial rewarded by inheritance, is present in the OT and Jewish thought. Abraham serves as the chief example.<sup>2</sup> Sirach and 1 Maccabees both describe him in terms similar to those used by Jesus of the disciples (*καὶ ἐν πειρασμῷ ἐυρέθη πιστός*, Sir. 44:20; *Αβραὰμ οὐχὶ ἐν πειρασμῷ ἐυρέθη πιστός*; 1 Macc. 2:52; cf. Lk. 22:28, 32, 40, 46). Sirach also expresses this principle in a general way (Sir. 22:23). If you have a friend, "in time of suffering, *θλίψις*, remain, *δέσμενε*, with him; and in order that in his inheritance, you may inherit with him."

The OT use of *πειρασμός* in the plural is limited to a description of the trials which God brought on Egypt to force her to release Israel (Dt. 4:34; 7:19; 29:2). This use places within a theological perspective the occurrence of natural catastrophes and the adversities of human life (e.g. Cyranides XL:24, *κίνδυνοι καὶ πειρασμοὶ ἐν τε γῇ καὶ θαλάσσῃ*; so cited

<sup>1</sup>See above, p. 213.

<sup>2</sup>J. H. Korn, *ΠΕΙΡΑΣΜΟΣ: Die Versuchung der Gläubigen in der Griechischen Bibel* (BWANT, IV:20; Stuttgart, 1937), p. 59.



in TDNT, VI, p. 24). The troubles have a divine author and they are used for the purpose of bringing men's actions into line with God's will. The plural use of πειρασμοί in Luke (Lk. 22:28; Ac. 20:19), though it may mean primarily the afflictions of human experience and persecution, should not be understood outside of this theological perspective either.<sup>1</sup> The nature of the reward, participation in the kingdom of the End-time, directs our attention beyond the human dimension to see the spiritual forces at work in the trials of Jesus.<sup>2</sup> Luke, then, uses πειρασμοί in an understandable koiné way but with an OT perspective.

The OT use of πειρασμοί, however, does not further determine Luke's use. It does not condition either the identity of the spiritual source of the trials, Satan (4:1-13; 22:3), or the purpose for which they come, to force Jesus to abandon his messianic mission in favor of a limited regency under allegiance to Satan (4:6-8). It is not a help in deciding the nature of the trials and when they occurred, except to show that they need not be seen only as primarily temptations by Satan either at the beginning or end of Jesus' ministry.<sup>3</sup> Jesus' announcement of Satan's coming temptation of the disciples states that its purpose is to produce faithlessness (22:31-34). The warning about the opposition which the disciples will face because of Jesus' rejection (22:35-38) provides the content for the trials just ahead.<sup>4</sup> They are different from the previous

---

<sup>1</sup>Lagrange, p. 551; with Brown (p. 9) we take the perfect of διηγέω as naturally having a past referent. The verb does not substantiate either the "Satan free period" of Conzelmann (Theology of Luke, p. 81), or the identification of Jesus' trials as totally within or at least beginning with his passion.

<sup>2</sup>Schürmann, III - Jesu Abschiedsrede, p. 39.

<sup>3</sup>Contrast Baumbach, p. 192; cf. Brown, p. 9.

<sup>4</sup>Further evidence of the way Luke carries out the theme of the apostles' loyalty in Jesus' final trial is the fact that Luke does not report the detail in Mark that at the arrest the disciples fled. (Mk. 14:50; cf. Lk. 22:53; Baumbach, p. 192).

trials only in that Jesus will no longer be with the disciples. In both situations the "trials" could be understood both as temptations by Satan for them to forsake their Lord and as tests of the genuineness of their loyalty.<sup>1</sup> They could also be viewed both as hardships and personal opposition and as attacks of the spiritual power of evil, using such circumstances. The new element in the use of the term, which the OT does not have, is the attribution of the origin of such trials to Satan. Still, the OT understanding of *πειρασμοί* is the basis in Luke for the principle that perseverance in suffering, standing the test, will be rewarded. It is also the key to the way in which Luke could view both the events of Jesus' life and life in the early church as trials with theological significance. Compare the fact that the similar uses of *πειρασμοί* in Lk. 22:28 and Ac. 20:19 are within what are sometimes regarded as parallel literary forms, farewell discourses.

The reward for loyalty to Jesus is expressed by a cluster of OT ideas: the Father who covenants a kingdom, eating and drinking at the table in the kingdom; and sitting on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel (22:29-30). Luke presents Jesus' use of the term "father" to refer to or address God always within a messianic perspective. Jesus as the messianic son of David is also God's son and is therefore justified in calling him "Father."<sup>2</sup> The reference to God as "my father" is appropriate

---

<sup>1</sup> Contrast A. Vööbus' (*The Prelude*, p. 34) comment that this is spoken by the Risen Lord to the church. His argument that Luke does not portray Jesus' life as a series of trials is difficult to completely refute. The probable explanation for such a description of Jesus' life at Lk. 22:28 is that Luke takes this thought over from his source (Schürmann, III - *Jesu Abschiedsrede*, p. 39). The thought of Jesus' trials during his lifetime is acceptable to Luke on other grounds than its presence in the gospel tradition which he received. Indeed, that tradition does hint every so often, at Jesus' struggle in his mission (12:50; 13:31-34; 19:45-20:8). The parallelism between Jesus' experience and the experience of the early church, which Luke stresses, would welcome and promote such a statement as Lk. 22:28.

<sup>2</sup> H. F. D. Sparks, "The Doctrine of the Divine Fatherhood in the Gospels," *Studies in the Gospels and Acts: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*, ed. D. E. Nineham (Oxford, 1955), p. 250; For a full discussion of the term in Luke see below, p. 608.

in this context of "covenanting a kingdom" because part of God's covenant promise to David was that he would be a father to David's offspring who would sit on the throne forever (2 Km. 7:14; cf. 1 Ch. 17:13). The significance of the reference to God as father in Lk. 22:29 is twofold. It both establishes the authority of Jesus by which he can dispose to his disciples a share in the kingdom. He does it as the Davidic Messiah.<sup>1</sup> But it also shows the relationship of the Son to the Father as a relationship of dependence. He only covenants part of what has been covenanted to him (10:22; cf. 12:32).<sup>2</sup>

The whole of verse 29 provides a context which demands this understanding of Jesus' relationship to God as father. The key word in this promise of Jesus is the verb, διατίθεμαι . . . διέθετο . In the only other use of this verb in Luke-Acts (Ac. 3:25) we have an example of the distinctive LXX usage. In the LXX διατίθεμαι may signify the action of God in making a covenant with man (cf. Gen. 15:18; 21:27; 2 Ch. 7:18). The use is distinctive in the sense that God is one of the parties to the agreement, (cf. Aristophanes, Aves, 439; 1 Ch. 19:19 for the use of διατίθεμαι to describe human agreements). The Hebrew has a technical phrase for describing the making of a divine-human covenant (אָמַן אֱלֹהִים עִם). The LXX consistently uses διατίθεμαι to translate the verb of this phrase. Since διατίθεμαι occurs in the context of a farewell discourse, it may have one of its special meanings, "to dispose in a last will and testament."<sup>3</sup> Further, if the more general meaning "to dispose or appoint" (without reference to a last will and testament) be accepted, the verse may be explained without reference to either the OT covenantal idea or to the last

---

<sup>1</sup>A. George, "Jesu, Fils de Dieu dans l'Évangile selon S. Luc," RB, LXXII (1965), p. 207.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 209.

<sup>3</sup>e.g. J. Jervell, Luke and the People of God (Minneapolis, 1972), p. 79; Josephus, Ant. XIII:407, τὴν δὲ βασιλείαν εἰς τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ διέθετο .

will and testament context.<sup>1</sup>

The other parts of the Lukan context indicate that the special OT meaning should be understood in the use of *διέθετο* in the comparative clause. Two times in the OT the verb is used in connection with a promise of "rule." At 2 Ch. 7:18 (*ὥς διέθεμην Δαυὶδ τῷ πατρί σου*) God reconfirms with Solomon the covenant promise he made with David that his house would rule over Israel forever. Ps. 88(89):4 (*διέθεμην διαθήκην τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς*) alludes to this promise.<sup>2</sup> Though at these places the verb functions in the same way as when it is used to describe the disposal of property from one person to another whether by appointment in general or by testamentary bequest, the significant difference again is that God is one of the parties.

If the supporting ideas from the immediate context are taken into account, i.e. Jesus' promise of participation in the messianic meal at his own table (cf. 2 Km. 9:10); and the allusion to Ps. 121(122):4, 5, then the most probable meaning of the phrase "as my Father appointed a kingdom to me" is that Jesus claims for himself the full rights of the Davidic Messiah. Indeed, the idea of God's covenanting with Jesus in the Davidic covenant is not just additional OT coloring. It is central to Jesus' promise. It is only by virtue of the covenant made to David and his seed that Jesus may dispose of anything to his disciples.

Is it proper that the transaction between Jesus and his disciples should also be called making a covenant?<sup>3</sup> It probably should be so

<sup>1</sup>TDNT, II, p. 105; cf. 4 Esdr. 13:26; no such use in LXX.

<sup>2</sup>Farrar (p. 372) sees this OT verse as evidence for the meaning "appoint by way of bequest." He fails to take into account the MT (*וְיָדָעְתָּ*).

<sup>3</sup>Jesus' promise *διατίθεμαι* does not appear to have a clear predicate. The object of this verb must either be *βασιλείαν*, which is also the object of *διέθετο* (Plummer, p. 502), or the *ὡς* clause (Creed, p. 269). Some textual variants insert *διαθήκην* after *διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν* (Alexandrian: 579, cop<sup>sa</sup> (579 also replaces *βασιλείαν* with *διαθήκην*); Caesarean: θ; Origen; Byzantine: A), in order to overcome this grammatical difficulty and in the process interpret *διατίθεμαι* as meaning, "to make

understood, not essentially, but only because of the comparative phrase which follows it. It has been suggested that the figures of the suffering Servant or the Son of Man,<sup>1</sup> are the proper OT background for this idea. Both were understood in Jewish thought as mediators of the covenant of the End-time (cf. Is. 42:6; 49:8; 1 En. 48:7). However, there are not enough distinctive verbal or material parallels in the immediate context<sup>2</sup> to indicate either as the basic OT messianic figure in view at this point. Rather the Davidic Messiah predominates and satisfactorily explains the special OT content associated with διατίθημι.

---

a covenant." Luke normally presents a construction of clauses connected by a comparative conjunction by placing all of the content of the first clause before the comparative conjunction (e.g. 6:36; 11:1; 24:39; Ac. 15:8; 10:47). This sets out plainly what he intends to be the subject of comparison. It is then unlikely that "kingdom," coming as it does after the comparative conjunction, is intended as the object of διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν. Further, the content of the comparison is the act of disposing and not the inheritance given. Thus, the object of διατίθεμαι is not necessarily part of the comparison. This may explain why the object in the form of a ὡς clause does not come immediately after the verb διατίθεμαι. The awkwardness involved in seeing βασιλείαν as the object of both verbs is the need for understanding two different meanings for the noun as it is used with regard to Jesus and his followers (Creed, p. 269). Also, the ὡς clause does not describe only the exercise of authority but fellowship at the Messiah's table, which is not necessarily included in receiving a kingdom. Although διατίθημι usually takes an accusative and not a ὡς clause as its object, it is best to understand διατίθεμαι's object as the ὡς clause and δίδωτο's object as βασιλείαν, since this understanding allows the intended emphasis in the comparison to come through properly and the βασιλείαν to function clearly as the object of one verb.

<sup>1</sup>Otto, pp. 292ff.

<sup>2</sup>Doeve (p. 142) sees the use of Son of Man at Lk. 22:22 as clear evidence that Da. 7:22 is the background for Lk. 22:30; However, we have already presented reasons why Ps. 110(122): 4, 5 and not Da. 7 is the basic OT reference (see above p. 216); Otto (p. 294) in his reconstruction, which links Lk. 22:19a directly with Lk. 22:28-30, suggests that the connection of the death of Jesus with eschatological salvation through the mediation of a covenant can be best understood as having its basis in the figure of Isaiah 53-54. However, the interest in Lk. 22:28-30 is not primarily in the means by which he is able to covenant with his disciples the blessings of eschatological salvation. This is taken care of simply by authoritative reference to the Davidic covenant [though this too might be seen as a reference to the Servant (Is. 42:6)]. The connection with Jesus' death is not as close as at Lk. 22:20 and the Davidic covenant imagery accounts more adequately for the details of the promise than the imagery associated with either the Son of Man or the Servant.

Luke seems to slightly vary the use of *διατίθεμαι*. The first, *διατίθεμαι ὑμῖν*, bears the more normal meaning, "appoint," but it also has the overtones of the special OT meaning. The disciples can trust the disposition of places of fellowship and power because it is made on the authority of the Davidic covenant. However, this disposition should not necessarily be viewed as another covenant within the Davidic covenant but rather as an aspect of it. The second use, *δέδοτο μοι*, is basically an OT usage founded on God's covenant with David. This second use determines and is not influenced by the first. Hence, the covenant to David which in eschatological terms is the "new covenant" is reinterpreted only in the sense that Jesus claims himself to be the proper messianic successor to it. What is new is the means for establishing it, his death.<sup>1</sup>

Luke follows the normal OT understanding of "kingdom"<sup>2</sup> as it relates to God and his reign in the End-time. The OT emphasized both the kingdom or reign of God and the reign of the Davidic Messiah as the chief characteristics of the End-time (e.g. Ob. 21; cf. Is. 24:23; 33:22; Zeph. 3:15; Is. 9:6; 2 Km. 7:12, 13; 2 Ch. 7:18; cf. Zech. 9:10; Jer. 23:5 Mic. 5:1). These ideas were not in conflict since the Messiah derived his authority to rule from the Davidic covenant. However, the relationship of the two reigns was not clearly worked out.<sup>3</sup> Daniel 7 is the first place where the spiritual and eschatological nature of the "kingdom" is clearly presented. God himself reigns supreme. After exercising judgment on the successive regimes of the nations, he hands over to the saints of the Most High the kingdom (Da. 7:18, 27) which they will exercise

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. G. W. H. Lampe, "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of Luke," Studies in the Gospels and Acts: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot, ed. D. E. Nineham (Oxford, 1955), p. 192; G. H. P. Thompson (The Gospel According to Luke in the RSV (The New Clarendon Bible; Oxford, 1972), p. 260) thinks that the covenant which God entered into with Jesus to make him messianic king was only analogous to the Davidic one. The covenant Jesus refers to was probably made at his baptism.

<sup>2</sup>This is one of the religious ideas which Haering suggests should be studied to see the influence of OT meaning on NT concepts (see above, p. 48).

<sup>3</sup>TDNT, I, p. 568.

forever. This places in eschatological perspective the covenant promise to David (2 Km. 7:13). In addition to this perspective, the OT use also has the peculiarity of emphasizing the functional meaning, "reign," rather than the concrete meaning, "territory."<sup>1</sup>

In Luke 22-23 we find references to the kingdom of God (Lk. 22:16, 18; 23:51) as well as to the kingdom of the Messiah, Jesus (22:29-30; 23:42). There seems to be no attempt on Luke's part to systematically relate these two ideas.<sup>2</sup> The main question in the interpretation of Jesus' promise to his disciples is whether the fact of Jesus' earthly ministry, the interim heavenly reign of the ascended Jesus, or the emergence of the church in the interim period before the parousia have changed Luke's understanding of the eschatological nature of the coming of the kingdom. Luke does emphasize that the reign of God was present in the ministry of Jesus (cf. the description of Jesus' activity as "preaching the kingdom of God" (4:43 cf. Mk. 1:38; Lk. 8:1) and Jesus' statements, 9:27; 17:20). Luke does say more explicitly than the other gospel writers that the resurrected and exalted Jesus has entered into his glory (24:26; 22:69). In Acts he records the proclamation that Jesus is already exercising his reign at the right hand of God (Ac. 2:33-36; 7:56; cf. Ac. 17:7 where the accusation against Christians is that they say there is another king, Jesus; cf. the description of the missionary preaching as "preaching the kingdom of God," Ac. 8:12; 20:25; 28:23, 31). However, Luke does not de-eschatologize the OT idea, kingdom of God.<sup>3</sup> During Jesus' ministry a delicate balance is maintained between the proclamation of the kingdom of God by Jesus in the present and its future consummation in the final eschatological fulfilment (Lk. 9:26/27; 16:16/19-31; 17:20/22-37). The

---

<sup>1</sup>Ibid., p. 580; cf. Ob. 21; Is. 9:6.

<sup>2</sup>Conzelmann, Theology of Luke, p. 118, n. 2.

<sup>3</sup>cf. Ibid. (p. 113) for the view that there is a partial de-eschatologization.

<sup>4</sup>E. E. Ellis, "Present and Future Eschatology in Luke," NTS, XII (1965-66), p. 33f.

connection between the two is the divine pattern of suffering issuing in glory. This same pattern obtains for the early church. They proclaim the kingdom of God through many trials and know it in their midst by the power of the Holy Spirit (Ac. 2:33-36), but they have not yet entered into it. Its final consummation is still in the future (Ac. 14:22). Nowhere in Acts does Luke say that the church is the kingdom of God or that Christians are in Jesus' kingdom. Thus, there do not appear to be grounds for saying that Luke interprets the reign of the exalted Christ in the interim period as Jesus' final entry into his kingdom. Hence, the descriptions of the reward as eating at his table and sitting on thrones judging do not need to be reinterpreted so that they become promises about Jesus' presence with Christians at the Eucharist and the authority which the disciples will have as leaders and witnesses in the church.<sup>1</sup> Rather, this imagery is presented in line with OT thought and Jewish expectation. In Luke's understanding the final coming of Jesus' kingdom is eschatological (cf. Lk. 1:32, 33; 19:12-27). As Jervell concludes, "There can be no doubt that this basileia (22:29) is linked to the restoration of Israel, that it is 'the kingdom for Israel.'"<sup>2</sup> The OT then provides the controlling framework for Luke's use of the term βασιλεία with reference to God and Jesus.

---

<sup>1</sup>Cooke (Theol. Stud., XXI, p. 24) contends that vv. 29-30 should be viewed in the light of ἀνάμνησις (22:19), and therefore have eucharistic significance. ". . . the conclusion would seem to be that the Eucharist (both at the Supper and later) is the fulfilment of the Pasch and the advent of the Kingdom;" Cooke claims that this does not de-eschatologize the concept of the final arrival of the kingdom, but this seems to be effect; Thompson (p. 260) comments that by preaching the gospel to Israel the disciples show Israel up in her true light and in that way judge her; Contrast Voss, p. 108.

<sup>2</sup>Jervell, p. 82; cf. Ac. 1:6; Lk. 24:21.



The new content which Luke introduces into the concept both transforms it and gives it greater definition. This happens in the light of Jesus' teaching, resurrection, and exaltation. He presents Jesus' death as a necessary step to the coming of the kingdom (22:15-18).<sup>1</sup> Indeed, the whole nature of Jesus' reign is changed by the fact of his humble service unto death. His kingdom is not one of this world, established by the human means of military victory. Rather, obedient to death the royal Messiah designate enters into his glory. This is the pattern which those who would be great in the kingdom should follow (22:25-27).<sup>2</sup> The other change in the basic concept of kingdom is that its essential nature is defined in terms of personal relationship. The disciples not only are given the kingdom (12:31, 32), or are charged to strive to enter it (18:16, 17; Ac. 14:22), but they are told that the kingdom consists in being with Jesus (Lk. 17:20, 21; 22:28-30; 23:42-43). We have already noticed that Jesus' promise about the occupation of thrones takes up and completes a feature of the kingdom, multiple rule. Jesus identifies the thrones' occupants. As we have already seen and will notice more fully later, the death, the resurrection, and ascension to the right hand add greater definition to the plot of how the kingdom will finally fully come. The OT promises that the Son of David will sit at God's right hand until his enemies are subdued (Ps. 109(110):1), that the Son of Man will appear to receive the kingdom (Da. 7:13), and that a new covenant and the forgiveness of sins (Jer. 38(31):31), will come, now all mesh together in an understandable pattern. The kingdom of Jesus which will be the actualization of the kingdom of God is for Luke eschatological, royal messianic, and not of this world.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Navone, p. 91; his observation that Luke's originality also consists in linking Christ's kingship with his divine sonship does not take into account the understanding of the royal Messiah as God's Son which the OT background presents.

<sup>2</sup>A. George, "La royauté de Jésus selon l'évangile de Luc," Sci. Eccl., XIV (1962), p. 66.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

Luke is quite restrained in his description of the End-time. He contents himself with the traditional imagery of the messianic feast and the eternal reign.

The messianic banquet is one of Luke's favorite ways of describing the End-time (Lk. 14:15-24; 13:29; 22:16, 18, 30). As Boismard has repeatedly reminded us,<sup>1</sup> the invitation to eat and drink at the king's table is a symbol of provision and fellowship issuing from royal good pleasure (2 Km. 9:7-13). Another significance of the king's table for those who partake at it, is that it is on occasion the scene of a victory banquet accompanied by great joy (Ps. 22(23):5). With the destruction of the royal dynasties, the exile, and the return, the living symbol of God's covenant loyalty to the people of Israel through an established royal table of David's line was replaced with a living hope for the Lord's table set up in the last days (Is. 25:6; 1 En. 62:14). In Isaiah it is the Lord who prepares the feast. In Enoch, the "Lord of the Spirits" abides over the "righteous and elect" and the Son of Man eats with them.<sup>2</sup> We need also to remember that the Passover meal was approached from an eschatological perspective, with the anticipation that the Lord would perform the final redemption at Passover and thus fulfill Israel's hopes by turning the Passover celebration into the eschatological meal in the kingdom.<sup>3</sup>

The wording which Luke uses to introduce this OT idea shows that he wants to emphasize provision and fellowship with Jesus. Because the word is given in the context of the Passover meal, there is more of a stress on the actual partaking of a meal than is normally encountered when the imagery of a messianic banquet is employed simply to graphically portray

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, pp. 193, n. 1; 217, n. 2.

<sup>2</sup>cf. rabbinic references in SEK (IV:2, pp. 1145ff), which have the same emphases of provision (Ex. R. 25 (86<sup>a</sup>, 6, eating manna); victory (Shabb. 153<sup>a</sup>, 16, quoting Is. 65:13 as evidence that enemies shall serve victorious Israel; cf. 2 Bar. 29:4 where the Leviathan is eaten); and joy (Pesik. R. 41 (174<sup>b</sup>): quoting Ps. 13(14):7); cf. 1 QSa. 2:11-22.

<sup>3</sup>See above, p. 165.

the joy of life in the kingdom of God.<sup>1</sup> The Passover meal will be fulfilled by another joyous celebration (Lk. 22:16), and it is in the light of the Passover that this fulfillment meal also has the connotation of victory. But above all it is the fact of being with Jesus at his table, which Luke's reference to the fellowship of the king's table communicates.

The second picture, the disciples sitting on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel, has its material basis in Ps. 121(122):4, 5. It, however, contains some OT ideas which need to be mentioned. The verb κρίνω is used in the general sense "to govern." This meaning derives from the frequent LXX use of κρίνω to translate שָׁפַט, "to judge, to govern." Since the exercise of political authority in theocratic Israel was initially the hearing and deciding of cases according to the law of God, the word for "to judge" naturally developed the general meaning "to govern" (e.g. Ex. 18:13, 22-26; Judg. 12:7, 8). When the monarchy was established the king likewise was set over the people to judge, to govern them (3 Km. 3:9). The deciding of disputes was one of the ways the king governed his people (cf. 3 Km. 7:44(7) - Solomon's main hall is called the hall of the throne as well as the hall of judgment). The two terms, which speak of the reign of the king: "throne" and "judgment" are related both generally and technically. The throne is the sign of the ruling authority of the King (Hg. 2:22; 1 Ch. 28:5). To sit on the throne is to hold that authority (2 Ch. 23:20; 2 Esdr. 13:7; Ps. 88(89):45). At various times the throne may become a throne of judgment, when the king is called upon to decide a case (Pr. 20:8). While the king sits on his throne holding his power he is said to exercise it by "judging the people" (Pr. 29:14; Is. 16:5; cf. Ps. 9:8, 9). The Isaiah passage shows the general and technical uses of the term.

The verb κρίνω appears in Lk. 22:30 as a present participle, denoting continuing action. A reference to sitting on thrones normally denotes the

---

<sup>1</sup>TDNT, VIII, p. 212.

general idea of governing and not the specific idea of judging. These facts support a view that Luke uses *κρίνω* according to the LXX usage, "to govern."<sup>1</sup> In fact the mention of thrones helps to clarify that meaning.

The identity of those whom the disciples will govern, "the twelve tribes of Israel," is to be discovered in Luke's use of the term *Ἰσραήλ* only to designate the Jews, and then primarily in a theological context as the people of God.<sup>2</sup> In the OT there is no special theological significance attached to the use of *Ἰσραήλ* (the LXX transliteration of *יִשְׂרָאֵל*) to designate the Jews. It is simply the fact that this term is commonly used to denote the nation whom God has delivered and called into a covenant with himself (e.g. Dt. 6:4; Ps. 102(103):7) which makes it appropriate for use in the NT to designate the Jews as the people of God. These theological associations come out clearly in NT times when it was the Gentile practice to refer to the Jewish nation as *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι*.<sup>3</sup>

The twelve tribes speak of the whole nation of Israel, and more importantly the pristine unity in which God took them out of Egypt and they inherited the land. Jesus' choice of twelve men to govern these tribes was a pledge that the Jewish hope for a reconstituted nation would be fulfilled (e.g. Ezk. 47:13; 48:31). This is Luke's only mention of the twelve tribes of Israel (cf. Lk. 2:36; Ac. 13:21 - the only other use of the word *φυλή* in Luke-Acts).

The reference to Israel, the Jewish people, stands in contrast to *ἔθνος* (22:25) which is employed with its special OT meaning, "Gentiles, non-Jewish nations."<sup>4</sup> The LXX maintained quite faithfully the Hebrew

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. BAG, loc. cit.

<sup>2</sup>Jervell, p. 49; TDNT, III, p. 384; e.g. Israel as the object of God's redemption, 1:16, 54, 68; her people as the recipients of the gospel message, Ac. 2:36; 5:31; 10:36; 13:23, 24; cf. 28:20; her rulers as the active fulfillers of the will of God, even as the executioners of Jesus, Ac. 2:36; 4:10, 27; there is no indication in Luke's use that he understood *Ἰσραήλ* since Christ's coming to mean the Christian church, the new Israel.

<sup>3</sup>See below, p. 438.

<sup>4</sup>Swete, p. 453; Lagrange, p.cii.

distinction between the Jewish and non-Jewish peoples by creating the translation equivalents, Jews =  $\text{Ἰσραήλ} = \lambda\alpha\omicron\varsigma$  ; non-Jews =  $\text{ἔθνη}$  (e.g. 2 Km. 7:23; Num. 23:9). Aside from distinguishing peoples as non-Jewish the term also developed a negative connotation for the  $\text{ἔθνη}$  were idolatrous (e.g. Lev. 20:23; 4 Km. 17:8) and hostile to Israel (e.g. Jer. 5:15; 1 Ch. 16:35). Since Luke's use of the term  $\text{ἔθνη}$  is so varied it is normally the immediate context in which the Jewish nation is also mentioned which determines the presence of this special usage (e.g. 18:32, cf. Mk. 10:33; Ac. 13:46; 18:6; 22:21; 26:20; cf. Luke's use of  $\text{ἔθνη}$  to denote the Jewish nation, Lk. 7:5; 23:2; nation in general, 21:10; all mankind including the Jews. This usage is usually prefixed with "all," 21:24; 24:47; Ac. 15:17). Luke's use here may also contain some of the negative connotation attached to "the Gentiles" in the OT. Just as the Jews were not to follow their idolatrous example so the Christian community should not order its life according to Gentile values (Lk. 22:24-27). The one factor in Luke's use of  $\text{ἔθνη}$  which supports the view that "Israel" at this place does mean the Jewish nation and not the new Israel, the Christian church, is that  $\text{ἔθνη}$  in Luke is never contrasted with the Christian Church and hence held to mean "the non-Christian world."<sup>1</sup>

These OT ideas then provide the specific content for the major elements in a Biblical farewell discourse. Jesus presents his life as one who serves as the example which those who follow on must emulate. He speaks of his past life as a series of trials in which he has been both tempted and tested as were the ancients in Israel. Jesus reconfirms the covenant, specifically the Davidic covenant which merges in his thought with the "new covenant." He does so by disposing in a quasi-testamentary fashion seats of honor and positions of authority to the disciples using the language of Ps. 121(122):4, 5. He sets this bequest in an eschatological context

---

<sup>1</sup>Jervell, p. 49; cf. Luke's editing of the Q statement Lk. 12:30/Mt. 6:32; the parallel statement (22:25b) contains a term often used of the Hellenistic ruler, see BAG; cf. Esth. 8:12c(13); 2 Macc. 4:2.

using the idea of the messianic banquet. So Luke in presenting these images shows that he is in accord with the OT and Jewish eschatological expectations concerning the Jewish people. And since this discourse comes during a Passover meal with its customary haggadah, the literary form of farewell discourse meshes with the practice of midrash. Indeed, the words of Lk. 22:15-20, especially those which speak of the fulfilment "in the kingdom" and the "new covenant" receive their interpretation in Lk. 22:24-30.

#### Old Testament Style

There are only a few constructions in this section which might possibly be evidence of imitation of LXX style. While some of the normal indicators of LXX style in the section's syntactical structure are missing, we do have several LXX stylistic elements.<sup>1</sup> The use of δέ and καί as coordinating conjunctions is balanced (δέ - 5X; καί - 4X). The word order does not show any decisive preference for the semitic pattern, verb-subject-object (verb-subject-object; 1X main clause; 1X subordinate clause; subject-verb-object 4X main clause; 3X subordinate clause). One possible influence of LXX or semitic style on word order is the post-positive pronomial adjective, which corresponds to the Hebrew pronomial suffix (e.g. Ps. 22(23):5, 6, where the post-positive μου renders the pronomial suffix, ' . ; Lk. 22:28, ταῖς πειρασμοῖς μου ; 22:29, ὁ πατήρ μου ; 22:30, ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης μου ; ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου ).<sup>2</sup> This word order is found throughout Luke-

<sup>1</sup> cf. Beyer (I:1, p. 211), who sees the LXX articular adjective, which translates a substantive participle in Hebrew as the model for ὁ μέσσω (22:26); For a discussion of ἐν μέσσω with the genitive see below, p. 368; Rese (*Die "Stunde,"* p. A52, n. 69), assuming that Luke is reworking Mk. 10:41-45 at Lk. 22:24-27, explains the presence of ἐν μέσσω with the genitive in Luke as a LXXism attributable to him. Rese fails to take into account the fact that in two of the three other cases of Luke's redaction the idea of "in the midst" is explicitly present in Mark and is only expressed differently or expanded in Luke by the use of this phrase. The Mk. 10:45 passage provides less of a basis for Lukan expansion (cf. εἰς, Mk. 4:7/Lk. 8:7; Mk. 14:54/Lk. 22:55; cf. Mk. 13:14/Lk. 21:21; there is no preposition in Mk. 10:45; cf. Schürmann, *III-Jesu Abschiedsrede*, p. 88).

<sup>2</sup> A. Wifstrand, "A Problem Concerning Word Order in the NT," *Stud. Theol.*, III (1950-51), p. 182; As in the case of subject predicate word

Acts, while the exceptions to it appear to be employed for emphasis (e.g. 7:44, 45: Ac. 1:8; 21:13; 22:1). Since Luke never introduces this word order in his redaction of Mark (cf. Lk. 8:45/Mk. 5:30 where he removes the noun in a pre-positive construction) it is difficult to maintain that this word order (12X in Luke 22-24) is due primarily to Lukan redaction. It is probably from Luke's source but Luke approves of the style which lends the majesty of the LXX to the utterance of prophetic promises by Jesus. Although the use of the possessive adjective "my" is so diverse in Luke, part of a pattern of theological significance can be detected within the confines of the farewell discourse. The word is used in Lk. 22:15-38 only at Lk. 22:19, 20, "my body," "my blood," and in this cluster of Lk. 22:28-30. Its use emphasizes the key role that Jesus himself plays in the coming of eschatological salvation to his disciples. Jesus explicitly appropriates to himself all of the OT promises. The messianic table and the messianic kingdom become "my table" and "my kingdom." The eschatological trials are his trials. The phrase ὁ πατήρ μου has become almost a technical one by which Jesus describes his relationship with God.<sup>1</sup> The LXX word order in its way witnesses to the confidence of the speaker and writer in the truth of these claims.

The phrase "to eat and drink" (22:30), though a quite natural combination which does appear in extra-Biblical Greek,<sup>2</sup> may qualify as a LXXism because of its great frequency in that version as a translation for אכלו ושתו. The use of the phrase within the context of the cult (Ex. 24:11; 1 Ch. 29:22) and the monarchy (2 Km. 11:13; 3 Km. 1:25; 4:20) gives us the necessary background for its use at Lk. 22:30. In both

---

order it is difficult to distinguish between the imitation of LXX style or the translation from a semitic gospel source as the probable cause of this feature.

<sup>1</sup>See below, p. 608 .

<sup>2</sup>cf. Homer, Od. II:305, ἐσθίμεν καὶ πίνεμεν .

contexts "eating and drinking" connotes joy and celebration. It is not insignificant that one of the cultic references is to the covenantal meal eaten in the presence of the Lord by the elders of Israel after the sacrifice and the blood of the covenant rituals had been performed. However, because Luke does not allude to the Exodus 24 passage in his form of the words of institution, this cultic meal is probably not the basic OT reference here. Rather, both the idea of provision at the king's table which enables the disciples to sustain themselves and the idea of joyful celebration are what Luke brings forward in his use of this phrase. Although this is one of Luke's favorite phrases, which he uses throughout Luke-Acts (e.g. Lk. 7:33; 13:26; Ac. 9:9; 23:12, 21), there is only one place where he inserts the phrase (Lk. 5:33 cf. Mk. 2:18). A strong case for Lukan redaction at Lk. 22:30, then, cannot be made.<sup>1</sup> Though possible, it is more probable that Luke is using a septuagintalizing source. In any case, this LXXism combines well with the next phrase, "at my table," also a LXXism<sup>2</sup> to create the proper royal setting for the allusion to Ps. 121(122):4, 5 in the next verse.

A final possibly pleonastic semitism in this section is the combination of the verbs sitting and judging<sup>3</sup> (22:30, καθήμενος . . . κρίνοντες). The OT background of this phrase goes back to the custom of the king taking his place on his throne or at the city gate in order to hear the cases of the people (2 Km. 19:9, 10). Though a paratactical linkage of these two verbs may truly render the "sitting" verb redundant, the formulation in which the "judging" verb is subordinated to the "sitting" verb does not make either part unessential. Rather, the emphasis is now placed on the

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. Rese's Die "Stunde," p. A56, n. 92.) recognition of outside influence (Lk. 10:7) on the form of ἐσθίω. However, his conclusion that it is Luke who forms the expression under that influence does not necessarily follow. It could just as well be Luke's use of non-Markan source material; cf. Schürmann, III-Jesu-Abschiedsrede, p. 49.

<sup>2</sup>See above p. 217, n. 2.

<sup>3</sup>Dalman (Words, p. 22) calls this construction a pleonasm in which a sedentary action, "judging" is connected with a "superfluous mention of the position." He cites Jo. 4:12; Zech. 6:13.



authority one has who occupies the throne and the participle becomes explanatory of the use to which he puts that authority. Thus, Luke's use of καθ' αὐτόν in this passage as in the rest of his work is not pleonastic (cf. Ac. 23:3). There is no LXXism in the sense of pleonasm here but there are the positive OT ideas contributed by Ps. 121(122):4, 5.

## CHAPTER VI

## LUKE 22:31-34: THE EXHORTATION TO PETER

## Introduction

Jesus' attention shifts from the distant future of reward (22:28-30) to the immediate future of testing (22:31-38). He begins to spell out for the disciples in general and Peter in particular the temptations they must face. Again OT ideas concerning testing and perseverance help Luke report Jesus' thought.

There are several features of this episode in Luke which link it more closely to the tradition found in John than to Mark. The words are spoken during the farewell discourse and not on the way to Gethsemane (Mk. 14:26ff.; cf. J. 13:36ff.).<sup>1</sup> The progression of thought from a statement to Peter about loyalty to Peter's protest of loyalty even to death and then to Jesus' prediction of his denial, is the same in Luke and John. Mark's dialogue progresses from a statement that all will be scandalized to Peter's protest of loyalty, and then to Jesus' prediction. Peter's reiteration of his loyalty even to death comes next and is followed by a common protest of loyalty by all the disciples.<sup>2</sup> When these general considerations of differences in context and thought progression are combined with the linguistic evidence, which shows little verbal agreement between Mk. 14:26-29 and Lk. 22:31-33,<sup>3</sup> it seems reasonable to conclude that this episode is taken from a non-Markan source. Although Lk. 22:34 shows greater similarity in wording to Mark than the rest of the perikope, it appears that this too, because of parallel tradition in John,<sup>4</sup> should be seen as coming from a non-Markan source. Possibly v. 34 has also been

---

<sup>1</sup>Contrast E. Linnemann ("Die Verleugnung des Petrus," *ZTK*, LXIII (1966), p. 22), who contends that the different contexts can be accounted for by Luke's purpose of constructing a farewell discourse at the Last Supper.

<sup>2</sup>cf. Boismard, II, p. 387.

<sup>3</sup>Taylor, *The Passion Narrative*, p. 65f.

<sup>4</sup>Bailey, p. 39; Rengstorf, p. 248.

influenced by Mark.<sup>1</sup>

With his use of a non-Markan source, Luke has on the one hand eliminated an OT quotation present in Mark (Mk. 14:27) and, on the other hand, has included a saying which is stamped by three possible OT allusions (Lk. 22:31-32). One of the supposed allusions which also seems to influence Peter's protest of loyalty (v. 33) creates what Taylor calls "one of the more reputable examples of typology" in the NT.<sup>2</sup> It is proposed as an allusion to David's experience in 2 Km. 15:20f./Lk. 22:32-33. The other proposed allusions are a material allusion to Job 1:8-12/Lk. 22:31-32 and an allusion to Am. 9:9/Lk. 22:31. There are also OT ideas which color the wording of Jesus' exhortation: "Satan," the "sifting as wheat" image; the prayer of intercession; non-failing faith; conversion and strengthening the brethren. Finally, a few marks of LXX style appear.

#### Old Testament Quotation and Allusion

On the way to Gethsemane according to Mark Jesus announced that all the disciples would be scandalized because of him (Mk. 14:27). To confirm that this would take place according to the plan of God Jesus quoted Zech. 13:7 (Mk. 14:27). Luke by his use of a non-Markan source omits this quotation, which happens to be the only explicit OT quotation in the Markan passion narrative. Can we find any reasons behind this choice of materials by Luke<sup>3</sup> which would explain why he did not wish to use the OT here?

We may explain it on general compositional grounds by noting how the account of this episode in the non-Markan source better suits Luke's purposes. The account is placed at the Last Supper table and can fit in

---

<sup>1</sup>Taylor (The Passion Narrative, p. 65f.) sees it as an addition from Mark; Schürmann (III-Jesu Abschiedsrede, pp. 27-35) claims that v. 33 as well comes from Mark.

<sup>2</sup>Taylor, The Passion Narrative, p. 66.

<sup>3</sup>Karnetzki (p. 209) explains it simply from Luke's choice of sources; Flessemann (Zur Bedeutung, p. 87) sees the quotation as a later redaction into Mark but doesn't comment on whether Luke knew it.

well with Luke's presentation of a farewell discourse. The structure of the dialogue, as at Lk. 22:21-23, focuses one's attention on Jesus. It does not allow for much give-and-take between Jesus and Peter, and none with the rest of the disciples (contrast Mk. 14:26ff.). This suits Luke's purpose of presenting a farewell discourse by the Lord not a discussion among peers. For these stylistic reasons, then, as at Lk. 22:21-23<sup>1</sup> OT material is lost in consequence of a preference for a non-Markan source.

Two inter-related theological reasons for the omission are Luke's theme of Jesus' solidarity with his disciples and his consequent removal of any suggestion that Jesus was forsaken in his last hour.<sup>2</sup> Throughout the Last Supper discourse Jesus expresses his unity with his disciples. In addition to statements in common with Mark (Lk. 22:11/Mk. 14:14; Lk. 22:14/Mk. 14:17) we have this fact emphasized by Luke in Jesus' words (Lk. 22:15; 22:28) and in Peter's protest of loyalty (22:33; cf. J. 13:37; contrast Mk. 14:29). As an outgrowth of Jesus' promise to the disciples that they will inherit positions of honor with him in his kingdom because they have remained with him in his trials, we have this solidarity theme influencing the wording of the instructions in Gethsemane (Lk. 22:40, 46). They are to pray just as their master is praying. This instruction is given to all the disciples (22:40; contrast Mk. 14:32, 33). The solidarity

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, p. 192.

<sup>2</sup>The explanation that Luke's lack of a tradition about Galilean resurrection appearances caused the omission (Rese, Alttestamentliche Motive, p. 176; Stendahl, p. 80) tends to assume that the mention of reunion in Galilee is necessarily related to the prophecy about "scattering." Since there is no implication in the way Mark presents Jesus' words that Galilee was the place to which the disciples were scattered, or that the prophecy about scattering is a necessary prelude to reunion in Galilee, it appears that if Luke wished to avoid the Galilee reference he could have removed it without diminishing the sense or function of the OT quotation. Hence this explanation, while possibly supplementary, cannot be treated as the primary motivation for Luke's omission.

of Jesus with his disciples, the fact that they experience the same joys and trials is expressed through the gospel (Lk. 8:1; 6:17; 22:59; 24:44; Ac. 4:13; cf. Lk. 8:38). The pattern of parallelism even in wording between the experience of Jesus in the gospel and the early church in Acts is another expression of this theme of solidarity (cf. Lk. 24:26/Ac. 14:22; Lk. 4:18ff./Ac. 1:8). It would be inappropriate for this theme, if in the greatest hour of Jesus' trial the disciples were not present to in some small way fulfill the condition of those who remain with him in his trials.<sup>1</sup>

This emphasis on solidarity means that Luke must cover up the forsakenness which Jesus experienced during the Passion. Luke following a non-Markan source deletes the disciples' protests of loyalty (Mk. 14:31), as well as the description of their flight from Jesus and those who arrest him (Mk. 14:50-52). There are still indications that Luke realized that the abandonment by the disciples was part of the Passion history which should be told (after the arrest Peter alone follows afar off, Lk. 22:54-62; at the cross there are Luke's inferences that the disciples are still present, 23:49). However, even these details are softened so that silence becomes the strongest witness to the disciples' abandonment of Jesus. Jesus promises to pray for Peter (22:32) and is confident that his denial will not be permanent. Jesus is still related to Peter even after the denial if only by a look (22:60, 61). But that look seems to move him toward repentance (Lk. 22:62/Mk. 14:72). Though it is not positively stated that the disciples were at the cross, the wording of Lk. 23:49 is vague enough to allow for the historical fact of the extended flight of some disciples, but also the possible presence of others

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. Rese (Alttestamentliche Motive, p. 174), who notes that the presence of the book of Acts shows that the disciples did endure. But he takes this fact as evidence that Luke concluded that the prophecy was not fulfilled and therefore should be omitted. Rather, it is the positive desire of Luke to show the solidarity of Jesus and the disciples in all experiences which controls him here.

(cf. J. 19:25-27). The detail that they stood ἀπὸ μακρόθεν, presumably not to be recognized by the authorities, shows that Luke understood the presence of the real danger which had caused their flight in the first place. Though some of Luke's motivation in playing down the flight of the disciples may have been to show in the best light those who held apostolic authority,<sup>1</sup> the positive theological theme, the solidarity of Jesus with his disciples in all experiences, seems to have governed Luke's omission of this prophetic quotation. We hasten to add that this omission and subsequent ones are not replaced by positive statements concerning the presence of the disciples which would contradict the historical truth. Rather Luke delicately balances his desire to show the disciples' solidarity with Jesus against the reality that they for however long a time did forsake him.

Just as the Zechariah quotation functions in Mark as an explanation for the flight of the disciples, so a material allusion to Job 1:8-12 at Lk. 22:31-32 provides the theological perspective for understanding Peter's denial.<sup>2</sup> Although neither Σατανᾶς nor ἐξαιτέω is used in the Job context, it is the only place in OT Scripture where Satan, the Devil, is presented in God's presence asking that a righteous person be subjected to trials which will test his faithfulness to God (Job 1:8-12; 2:4-6; cf. 1 Ch. 21:1 where Satan acts on his own initiative; and Zech. 3:1, where he stands as accuser in the court of God against Joshua the high priest).<sup>3</sup> Hence, it may qualify as a material allusion. Admittedly in Job, Satan does not ask that Job be placed in his power but only that God extend his

---

<sup>1</sup>Fleigel, p. 97.

<sup>2</sup>Montefiore, II, p. 601.

<sup>3</sup>TDNT, I, p. 194; Contrast Baumbach's (p. 193) view that the possible reference to Job does not determine the meaning of ἐξαιτέω. He takes it to mean "to tempt." However, he produces no convincing evidence. The articular infinitive purpose clause which follows may be taken equally well with the meaning "to tempt" or "to ask."

hand against him (Job 1:11; 2:5). However, God grants his request by delivering him into his power (Job 1:12; 2:6), so that the result is the same as if he had originally asked permission to tempt Job himself. The application of the allusion is to all the disciples and to Peter in particular. This is appropriate since Job is presented by God as an example of a righteous man. The opening scenes of the book, though presented as a number of events in celestial and terrestrial history, appear clearly to set up a model of the interaction of forces in the divine-human economy which creates the situation in which the righteous suffer. The rest of the book attempts to treat various aspects of that dilemma. It is thus in keeping with the perspective and intention of the book that the experience of Job, an example of a righteous man,<sup>1</sup> be applied by Jesus to the disciples and their representative, Peter. The same pattern of interaction applies. God is sovereign and Satan, this time more of the aggressor, must ask God's leave for his plans to tempt Peter and the rest. This understanding aids Luke's purposes in two ways. It assigns to Satan and not to God's plan (Mk. 14:27) the creation of the occasion for the sin of Peter and the rest.<sup>2</sup> The scriptural warrant for the necessity of such scandalous actions was no longer expressed in terms of prophecy and fulfilment. Rather, the pattern of God's interaction with men as first explained in the OT is invoked as the way for understanding what is going to happen. There is prophecy involved in Jesus' statement, but it is a matter of Jesus' own foreknowledge expressed with these OT ideas. The material allusion is significant only for the fact that nowhere else in the OT does such a description of Satan's assault on men occur. Since this is a material allusion without verbal parallelism, it is not possible to decide the question of whether the allusion points

---

<sup>1</sup>Korn, p. 83, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup>Rese, Die "Stunde," p. 116.

to its larger original context.<sup>1</sup>

The purpose of Satan is described in words which may contain an allusion to Am. 9:9 (22:31, ἰδοὺ... τοῦ σιναίσαι ὡς σίτον; Am. 9:9, ἰδοὺ... λικμῶ... ὃν τρώπουν λικμάτα ἐν τῷ λικμῶ).<sup>2</sup> There is no verbal similarity between Luke and the LXX, although Luke's version of the metaphor reproduces the content of the Hebrew more literally.<sup>3</sup> At the most, then, it could be termed a material allusion. Amos uses the image as part of his message that God will preserve the good grain, Israel. Not one part of which will fall to the ground, although sifting, judgment, comes (cf. Is. 41:16; 30:28; Jer. 15:7; 4:11). Though the application of this thought to the new Israel, the church, may have been the background of the use of this image in Luke's special tradition,<sup>4</sup> the use Luke makes of it sets it in quite a different context. It is now Satan who sifts the disciples. It is not his purpose to preserve the good seed. The faith of the disciples is intended to fall through the sieve. The chaff of their evil deed, the abandonment of Jesus, will be preserved. It will then serve as the evidence for the case Satan presents as accuser before God (Zech. 3:1).<sup>5</sup> In both cases, however, God wills that the good not fall but be preserved (Am. 9:9, οὐ μὲν πέσῃ σὺν τριμμά ἐν τῇ γῇ ; Lk. 22:32, Jesus' prayer, ἵνα μὴ ἐκλείπῃ ἡ πίστις σου ). The purpose of the sifting

---

<sup>1</sup>For the significance of the ideas in this allusion for the larger context of Luke's work see below, p. 246f.

<sup>2</sup>Clapton (p. 31) calls it an indirect quotation or allusion; France (Jesus and the OT, p. 245) places it in his less certain allusions category.

<sup>3</sup>cf. France (Jesus and the OT, p. 245), who observes that the LXX substitutes the more familiar process of winnowing, for the metaphor of sifting; σιναισῶ is a hapax legomenon in the NT and does not occur in the OT.

<sup>4</sup>Dodd, Historical Tradition, p. 51, n. 1; "it is possible that the ordeal of the disciples was understood as the sifting or purging of Israel, in preparation for the restoration of the people of God in the form of the church. . ."

<sup>5</sup>W. Foerster ("Lukas 22:31f." ZNW, XLVI (1955), p. 131f.) presents a good explanation of the OT image in its specific connection with Satan. It is a large grid sieve, which lets the good fall through and saves the bad (cf. Sir. 27:4); W. Ott (Gebet und Heil (Stud. zANT, XII; Munich, 1965), p. 76) disagrees and says that the sifting action and not the kind of sieve is the real point of comparison.



then, because it is done by God, on the one hand, and Satan, on the other, is different. This destroys any material parallelism between Amos and Luke. Thus we are unable to conclude that the use of the image in Luke is meant to be an allusion to Am. 9:9. At the most it should be treated as an OT metaphor for judgment.<sup>1</sup>

It has also been proposed that Lk. 22:32-33 has been influenced in its wording by 2 Km. 15:20-21 (Lk. 22:31-32, καὶ ἐπιστρέψας . . . τοῦς ἀδελφούς σου . . . εἶπεν . . . εἰς . . . καὶ εἰς θάνατον ; 2 Km. 15:20-21, ἐπιστρέφου καὶ ἐπιστρέφον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου . . . εἶπεν . . . εἰς θάνατον καὶ . . . εἰς ).<sup>2</sup> The possible verbal parallelism in Lk. 22:31/2 Km. 15:20 (ἐπιστρέφω ; ἀδελφός ) is marred both by the uncertainty of the Lukan text and the difference in meaning of both terms as they are used in 2 Samuel and Luke.<sup>3</sup> In Luke "returning" and "brethren" are understood in a spiritual sense. 2 Samuel takes "returning" physically, Ittai and his band are to return, to leave David. "Brethren," while having a possible metaphorical sense, "kinsmen" or "fellow countrymen," does not have any spiritual connotation in 2 Samuel. Since both words are quite appropriate to Luke's style and thought for what he wants to say at Lk. 22:32, and since these differences in meaning lead one away from seeing a correspondence with 2 Samuel 15, it is not necessary to see in this choice of wording an allusion to 2 Km. 15:20. This may have been an allusion at an earlier stage in the tradition for the combination of this verb and noun occurs elsewhere in the LXX only at Gen. 37:30. However, the use which Luke

<sup>1</sup>Montefiore, II, p. 600.

<sup>2</sup>Clarke, The Beginnings of Christianity, II, p. 104; cf. Schürmann (III-Jesu Abschiedsrede, p. 31, n. 120) who points out other similarities of wording with 2 Samuel 15 within the gospel passion narratives (J. 18:1/2 Km. 15:23; 2 Km. 15:14/J. 14:31).

<sup>3</sup>cf. Grundmann, p. 407; the Western reading is σου δὲ ἐπιστρέφον καὶ for καὶ σὺ ποτε ἐπιστρέψας; this makes the verbal and material parallelism closer, but since it is the less difficult reading which seems to explain away the difficulty of the meaning of ἐπιστρέψας as applied to Peter, it is secondary.

makes of the words blurs rather than sharpens any allusion.

The verbal similarity in Lk. 22:33/2 Km. 15:21 is quite striking especially when we note that there is strong material parallelism.<sup>1</sup> Though it is possible for Luke to use the parallel construction of εἰς . . . εἰς with coordinating conjunctions (Lk. 8:34/Mk. 5:14; Lk. 14:35; 15:22), he seems to prefer to avoid such redundant repetitions of the particle as well as the phrase, εἰς θάνατον (Lk. 21:16 cf. Mk. 13:12; cf. Ac. 14:21; 16:1, δὲ εἰς . . . καὶ εἰς ). The presence of the phrase here is out of character with Luke's stylistic preferences and may indicate Luke's faithful reproduction of the words of Jesus from this source. That it is Luke's formulation according to 2 Km. 15:21 is undeterminable since we do not have other instances of Luke's redaction of this phrase into his text. The corresponding phrase in the OT is unique to 2 Km. 15:21. The material parallelism rests on the typological identification of Jesus with David and the protest of total loyalty which both Ittai and Peter make. Although we do have Jesus' claim to being the legitimate heir to the promises of the Davidic covenant, the form in which the claim is made is not the typological reliving of David's experiences but the prophetic re-iteration of the covenant promises (Lk. 22:28-30). The one detail which creates the closest bond between 2 Samuel 15 and the announcement to Peter is missing in Luke. Jesus speaks these words at the Last Supper table and not as he leaves the city and crosses the brook Kidron (2 Km. 15:23; cf. Mk. 14:26).<sup>2</sup> Luke appears, then, by his choice of sources to blur whatever allusion might be present. When he has the opportunity to heighten typological allusion he avoids it. Verbal parallelism which is present may show what

---

<sup>1</sup>Boismard (II, p. 388) even sees the μετὰ σοῦ . . . πορεύεσθαι (22:33), as coming from the previous question in 2 Km. 15:20, μεθ' ἡμῶν τοῦ πορευθῆναι, but the use of πορεύεσθαι is so frequent in the 2 Samuel section it is hard to attach any significance to this phrase especially when we notice Luke's frequent use of πορεύεσθαι (cf. Lk. 22:22).

<sup>2</sup>cf. Selwyn, Oracles, p. 353.

correspondences earlier traditions found between the two stories. Their preservation in Luke is not from a desire to allude to the OT through a typological picture but simply to reproduce the words of Jesus which he received in his source. The remnants of a possible allusion at an earlier stage in the tradition become examples of OT ideas and style which Luke uses for his own purposes.

#### Old Testament Idea

We have already dealt with the OT ideas which are contained in the allusion to Job 1, 2 and the imagery of "sifting as wheat." What remains is to consider briefly how these OT ideas fit into Luke's theological themes. We also need to investigate the possible OT ideas present in Jesus' description of himself as intercessor and in the content of his prayer, and exhortation.

By describing Satan as operative both in Jesus' passion (Lk. 22:3; cf. v. 53) and in the disciples' trials which are occasioned by that passion, Luke again binds the disciples and Jesus together according to his solidarity theme. The OT idea of Satan the tempter and accuser of the righteous before God not only allows the solidarity theme to be carried out by portraying Jesus and the disciples under the same spiritual economy, but it also reinforces again the spiritual perspective with which Luke wants his readers to view the passion events. Just as Satan is the author of the betrayal which Judas will accomplish, so Satan is the tempter of the disciples. Using circumstances, the arrest of Jesus, he sifts them in order to make them abandon their faithfulness. Mark's method of presenting the supernatural side of this drama is through allusions to and quotations from the OT, which show that what is happening is according to God's plan. Luke uses allusion in a different way. He appropriates the OT idea<sup>1</sup> concerning

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. a possible Jewish appropriation of the OT idea: Test. Ben. 3:3, ἐὰν τὰ πνεύματα τοῦ βελιάρ εἰς πάντα πονηράν τοῦ θλίβει ἐμὴν σὺνταίμα cf. also Plutarch, Def. Orac. 14 (II 417d), ἰσχυροὶ καὶ βίαιοι δαίμονες ἐξαιτούμενοι ψυχὴν ἀνθρώπινην.

the activity of Satan as an interpretive explanation of what is taking place in the Passion. It accords well with his "dynamic" approach to salvation history. It enables him to help his readers relive the saving events of the Passion on all levels of reality at which they were acted out.

It may seem that Luke with his salvation history scheme has effectively de-eschatologized the trial which Peter and the rest will go through. By placing Jesus and the disciples in the same moral economy and under the same tempter, it may appear that the decisive importance of Jesus' death and the significance of the disciples' response to Jesus in his last trials may have been lost. The warning to Peter becomes a general ethical instruction which applies to all who would follow Jesus.<sup>1</sup> What may show us that Luke though he may have found this episode appropriate for early church parenesis, still viewed it as an extraordinary event in the course of salvation history, is his use of the OT image, the sifting of wheat. In the OT this image primarily describes the decisive action of God when he judges a nation for its sin by dispersing its people from their land into captivity just as the worthless chaff, during winnowing, is dispersed by the wind. This image of judgment is applied to the activity of the Messiah at the last judgment in the preaching of John the Baptist (Lk. 3:17/Mt. 3:12, οὗ τὸ πύον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ). Whether we should go so far as to see in Lk. 22:31 a reference to Satan as the anti-Christ, taking to himself the function of the Messiah, is not certain.<sup>2</sup> But the image does restore the eschatological significance to this particular temptation of Satan's for it is connected with his most powerful assault on the decisive event in God's plan of salvation, the suffering of Jesus. It may be that the parenetic purpose should not really be

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. Linnemann, ZTK, LXIII, p. 31f.

<sup>2</sup>H. Ridderbos, The Coming of the Kingdom, trans. H. de Jongste; ed. R. O. Zorn (Philadelphia, 1962) p. 108f.

set over against the eschatological perspective but rather seen within it. Satan's temptation in the arrest of Jesus is an hour of judgment par excellence for Peter and the disciples. But this trial is like every other subsequent temptation which they will endure. The seriousness of the temptation is thus emphasized through the use of the OT image.

The intercessory prayer of Jesus should not be seen in the OT context of the intercession of a righteous man for the forgiveness of the sins of another.<sup>1</sup> Rather, it is a request that, though Peter yields to the temptation to deny Jesus, he will not utterly lose his faith. In the OT there are intercessory prayers (*δέσμιαι περὶ*) which do not involve requests for forgiveness (e.g. Gen. 25:21; Jdth. 8:31). We have a non-forgiveness request here (cf. Ac. 8:24). The more probable OT context in which to see Jesus' prayer is to view it as his defense of the disciples in the court of God against Satan's accusation (cf. Zech. 3:1, 2; cf. Jd. 9).<sup>2</sup> Although the main content of this defense may very well be Christ's atoning death on the cross, this must be inferred from Jesus' statement. There is no explicit reference to forgiveness such as we have at Lk. 23:34.

The content or purpose of Jesus' request, "that your faith may not fail," owes little of its meaning to specific OT uses. In the OT the term, *ἡ πίστις*, is normally used in a phrase which understands faithfulness as a quality of life (e.g. *ἐν πίστει* - 4 Km. 12:16; 22:7; *ἐκ πίστεως* - Hab. 2:4; cf. Jer. 7:28, *ἐξέλεπεν ἡ πίστις ἐκ στόματος αὐτῶν*; Pr. 3:3). Peter's *πίστις* in the sense of "faithfulness" did fail when he denied Christ. Jesus seems to allow for this in his next phrase which speaks of conversion. It is better, then, to take *πίστις* in the sense of "faith, trust in Jesus as the Christ."<sup>3</sup> What does have OT significance attached

<sup>1</sup>Such an understanding which E. Stauffer (p. 131) and T. Boman ("Der Gebetskampf Jesu," *NTS*, X (1963-64), p. 273) present does not take into account either the content or purpose of the prayer as given by Jesus in the *ὡς* clause.

<sup>2</sup>Foerster, *ZNW*, XLVI, p. 132; Schürmann, *III-Jesu Abschiedsrede*, p. 102.

<sup>3</sup>Brown, p. 39; cf. Lk. 22:67; 8:25; Ott (p. 81) observes that this use stands in close connection with Lk. 18:1-8 (8b).

to it is the use of ἐκλείπω.<sup>1</sup> The OT connotation of utter destruction (2 Km. 20:18; Ps. 9:7; Jer. 7:28) makes sense in its use here (cf. Lk. 16:9; 23:45).

Luke uses ἐπιστρέφω normally in the intransitive. It means either "to return" physically (e.g. 17:31; Ac. 16:18) or spiritually, i.e. "to repent, be converted" (e.g. Ac. 3:19; 9:35; 14:15). The exception is the transitive use in Lk. 1:16, "to convert" someone else. Several attempts have been made to explain the meaning of ἐπιστρέψας (22:32) from the LXX translation of peculiar uses of נָחַץ.<sup>2</sup> Still, the normal use in the spiritual sense, "to repent and be converted; to turn from sin; to turn to the Lord," is the appropriate background here (e.g. 3 Km. 8:35; Is. 31:6; Ps. 79(80):4; Hos. 6:1). Although each act of repentance and turning to the Lord is a decisive one, the LXX does not appear to develop a special use of ἐπιστρέφω to indicate primarily the initial conversion experience, in distinction from continual acts of repentance after one has first turned to the Lord (cf. Ps. 7:13; 50(51):15; Ezk. 18:30-32). Since the OT understanding does not distinguish between initial conversion and continual acts of repentance, it does not help us to decide whether Jesus means that Peter needs after his denial to be converted for the first time or simply to repent "after a temporary aberration."<sup>3</sup> Perhaps Luke uses the term in the

---

<sup>1</sup>Schürmann (III-Jesu Abschiedsrede, p. 107) calls Luke's use a copying of LXX style.

<sup>2</sup>Bengel (II, p. 199f.) cites Ps. 84(85):7 where the participle ἐπιστρέψας simply signifies the renewal of activity, "again." Ps. 22(23):3; Lam. 1:11, 16, 18 show a use of the piel and hiphil of נָחַץ meaning "to revive." The participial use of ἐπιστρέψας at Ps. 84(85):7 is unique in the LXX. The meaning "to revive" normally has as its object "soul." Neither of these special uses of נָחַץ = ἐπιστρέφω are frequent enough in the LXX or specific enough in Luke to make their presence readily apparent to the reader.

<sup>3</sup>Plummer, p. 504; cf. Brown, p. 71, n. 281.

OT sense without distinction so that it becomes natural for him to call the fruit of a Christian's repentance, as well as the result of the initial repentance, a conversion.<sup>1</sup>

That this participle should not be taken transitively, as an imperfectly resolved parataxis of imperatives,<sup>2</sup> can be seen from the ποτε, which explicitly makes the act of "turning" a prior condition to the task of strengthening the brethren. The OT idea of the use of ἐπιστρέφω to signify the intransitive act of repentance and being converted then serves as the basis for Luke's use of the word here.

Luke's formulation of Jesus' command, "Strengthen your brethren," expresses the distinctive OT use, metaphorically, of the transitive meaning of στηρίξειν, "to support, strengthen," (cf. the literal use from which the metaphor is taken: Galen 18(2):34, στηρίξειν τὴν δύναμιν . . . ἐπιστομάχους τραφεῖς ; Gen. 27:37). In the LXX it is God who strengthens inwardly (Ps. 50(51):14; 1 Macc. 14:14; cf. Is. 59:16; 1 QH 7:6; 2:7). Luke appropriates this idea of spiritual strengthening and uses it to describe the work of the early Christian missionaries (Ac. 18:23). Since there are only two occurrences of the word in Luke which refer to the work of

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. TDNT, VII, p. 727; Contrast R. Michiels ("La conception lucanienne de la conversion," Eph. Theol. Lov., XLI (1965), p. 61), who claims that Luke has removed the originally semiticizing sense of the verb and through his redaction replaced it with his normal understanding of conversion; the difficulty with that conclusion is that Luke's absolute use here is still quite distinctive. Only Ac. 3:19 in a speech as exhortation has such a use (cf. Ac. 9:35; 11:21; 14:15; 15:19; 26:18, 20). Possibly this lack of the goal of turning is a sign that Luke does not have Peter's initial conversion experience in mind.

<sup>2</sup>Moulton II, p. 420; Zahn (Lukas, p. 683) cites OT passages where God does this work of converting Israel (Ps. 84(85):4; Ezk. 34:16; cf. Sir. 18:13); cf. also Mal. 2:6; Ezk. 34:4 where religious leaders are charged with this work; it should be noted that the transitive sense accords better with the hiphil use of גָּוַל which ἐπιστρέφω translates in 2 Km. 15:20 (ἐπιστρέφον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου). However, there is still the basic difference between its use in the spiritual sense in Luke and the physical sense in 2 Samuel.

Christian leaders there is not enough evidence to speak of a dominant theological theme. Yet this OT idea which places the word in a theological context helps advance Luke's purposes.<sup>1</sup>

The reference to fellow Christians as "the brethren" (22:32) is an instance of the appropriation for Christian purposes of a LXX and Jewish religious technical term (e.g. Ps. 21(22):23; Mic. 5:2; Ps. 121(122):8).<sup>2</sup> Originally the term could be applied literally to all in Israel for they had a common ancestor, Jacob. Later the term came to signify compatriot or co-religionist. This is its significance for Luke here and in many places throughout Luke-Acts (e.g. Lk. 6:41-42; 8:19-21; 17:3; Act. 1:15; 9:17, 30; 10:23).<sup>3</sup>

#### Old Testament Style

In addition to Σατανᾶς whose form is the LXX transliteration of the Hebrew, this section contains the LXX transliteration of the proper name, Simon (Σίμων = יְהוֹנָתָן, 2 Esdr. 10:31, cf. 1 Esdr. 9:32, other OT apocryphal books). The name is found frequently among Jews and Greeks.<sup>4</sup> There is no overall grammatical structure which imitates LXX style by its use of καί or parataxis.<sup>5</sup> Also, the pattern of subject-predicate word order is not semitic (verb-subject-object: 2X in subordinate clauses; subject-verb-object: 5X in the main clauses). There is, however, a consistent use

<sup>1</sup>cf. TDNT, VII, p. 656.

<sup>2</sup>Swete, p. 453; See above, p. 218.

<sup>3</sup>cf. Brown (p. 73) who emphasizes that the term is not restricted to fellow apostles but applies to all fellow Christians; for the theological significance of the use of κύριε (22:33) and σήμερον (22:34) in Luke, see below, pp. 362, 560.

<sup>4</sup>BAG, loc. cit.

<sup>5</sup>δέ - 3X; καί - 1X; but cf. v. 33, καὶ εἰς . . . καὶ εἰς . . . Since Schlürmann (III-Jesu Abschiedsrede, pp. 22, 25) sees Mark as the basic source of vv. 33, 34, he notes these changes in general syntactical structure: avoidance of parataxis; creation of semitic word order, verb-subject (22:34/Mk. 14:30).



of the post-positive second person singular possessive adjective. This corresponds to LXX style, which translates literally the Hebrew noun with its pronominal suffix (ἡ πίστις σου; τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου, 22:32; cf. 23:42).<sup>1</sup> This does give some OT stylistic flavor to Jesus' exhortation.

Of the specific constructions which may be LXX style imitation, ἰδοὺ, τοῦ plus the infinitive, and καὶ εἰς . . . καὶ εἰς occur in the verses of the section which are least like Mark. However, the first two constructions are so characteristic of Luke's style that whether or not one believes Luke used material other than Mark at this point, these features should be attributed to Luke's redaction.<sup>2</sup> The significance of the ἰδοὺ is, as at Lk. 22:10, 21, to point out a historical detail which Jesus prophesies is going to take place. Possibly, there is also some parenetic warning in the interjection, although Jesus' foreknowledge seems to understand that such a warning will not be needed.<sup>3</sup> The use of the genitive articular infinitive is probably for emphasis.<sup>4</sup> It combines well with the other LXX stylistic elements in the beginning of Jesus' words to lend authority to them.

The repetition of εἰς before each object after a verb of motion is a mark of LXX style (e.g. Gen. 24:10, εἰς . . . εἰς = ἕως . . . ἕως; 30:25, εἰς . . . εἰς = ἕως . . . ἕως; Ex. 7:28, εἰς . . . καὶ εἰς = ἕως . . . ἕως; Gen. 33:16 εἰς . . . εἰς = ἕως . . . ἕως). As we can see from the examples it translates a variety of Hebrew prepositions and often makes parallel what is more asymmetrical in Hebrew syntax. Although examples of a series of objects linked by καὶ εἰς following an initial εἰς may be readily discovered (see above and in addition 1 Km. 8:13; 14:45; Ex. 3:8), it is more difficult to

<sup>1</sup>See below, p. 566.

<sup>2</sup>Finegan, p. 15; Schürmann, III-Jesu Abschiedsrede, pp. 102, 104.

<sup>3</sup>cf. Vööbus' (The Prelude, p. 42) view that the function of the ἰδοὺ is to alert Luke's reading audience (ὁμᾶς) to the parenesis which follows.

<sup>4</sup>Schürmann, III-Jesu Abschiedsrede, p. 104.

find an example of a series which begins with  $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma$  (cf. Gen. 1:14). The first  $\kappa\alpha\iota$  in the Lukan construction then is probably not a semitism or LXX style imitation but functions to give equal emphasis to the two objects (cf. Ac. 16:1; Mk. 9:22/Mt. 17:15 the only other example in the Synoptic gospels; it appears in a passage which Luke does not reproduce).<sup>1</sup> Luke has an evident dislike for the juxtaposition of two prepositional phrases without a connecting particle ( $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ .\ .\ .\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma$  is removed at Lk. 4:44/Mk. 1:39; Lk. 8:26/Mk. 5:1; Lk. 19:28/Mk. 11:1; contrast Lk. 2:4, 39). He gives little evidence of a preference for the  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ .\ .\ .\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma$  construction which could serve as a mark of LXX style imitation (Lk. 8:34/Mk. 5:14; Lk. 14:35; 15:22; Ac. 25:8; 14:21). This editorial practice shows again the balance which Luke maintains between writing literary Greek and including LXX stylistic elements. In this case only that feature of LXX style which makes for acceptable though pleonastic Greek is included while the rough  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ .\ .\ .\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma$  construction is avoided.

---

<sup>1</sup>BDF, ¶ 444; Schürmann (III-Jesu Abschiedsrede, p. 33), sees the supposed allusion to 2 Km. 15:20-21 as the probable cause of this construction.

## CHAPTER VII

## LUKE 22:35-38: PREPARATION FOR CONFLICT

## Introduction

With words that speak of the changed situation which his death will bring, Jesus concludes his farewell discourse. He crowns all he has said concerning his suffering and the glory to follow, with a reiteration of the divine necessity of what he is about to experience. This he does by explicitly quoting part of Isaiah 53:12/Lk. 22:37. This is one of the few places in the passion narrative (cf. 23:30, 46) where we have an opportunity to analyze Luke's use of OT quotation. This quotation is at the climax of the farewell discourse and on the threshold of the action of the Passion. Jesus claims in the introductory formula that the quotation is fulfilled in him. Thus, the analysis of this quotation holds much promise for understanding how Luke uses OT quotations in his passion narrative and how he sees the OT finding its fulfilment in Jesus' Passion. There is also the special historical problem of Jesus' use of Isaiah 53 and the suffering Servant to describe himself and his mission. This Lk. 22:37 may help to solve. Though there are no OT allusions, this short section contains many OT ideas in the wording of the introductory formula, the quotation itself, and Jesus' brief response at the production of the swords. A few elements of LXX style are present.

Three textual problems in Lk. 22:37, 38 require attention before we make some observations about the literary sources. (1) The text form of the quotation includes a definite article before the term ἀνόμων in the Western witness ms. D.<sup>1</sup> This may be part of a partial assimilation to the LXX.<sup>2</sup> The shorter and more widely attested reading is to be preferred. (2) Many Byzantine, some Caesarean, and many Western Latin versions have the

---

<sup>1</sup> τῶν ἀνόμων - Western: D.

<sup>2</sup> There is still the difference in prepositions: Lk. - μετά; LXX - ἐν.

plural instead of the singular article with the prepositional phrase πρὸς ἐμοῦ,<sup>1</sup> which directly follows the quotation. The plural article may be a sign of the copyist's interpretation of the phrase to mean the prophecies of Scripture (cf. 24:27, 44; Ac. 13:29). The singular article contains an ambiguity for the phrase may also mean "my life" (i.e. this concerning me). The plural would then be a secondary attempt to overcome that ambiguity. The reading with the singular article, because it is more widely and anciently attested and because it is the more difficult to understand, is to be accepted. (3) In Lk. 22:38 the unusualness and ambiguity of the phrase ἰκανόν ἐστιν (cf. 3:14) is shown by its replacement in the Western text, ms. D, with the more easily understandable ἄρκει. That the unusualness is real and should be explained as a semitism of some kind is strengthened by this text variant. The Western reading should be regarded as secondary.

As in the case of Lk. 22:24-30 we encounter material in Lk. 22:35-38 which has no parallel in Mark's passion narrative. Again the basic choice is between assuming that Luke had the passion narrative of a source other than Mark at his disposal or that material in Q and Mark, which he has or has not used previously, provided the content for his own composition of the climax to the farewell discourse.<sup>2</sup> Those who accept the passion narrative of a source other than Mark as the basic literary source, if they are to be convincing, must show how the content of Lk. 22:35-38 is appropriate to its immediate historical context. They need to show how the elements of Lk. 22:35-38 form a natural and harmonious unity. They must indicate how the elements are essential to each other. Those who favor Lukan composition need to show how the various elements in Q and Mark were put together by

---

<sup>1</sup> τὰ πρὸς ἐμοῦ - Byzantine: most uncials including A, Γ, Δ; Caesarean: Θ, f<sup>13</sup>; Western: many Old Latin version mss; τὸ πρὸς ἐμοῦ - the rest.

<sup>2</sup> Schürmann, III-Jesu Abschiedsrede, pp. 116ff.; Finegan, p. 16.

Luke at this point in accordance with his purposes.

The farewell discourse in John also contains a section in which Jesus warns the disciples about the opposition of the world to their identification with him (J. 15:18-25).<sup>1</sup> His explanation also contains an OT quotation which functions in the same way as Is. 53:12 in Lk. 22:37: "If the world hates you, know that it has hated me before it hated you . . . now they have seen and hated both me and my Father. It is to fulfil the word that is written in their law, 'They hated me without a cause.'" (J. 15:18, 24, 25; Ps. 68(69):5). In addition to this external evidence, the most natural historical situation in which Jesus would have spoken words about a changed situation, the need for preparation against coming opposition, and the relationship of the disciples to his coming suffering is at the Last Supper table. Any other historical context makes one or more of these elements irrelevant.<sup>2</sup> As far as the literary structure of the piece is concerned, it has been quite thoroughly reworked by Lukan style so that the literary seams if they once existed are no longer visible. The claim that a lack of unity of thought betrays the diverse sources of the section<sup>3</sup> seems to rest on a misunderstanding of the true relationship between the instructions to the disciples and the quotation from Scripture. The Isaiah 53 quotation is not just a later insertion for apologetic or theological purposes.<sup>4</sup> Rather, it is an appropriate and even necessary theological foundation for Jesus' pronouncements about the new stage of salvation history which the disciples are about to enter. It confirms them in their loyalty to Jesus by saying that the opposition and suffering they may

---

<sup>1</sup>Godet (II, p. 302) compares J. 15:18-25 and says it is, ". . . the piece of which this (22:35-38), is, as it were, the summary and parallel."

<sup>2</sup>A. Schlatter, Die beiden Schwerter, Lukas 22, 35-38 (BFTb, XX:6; Gütersloh, 1916), pp. 39ff.

<sup>3</sup>Contrast Creed, p. 270.

<sup>4</sup>Contrast Reese, Die "Stunde," p. 129f.

endure are according to the will of God as revealed in Scripture. There is then sufficient evidence to conclude that the elements of Lk. 22:35-38 are in their correct historical context and that they are essentially related.

If the section was originally composed by Luke, it is proposed that he took elements from a number of different contexts and traditions. We cannot discover the unity of thought among these contexts and traditions which would have enabled Luke, under the guidance of several theological themes, to construct from them a unified segment of his farewell discourse. Also the explanations which use Luke's theological purposes as the guiding principle for the composition of the section present too fragmentary a picture of Lk. 22:35-38. They fail to capture the true unity of the segment, which its place in the historical context alone gives. Although it is true that the Q material, Lk. 10:4f./Mt. 9:9, which is supposed to be the model for Lk. 22:35, 36, stands in general contrast with the thought of Lk. 22:35-36, 38, the essential point on which they should show unity, even by contrast, is missing. The matter of self-defence is not present in Lk. 10:4.<sup>1</sup> That element, however, especially the mention of the swords (Lk. 22:38), is in harmony with the historical context in which Luke presents it, the night of Jesus' arrest (Mk. 14:47, 48/Lk. 22:49-52).<sup>2</sup> The ambiguity of the statements in both contexts (22:35-38; 49-52) with respect to Jesus' attitude toward the use of swords is more understandable as the result of the course of events than as the conscious formation of the writer. The source of the quotation, which is usually proposed, is the testimonia current in the early church. Luke is supposed to have selected it from the testimonia he knew.<sup>3</sup> However, Luke's general avoidance of the introduction of OT

---

<sup>1</sup> Contrast Hirsch (II, p. 260), who thinks the journey to Jerusalem is a proper and understandable original context.

<sup>2</sup> Finegan, p. 16.

<sup>3</sup> Hahn, p. 154; Rese (Die "Stunde," p. 130) offers Luke's understanding of the Is. 53:12 background of Mk. 10:45 as the source for his use of Isaiah 53 here.

quotations into his sources and his evident lack of interest in the suffering Servant figure as a way of understanding Christology make it unlikely that he would have taken the initiative of introducing the quotation into the narrative at this point if he did not have some indication that it was already present in the literary and historical context.<sup>1</sup> The fragmentary nature of the explanation from multiple theological purposes is in the end caused by the supposed disjunction between the apologetic purposes of the quotation and the parenetic purposes of the instructions. This is successfully overcome by presuming that they occurred originally together in a historical context which called for both. Understanding this section as coming from a non-Markan passion narrative source allows for both economy of theory and harmonizes best with what we know of Luke's use of Mark elsewhere.

#### Old Testament Quotation

We now have our first opportunity to apply to an explicit OT quotation of Luke all the questions which will enable us to discover what this way of using the OT can tell us about Luke's approach to the OT Scriptures. Of special importance in the study of a quotation from Isaiah 53 on the lips of Jesus in a gospel passion narrative is the question of the significance for Jesus and Luke of the suffering Servant figure as a key for understanding the divine necessity of Jesus' suffering. In addition, the lack of many OT quotations and allusions in Luke's passion narrative makes it doubly important that we analyze correctly the use Luke does make of this quotation.

When we compare the text-form of Lk. 22:37 and the Hebrew and Greek of Is. 53:12 we see that the Lukan form may be best described as a mixed text-form.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Grundmann, p. 409; cf. Schürmann's (III-Jesu Abschiedsrede, p. 126) full discussion of the arguments.

<sup>2</sup>TDNT, V, p. 707; n. 4.

Lk. 22:37 \_\_\_\_\_ καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη

Is. 53:12 (LXX) καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη

Is. 53:12 (MT) \_\_\_\_\_ 𐤓𐤕𐤕𐤕 𐤓𐤕𐤕𐤕 𐤓𐤕𐤕𐤕

The differences in text-form between the LXX and Luke are the use of a different preposition and the presence in the LXX but absence in Luke of the definite article. There is a difference of opinion as to whether the quotation should be classified as a quotation which agrees with the MT against the LXX<sup>1</sup> or, the differences being so slight, as a quotation which agrees with the MT and the LXX.<sup>2</sup> Those who classify it as the former see the MT and not the LXX as the OT text tradition from which the quotation has been originally drawn. Those who classify it as the latter either find themselves unable to decide which text tradition is the basis for the quotation, or view the LXX as basic here. To understand this quotation as based on only the MT does not properly take into account the similarities between Luke and the LXX which should be recognized in any evaluation of the text-form. Only one other time in the LXX does λογίζομαι translate 𐤓𐤕𐤕𐤕 (2 Ch. 5:6). Because λογίζομαι is not the normal Greek equivalent for 𐤓𐤕𐤕𐤕 (cf. ἡριθμήθη in Aquila and Symmachus at Is. 53:12), it is probable that the LXX has influenced the text-form of this quotation in Luke. The question is whether the quotation was originally based on the MT and later in its translation into Greek assimilated to the LXX or whether it was originally based on the LXX and modified for various reasons away from the LXX text-form. This question of basic text source must be answered by a theory which will account for all the elements in the mixed text-form. We shall propose the classification which seems to us to best explain the text-form and then present our reasons. It seems most reasonable that the quotation was originally based on the MT and was later assimilated to the LXX.

---

<sup>1</sup>Turpie, p. 20; Scott, p. 324; France, Jesus and the OT, p. 244; cf. Dittmar, p. 105; Contrast Döpke, p. 234.

<sup>2</sup>cf. Clemen, p. 56.



The agreements between the MT and Luke against the LXX show a more literal rendering of the Hebrew text than the LXX (the preposition μετά for 57 X ; the absence of the definite article).<sup>1</sup> This more readily explains these differences from the LXX than any reasoning from conscious editing of the LXX text. Stylistic improvement for better understanding (cf. Eusebius, Demonst. Ev. III:2:68-70 - LXX, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη followed by the paraphrase, καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων λογίσθεται ),<sup>2</sup> or theological editing out of respect for the person of Jesus<sup>3</sup> only explain the change in preposition but not the removal of the article. The explanation of the change in preposition is not so obvious or convincing when we consider that we must assume the same editorial practice for Justin (Apol. I:50:2; cf. I:51:2; Dial. 13:7; 89:3), as well as Eusebius.

It is true that when Justin and Eusebius use the text-form which agrees with Luke they are summarizing the content of Isaiah 53 by way of paraphrase. This could mean that they themselves are choosing the more natural or lucid way of expressing the ideas of Isaiah as they select this preposition. However, a better link between these three writers is not a conscious literary method or even a common lapse in writing from memory,<sup>4</sup> but Justin and Eusebius' common dependence on Luke. Although some might contend that Luke and the others are dependent on an independent LXX text tradition unknown to us,<sup>5</sup> the fact that Luke (Ac. 8:32ff.), Justin (Apol. I:51:2) and Eusebius

<sup>1</sup>cf. Symmachus - Is. 53:12, μετὰ τῶν ἀνόμων ; Rese (Alttestamentliche Motive, p. 154) sees no influence running in either direction between Luke and Symmachus. He views the parallel as evidence for a similar method of literal translation.

<sup>2</sup>Holtz, p. 43, n. 1.

<sup>3</sup>George, RB, LXXX, p. 197.

<sup>4</sup>Karnetzki (p. 247) proposes such for Luke; Wolff (p. 126) proposes such for Justin.

<sup>5</sup>TDNT, IV, p. 287, n. 12; K. F. Euler (Die Verkündigung vom leidenden Gottesknecht aus Jesaja 53 in der griechischen Bibel (BWANT, IV:14; Stuttgart-Berlin, 1934), p. 83) identifies two groups of textual tradition for the OT text of Isaiah 53.

(Demonstr. Ev. III:2:68-70) do know Isaiah 53 in the LXX text tradition which has come down to us makes it unlikely that these text-form discrepancies are due to an independent LXX text tradition which these writers used along side the more widely known LXX text tradition.

Luke's distinctive text-form is probably evidence of an original translation from the MT within the Christian community. We are immediately thrust into the consideration of the origin of the quotation when we begin to see it as a translation. While it is possible to see Luke as the translator of the MT here,<sup>1</sup> we wonder, knowing Luke's practice of adhering closely to the LXX when he is expanding a quotation from his sources and also quoting at length from the OT,<sup>2</sup> why he in his translation here presents a mixed text-form. It appears more in keeping with his use of OT material contained in his sources that he took the material over unchanged, not modifying it to make it conform with the LXX text-form. If the origin of the text-form is pre-Lukan,<sup>3</sup> we need to decide whether it originated with Jesus or the early Christian community. Since this is more properly discussed when we consider sources, we shall only indicate here what in the mixed text-form is of importance for that decision. Those elements which betray the MT, the difference in preposition and absence of the article, do not have any stylistic or theological significance, which might indicate that they are secondary archaizing. Nor need we to think of them as evidences of the text tradition of an Aramaic targum which Jesus used.<sup>4</sup> The quotation probably came into the gospel tradition through an Aramaic oral tradition,<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>France, Jesus and the OT, p. 244; V88bus (The Prelude, p. 135). without explanation notes that a text-form which is closer to the MT than the LXX is what we would expect of Luke.

<sup>2</sup>Sparks, JTS, XLIV, p. 132.

<sup>3</sup>Contrast Rese (Alttestamentliche Motive, p. 154), who maintains that the mixed text-form does not enable us to decisively conclude that this part of the tradition is pre-Lukan.

<sup>4</sup>Contrast B8hl, p. 87f.

<sup>5</sup>Toy, p. xxxv.

which had literally translated the MT. When the Aramaic tradition was translated into Greek, the familiar wording of the LXX left its mark on the quotation. The reason why the wording was not totally reworked according to the LXX probably was that the preservers of the tradition attempted to reflect as accurately as possible the wording of the Aramaic tradition which was revered as giving the words of Jesus. This peculiar text-form, which recurs in Justin is part of J. R. Harris' evidence for the Testimony Book Hypothesis.<sup>1</sup> There is a great deal of plausibility in his hypothesis, especially if one sees the figure of Jesus as the originator of the quotation. Respect for the words of Jesus is the reason why the mixed text-form with its basis in the MT is preserved intact by writers who know the LXX text-form. In sum, the mixed text-form shows itself to be dependent on the MT, influenced by the LXX in its translation from a semitic source into Greek, and finally taken over in this mixed form intact by Luke. It should be pointed out that the difference in text-form from the LXX does not involve any difference in its meaning.<sup>2</sup>

In general we may say the task of the introductory formula is to show the relationship between the OT quotation and its NT context. It may also give an indication of the general hermeneutical framework in which the NT writer sees the relationship of the OT to the NT situation. The introductory formula may further point out the relationship of the OT material to the reader of the NT work. Finally, the formula may serve to specify which OT book or even passage is being quoted.<sup>3</sup>

In our introductory formula, λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι τοῦτο τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί (22:37), the conjunction which grammatically connects the OT quotation to the NT context is γὰρ. In Luke the majority

---

<sup>1</sup>Harris, II, p. 70.

<sup>2</sup>Rese, Alttestamentliche Motive, p. 154.

<sup>3</sup>Karnetzki, p. 8.

of OT quotations contain no conjunction in their introductory formula.<sup>1</sup>

Almost always the quotation is part of either a dialogue or preaching and forms such an integral part of the conversation that the introductory formula does not need to include a conjunction. When Luke does use a connective he prefers equally *οὗτος* (Ac. 4:11; Lk. 7:27); *καθώς* (Ac. 7:42, 48; 15:15; Lk. 2:23; cf. *κατά* - Lk. 2:24; *ὥς* - Ac. 13:33; Lk. 3:4; *οὕτως* - Ac. 7:6; 13:34); and *γάρ* (Lk. 4:10; 20:42; 22:37; Ac. 1:20; 2:25; 13:47; 23:5). When it occurs in an introductory formula, *γάρ* may mean "for" in the strong sense of "because," showing that the quotation which follows is the reason or the cause of a certain opinion or action which has just been recorded (Lk. 4:10; 20:42; Ac. 2:25; 13:47). It may also be used in the weak sense of "for," showing that the quotation which follows is simply the explanation of the action which has preceded (Ac. 1:20; 23:5). In our present case the conjunction appears in the immediate context and functions in the strong sense. It doesn't simply provide an explanation for the instructions of Jesus. The solemn almost oath-like formula in which *γάρ* is found, *λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν* and the *δεῖ τελεσθῆναι* of the introductory formula point out that Jesus is going to use the strength of the divine necessity of the fulfilment of Scripture as the confirmation that his warning will come to pass.<sup>2</sup> The emphatic way in which this fulfilment of Scripture is put demands that if its full force is to be transferred to its immediately preceding context, then *γάρ* should be given the stronger meaning, "because." The

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. Lk. 4:4, 8, 12, 17; 10:27; 18:20; 19:46; 20:37; Ac. 2:30, 31; 3:25; 4:25; 7:3, 5, 27, 32, 35, 40; 8:32; 13:22; contrast Lk. 20:17; It might be contended that at Lk. 22:37 *γάρ* is not within the introductory formula proper, which actually begins at *ταῦτο*. Since the quotation is the content of Jesus', saying which he introduces by *λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν* we can understand how the *γάρ* exercises influence in relating the quotation and its introductory formula to what has gone before. It functions in the immediate context to connect the quotation to what precedes.

<sup>2</sup>V. Hasler, Amen: Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Einführungsformel der Herrenworte, "Wahrlich, ich sage euch," (Zürich, 1969), p. 112; cf. K. Berger, Die Amen Worte Jesus (BZNW, XXXIX; Berlin, 1970), p. 91.

the causal relationship, however, is not direct. The quotation does not give an OT prediction of hostility against the disciples of the Messiah. Rather, Jesus speaks of hostility against himself which is predicted when it is said the suffering Servant would be numbered among the transgressors and treated as a transgressor (22:37). The indirect causal relationship is created on the one hand by the fact that the disciples are identified with Jesus in his trials (22:28). They will experience the hostility that he experiences. Just as surely as according to the will of God revealed in Scripture he is going to be numbered with the transgressors so they by analogy can be certain that they must prepare for the hostility to come. On the other hand, the hostility shown to Jesus will trigger the new situation in which the disciples must be on guard. In a real sense the fulfilment of the prophecy concerning Jesus' being numbered with the transgressors will be the cause of the situation in which the disciples must take precautions.<sup>1</sup> Although at first sight the lack of direct relationship between the OT passage and the immediate NT context might make us wonder whether the OT quotation was originally present in this context,<sup>2</sup> when we consider that the γάρ properly connects the quote with its context and when we note the same kind of reasoning at J. 15:25, then we can understand that the quotation is indeed closely bound to its immediate context.<sup>3</sup> It not only formally communicates the certainty that the time of hostility is coming, it also gives the reason and even the cause why preparation should be made.

Luke's quite lengthy introductory formula gives us much information

---

<sup>1</sup>Schütz (p. 88) points out that the passive of the infinitive τελεσθῆναι implies that God himself will bring this Scripture to fulfilment. The passive voice of πληρῶω and τελέω is regularly used in statements about fulfilment of Scripture in Luke (4:21; 18:31; 24:44). It is probably not so significant. It only indicates that some unidentified agent whether human or divine will bring the Scripture to fulfilment (Ac. 13:29).

<sup>2</sup>Cf. Rese, Die "Stunde," p. 129; J. Weiss, p. 513.

<sup>3</sup>TDNT, V, p. 716.

about his hermeneutical approach to the OT. He does not state specifically from which OT book or passage the quotation was taken. He simply uses the substantive participle τὸ γεγραμμένον (cf. Lk. 20:17 where he replaces Mark's γραφὴν with τὸ γεγραμμένον, Mk. 12:10; the plural use in Lk. 18:31; 21:22; 24:44; Ac. 13:29; 24:14; cf. Ac. 2:16; 13:40). This indicates that it is OT Scripture which is about to be cited. The significance of this specification in the introductory formula is twofold. Although this formula does not point out a specific OT book, passage, or writer (contrast Lk. 3:4 and 20:42 where Luke expands and makes more specific the citation formula with respect to its OT reference, Mk. 1:2; 12:36; cf. Ac. 13:33), it does make the quotation more specific in another sense. It declares that this portion which is cited will be fulfilled. How the fulfilment will occur and whether more than what is cited will be fulfilled we leave for later discussion. What the phrase τὸ γεγραμμένον tells us at Lk. 22:37 is that a concrete part of the OT, the fact of being numbered, reckoned, treated as a transgressor will be fulfilled in Jesus.<sup>1</sup> The use of a substantive participle in the perfect tense seems to enhance the idea of fulfilment as set forth by the verb complex, δεῖ τελεσθῆναι. The perfect tense seems to communicate the continuing effectiveness into the present or to the time of fulfilment of the prophetic promise which has been made. The use of τὸ γεγραμμένον is akin to the use of γέγραπται in introductory formulas to fulfilment proof-texts (e.g. Lk. 3:4; 7:27; 24:46; Ac. 1:20; 7:42; 13:33; 15:15; 23:5).

The main verbs in the introductory formula, δεῖ, τελεσθῆναι, indicate immediately Luke's hermeneutical approach. It is a scheme of promise and fulfilment within which Luke wants us to view this quotation. He stresses this forcefully by using not one but two words which he often relates to the fulfilment of Scriptures. The impersonal 3rd person singular δεῖ, "it is

---

<sup>1</sup>Pilgrim, p. 149.

necessary," is one of Luke's favorite words for expressing the divine necessity under which Jesus obediently served even to death.<sup>1</sup> While δεῖ, which usually takes the particular nuance of its meaning from its immediate context, probably does not add any different meaning to the introductory formula, it does shift the emphasis of the formula decidedly in the direction of fulfilment. Although Luke does not use the word in every OT quotation which has to do with fulfilment, or in every passion prediction of Jesus, it does occur frequently enough to create a pattern. Its presence in this introductory formula makes this quotation the climax of the passion predictions (Lk. 9:22; 13:33; 17:25; 24:7, 26, 44). For the first time the Scriptures are mentioned explicitly in connection with the use of δεῖ to describe the necessity of Jesus' suffering and death. It is not insignificant that two of the three remaining uses of δεῖ in the gospel make this connection. (24:26, 44; cf. 24:7; Ac. 1:16; 17:3). Thus, δεῖ in this introductory formula is very important for understanding Luke's view of the relation of the divine necessity under which Jesus' lived and died and the fulfilment of Scripture.

The term which clearly indicates to us the hermeneutical perspective with which Luke viewed this verse is τελεσθῆναι. By immediately placing the quotation within a promise and fulfilment scheme it creates another function for Is. 53:12 within the passion narrative. The quotation declares that the near future which Jesus will experience must happen according to the plan of God in order to fulfill that which has been promised.

Three of the five uses of τελέω<sup>2</sup> by Luke involve the affirmation

---

<sup>1</sup>E. Fascher ("Theologische Bemerkungen zu δεῖ," NT Studien für R. Bultmann, ed. W. Eltester, 2nd ed. (BZNW, XXI; Berlin, 1957), p. 246) notes that of the 102 occurrences of δεῖ in the NT 44 are in Luke-Acts.

<sup>2</sup>Amsler (p. 79) distinguishes between the meanings of πληρόω and τελέω. He claims that Luke uses τελέω at Lk. 22:37 because he wants to emphasize that the OT passage is not yet fulfilled, but rather is in the process of being fulfilled. According to Amsler, if Luke wanted to emphasize the completed state of fulfilment, he would have used πληρόω. Neither Biblical nor secular Greek usage bears out this distinction in meaning between the verbs.

that the suffering which Jesus endured, his death, happened in order to fulfill Scripture (Lk. 18:31; 22:37; Ac. 13:29; cf. Lk. 24:44; Ac. 13:27). Since the fulfilment has not yet taken place the emphasis in Lk. 22:37 naturally rests on the "promise" aspect of the promise and fulfilment scheme. Hence, this quotation is an example of Rese's proof use in a "scheme of promise and fulfilment."<sup>1</sup>

The introductory formula is so constructed that we have an OT prophetic promise as the content of a prophetic promise which Jesus makes. The formula begins with Jesus' solemn promise, "For I tell you . . ." This is intended to confirm his warning to the disciples. Then immediately we encounter the introductory formula proper, "that this scripture must be fulfilled in me. . . ." This is followed by the quotation. Thus, the promise of Scripture itself becomes the promise of Jesus. This not only shows the harmony between Jesus' sense of destiny under the will of God and the will of God declared in Scripture, but it also shows that Luke saw Jesus in his subservience to that will of God as the active fulfiller of it. The ἐν may be understood in primarily an instrumental sense, though it also is used in a locative sense indicating that the fulfilment centers in Jesus. Jesus, then, not only takes the part of a prophet in interpreting the OT and even proclaiming prophetic promises which are about to come to pass, but in his interpretation he points to himself as the one concerning whom these have been written (22:37, τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει ; 24:27, 44).<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Rese, Alttestamentliche Motive, p. 155.

<sup>2</sup>Admittedly the precise meaning of the phrase which follows the quotation is disputed. Because of the grammatical coordination between the OT quotation and this phrase (22:37, γάρ . . . τό (quotation) . . . καὶ γὰρ (omitted by D, a few Old Latin mss, and syr<sup>s</sup>, c) τό), it is difficult to take the phrase as a subordinate further explanation of the quotation and render it "this concerning me has its fulfilment" (Creed, p. 271; Clemen, p. 57). Further, if the coordinate status is recognized and the above rendering is maintained, then the meaning of the whole becomes tautologous (Clemen, p. 57). However, when the possible meaning "my life is at an end" is substituted (cf. Josephus' (Ant. XVII:185) description of Antipater's reaction to the commotion in court which leads him to think that his father has died: πιστεύει τέλος ἀλθθῶς τὸν πατέρα ἔχειν . . . ; cf. VIII:388) then it is claimed that the phrase adds the proper emphasis to the quotation and is not



These statements about scriptural fulfilment and the interpretation of the Scripture in terms of the interpreter, which appear in this introductory formula, are unique in first century Jewish exegesis. To understand this it is necessary to compare briefly this introductory formula with introductory formulas in contemporary Jewish literature, particularly the Mishnah, the rabbinic writings and the literature of

---

repetitious (Klostermann, p. 214; Schlatter, Lukas, p. 432).

Although this explanation has convinced many, it is not unanimously supported by NT or Lukan usage. One of the two other uses of τέλος ἔχει in the NT does not describe death (Mk. 3:26; cf. Hb. 7:3 where σωῆς makes explicit the metaphorical sense "to die"). The phrase τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ, which Luke uses with various objects to indicate "those things concerning Jesus" (e.g. Lk. 24:19; Ac. 18:25; 23:11, 15; 28:31), usually occurs in a description of the missionary preaching of the early church. Hence, we must depend on the context to define its meaning more closely and therefore should not take as the basic meaning "the life of Jesus." Lk. 24:19 is a good example of its use with the meaning "the events of Jesus' life." Luke also uses the phrase in connection with the fulfilment of Scripture and in those contexts, "those things concerning Jesus" are the various prophecies in the OT which are fulfilled in his life (24:27, 44; Ac. 13:29; cf. the use of the preposition περὶ to relate OT promise to NT fulfilment (Lk. 7:27; Ac. 1:16; 2:31; 7:52; 8:34; 28:23). If we combine our understanding of Luke's use of τὸ περὶ both to indicate things in Jesus' life and OT promises made about Jesus with the recognition that we must seek in any given context the precise focus of the phrase, we realize that we must ask in the case of Lk. 22:37 whether there is an antecedent in the context which will tell us what meaning Luke attached to the phrase. There is in fact an antecedent which stands before the quotation itself. Thus τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ probably means the content of the OT quotation and not the life of Jesus. It is true that this conclusion means that the message of the ἐν ἐμοί of the introductory formula is repeated. The message of οὗτοι τέλεσθῆναι is also repeated in τέλος ἔχει. However, this repetition harmonizes well with the purpose of the quotation in the passage.

The proposed meaning for τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει, "My life is at an end," while solving one supposed difficulty, introduces another. Unless we are going to assume on the basis of the larger original context of Isaiah 53 that "being numbered with the transgressors" does mean "to die," we must take this phrase, "My life is at an end" as an interpretation of Is. 53:12 by Jesus and Luke following him. Yet, we have no other evidence in Luke that he understood that scripture in this way. As far as a positive reason for Luke's repetition here, we may cite the continuing difficulty of the early church to make non-Christians understand that the suffering and death of the Messiah was part of the divine plan (cf. 18:31-34; 24:25-27; 44-48; Ac. 17:3). For emphasis, in order to overcome this difficulty Luke states again after the quotation what he said before it that what is written will have its fulfilment in him (cf. Calvin, III, p. 145). Thus, from the point of view of grammar and Luke's theological purposes we prefer the meaning "this concerning me has its fulfilment" (cf. Josephus (Ant. X:35), who describes prophecy brought to completion as τέλος ἔχοντα; so also B.J. IV:387, τὴν κατὰ τοῦ πατρίδος προφητείαν τέλους ἡξίωσαν); cf. Selwyn's (Oracles, p. 370) view that Luke means by "that which concerns me has an end" the preparation which Jesus made in order to fulfill Scripture by the provision of swords.



valents for  $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\acute{o}\omega$  and  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega$  ,  $\chi\acute{\iota}\zeta\eta$  does not occur at all in the introductory formulas in the Qumran literature<sup>1</sup> and that the other equivalent,  $\square^{\prime}\rho^{\prime}\eta$  , occurs only once (CD 3:20, 21, where it means "ordained"),<sup>2</sup> shows that the Qumran and the NT communities had different understandings of where they stood in relationship to the final fulfilment of OT prophecy. The Qumran sect believed that it had not yet come. They interpreted Hab. 2:3 to mean that the last times were prolonged beyond all that the prophets spoke (1 QpH 7:7). They might be at the beginning of it, but they were certainly not at the end. The NT writer declared that the last times had finally arrived in Jesus and that all was now beginning to be fulfilled in him.<sup>3</sup> Thus, verbs specifying fulfilment could figure prominently in the NT introductory formulas while they remained rare even in a Jewish sect which interpreted Scripture from essentially the same apocalyptic perspective. Even in a quotation, such as Lk. 22:37/Is. 53:12, which forms part of a prediction that is yet to be fulfilled, the conviction that the fulfilment is immediately at hand allows the NT writer to use a fulfilment verb. The Qumran exegetes writing from the same basic eschatological perspective probably would not have employed a fulfilment verb.

This brings us to the decisive difference in hermeneutical perspective between the NT and Jewish exegesis of the OT. The NT interpretation is eschatological in perspective only because it is essentially Christological or Christocentric.<sup>4</sup> It is the presence of Jesus the Christ who fulfills all Scripture which makes the present situation eschatological, a time when fulfilment does and will take place. Thus, the interpretations of the OT in Luke are primarily the interpretation of things concerning the promised

---

<sup>1</sup>J. A. Fitzmyer, NTS, VII, p. 303.

<sup>2</sup>See above, p. 269 , n. 3.

<sup>3</sup>F. F. Bruce, Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts, p. 67.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 68.

Messiah which have been fulfilled in Jesus.<sup>1</sup> Hence, we have the declaration by Jesus at Lk. 22:37 that the Scripture must be fulfilled in him and the emphasis after the quotation that "this concerning me" has its fulfilment.

The other difference in hermeneutical perspective is that in the Gospels the one who interprets is also the subject of the interpretation. Although Jesus and the Teacher of Righteousness both perform the same role for their respective communities, only Jesus presents himself as the subject of his exegesis.<sup>2</sup> We see, then, that this introductory formula (22:37), manifests a hermeneutical perspective which, while having some similarities with the Jewish approach, shows these distinctive features: an understanding of the promise and fulfilment scheme which sees fulfilment in the present or not too distant future; a Christological or Christocentric perspective for interpreting the OT Scriptures; and the presentation of the interpreter of Scripture as the subject of the interpretation.

Having noted the interpretational perspectives and contextual relationships which the introductory formula indicates, we are almost ready to ask how Luke uses the quotation in his narrative. First, however, we must ask about the basic meaning of the quotation itself.

"And he was reckoned with transgressors" (Is. 53:12d) is the second member of a fourfold concluding summary of the fourth Servant Song (Is. 52:13-53:12).

Isa. 53:12

- A. MT - יְשׁוּעַת הַיָּמִין וְהַיָּמִין  
 LXX - ἀνθ' ὧν παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ
- B. MT - וְהַיָּמִין וְהַיָּמִין  
 LXX - καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη

<sup>1</sup>See above, p. 267, n. 2.

<sup>2</sup>Pilgrim, p. 289.

A. MT -

LXX = καὶ αὐτὸς ἀμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνῆνεν κεν

B. MT -

LXX = καὶ διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη

Leaving aside the question of the identity of the Servant for the time being,<sup>1</sup> we shall treat the passage in which our quote is contained as the concluding summary of an account of the suffering of a human agent, which involves a death that will atone for the sins of "the many." This four-fold conclusion not only summarizes what has been described in the main body of the song but it is also directly connected with a preceding statement about the Servant's glorification (Is. 53:12a, b). The summary of his sufferings is the reason for his glorification.

The four member summary may be understood as two couplets in an ABAB pattern. The A member states in general terms, the B member in specific terms, items about the Servant's sufferings from a common perspective. The first couplet presents the objective perspective on the Servant's sufferings. The second couplet presents the theological significance of that suffering. This is clearer in the MT than the LXX.

Objective: A - "because he poured out his soul to death"

facts: (LXX - "because his soul was handed over to death")

B - "and was numbered with the transgressors"

Theological: A - "yet he bore the sin of many"

Significance: B - "and made intercession for the transgressors."

(LXX - "he was handed over because of their sins")

As we can see Luke has chosen to quote that section of this summary which is the more specific about the objective facts of the Servant's suffering.

The LXX normally uses λογίζομαι to render λογίζομαι, "to think, account, esteem, reckon" (e.g. 2 Km. 19:44); Is. 33:8). Only twice does it render

<sup>1</sup>See below, pp. 286, 295.

the verb לָמַד which has the more restricted meaning, "to count, number" (2 Ch. 5:6; Is. 53:12). This acceptable though not so literal translation<sup>1</sup> may have been caused by the influence of a double occurrence of לָמַד - לֹא - לֹא earlier in the song (Is. 53:3, 4). This use of לֹא might also be seen as an attempt to interpret the summary phrase in the light of that earlier description of the people's low estimation of the suffering Servant. Since there are no other comparable uses of לֹא with the preposition עִם or מֵת in Isaiah or the rest of the LXX, we must content ourselves with this understanding of the presumed process of translation as the key to the basic meaning of the verb here. The picture is that of someone who has been classified, identified, numbered with a certain class of persons, transgressors. The emphasis appears to be on the classification to which the person has been assigned. The use of לֹא, however, brings in some inferences about the character of the act of numbering. It is a matter of evaluation which possibly includes subjective prejudice.

The term ἀνόμων which denotes the class of persons with whom the Servant is being reckoned translates a variety of Hebrew words. In our case it is אֲנֹכִי (Is. 53:12). The word ἀνόμων is used in the LXX to describe those who are basically irreligious or disloyal to God. They show this in one respect by a rebelliousness, a disobedience of the Law of God (e.g. Ps. 50(51):15; Pr. 28:10). The term may also have the specialized meaning, "Gentile," to indicate non-Jews either in a neutral or pejorative sense (e.g. Esth. 4:17u). The LXX translator of Isaiah used this term equally of Jews and Gentiles (e.g. Is. 10:6; 48:8) and "evidently resorted to the term. . . whenever he was in need of a synonym, or wished to give the Greek equivalent of a term he found difficult to translate."<sup>2</sup> Thus, we cannot identify a more specific meaning for it than "transgressor" in a

<sup>1</sup>cf. Aquila and Symmachus who have ὑπομέτρον.

<sup>2</sup>I. L. Seeligmann, The Septuagint Version of Isaiah (Leiden, 1948), p. 105.

religious sense.

Since the statement (Is. 53:12d) is part of a concluding summary we may look to the rest of the song to see what "being reckoned with the transgressors" means. It appears to cover the experiences of rejection, trouble, distress, and ill-treatment described in Is. 53:3, 4. Those who witness the suffering of the Servant reckon that it is God who is smiting him (Is. 53:4). It is the nature of God to recompense evil on evildoers (3 Km. 8:32/2 Ch. 6:23) and visit wrathful judgment and persecution on them (Job 19:29; 34:17; Ps. 36(37):28). Since the Servant is experiencing such calamity he must have been so reckoned by God. The people feel justified in evaluating and treating him as a transgressor. The larger context also points out that the Servant was innocent and did not deserve this classification. He was smitten and afflicted for the sins of the people (Is. 53:8, 12e, f). It may seem that we have moved easily from an explanation of this phrase (Is. 53:12d) as a statement of an objective fact, the evaluation and treatment of the Servant as a transgressor by the people, to seeing it as conveying theological significance, such human reckoning believes that God has evaluated the Servant this way since he has afflicted him with a transgressor's punishment. However, we should understand that the character of the statement as objective fact still predominates. The theological significance only comes to the fore because the action is stated in the passive voice and the agent is not explicitly given.<sup>1</sup>

The vagueness in Is. 53:12d with respect to the agent's identity, the

---

<sup>1</sup>C. Westermann (*Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary*, trans. D. M. G. Stalker (OT Library; London, 1969), p. 268) observes that the reflexive rather than the passive translation of the verb is to be preferred in the MT because the emphasis in the first member of the summary (Is. 53:12c) is on the Servant's active role in giving over his life. Though this rendering would maintain the objective perspective of this couplet and allow a more direct application of the passage to Jesus' actions in allowing his arrest and crucifixion with criminals, we need to bear in mind the passives of the LXX translation (Is. 53:12) which possibly imply divine activity.

specific content of being reckoned with transgressors, and the nature of the transgressor obviously opens the way to a variety of interpretations when one claims, as Luke does, that this passage is fulfilled in the Passion of Jesus. What we should maintain is a balanced view of the various features in Is. 53:12. Though primarily descriptive of an objective fact this statement with its implied but unnamed agent also implies divine involvement in the action.

Luke uses λογίζομαι only twice (Lk. 22:37; Ac. 19:27). The second usage follows one of the normal Greek constructions and has the meaning, "to be evaluated as, counted as" (εἰς οὐθὲν λογισθῆναι; cf. Xenophon, Cyr. III:1:33, εἰς ἀργύριον λογισθέντα). Although some of the nuance of evaluation may be present in Luke's use at Lk. 22:37, the main emphasis is probably on the category into which Jesus says he will be placed and according to which he will be treated.<sup>1</sup> The only other use of ἀνομος in the gospel and Acts (Ac. 2:23) may denote "Gentiles" in a pejorative sense. They are the godless ones who unjustly crucified Jesus, the man approved by God. Thus the more general meaning of lawless transgressor comes into play there too.<sup>2</sup> Unfortunately this isolated use cannot tell us whether Luke generally used the word in the specialized sense, "Gentile," or in the more general sense "transgressor" or "evildoer." We cannot determine from it the term's precise meaning in Lk. 22:37. At least, we can say that possibly Luke's knowledge of the specialized use caused him to refrain from using the term later in the passion narrative to describe the criminals with whom Jesus was crucified. A later interpolation into Mark saw Jesus' crucifixion between criminals as the fulfilment of Is. 53:12 (Mk. 15:28).<sup>3</sup> Luke consistently uses κακούργος to describe

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. P. Lond. 328:8 a camel's colt that is full grown may now be classed with the mature, λογισμένου νυνὶ ἐν τελείois.

<sup>2</sup>Baumbach, p. 162; Conzelmann (Theology of Luke, p. 91) sees no special usage to mean "Gentile" at Ac. 2:23.

<sup>3</sup>See below p. 280.



these criminals (Lk. 23:32, 33, 39; cf. Mk. 15:27). This term seems to convey the same meaning as the general use of *ἄνομος*. He may refrain from using *ἄνομος* in those places because he thought that the predominance of the specialized meaning in his readers' thinking would confuse them and block his intentions to use it in the more general sense.

Though we can understand that "Gentile" is probably not meant at Lk. 22:37, it is difficult to decide between "criminal," one outside human law, and "transgressor," one outside God's law, as the exclusive meaning. Probably since this verse is used as a reason for the disciples' need to take defensive precautions against opposition by their contemporaries, it is best to take "criminal" as the basic meaning here. The disciples must defend against being treated as outlaws, enemies of society, because their leader is going to be classed among and treated as an outlaw. Jesus' instructions about the preparations should be taken concretely and not metaphorically or in a spiritual sense.<sup>1</sup> And since Jewish society deemed itself to be founded on the law of God, the religious or theological overtones to the term which predominate in the OT must also be seen as appropriate to Jesus' statement here. He is classed as a transgressor as well as an outlaw.

---

<sup>1</sup>The metaphorical or spiritual understanding of the instructions (22:35-36) is normally introduced as part of an attempt to harmonize the instruction to buy a sword with Jesus' enigmatic reply in Lk. 22:38 and his rebuke to the disciples at Lk. 22:51. (Montefiore, II, p. 603; cf. most recently Völsch (The Prelude, p. 46), who builds his argument on the parenthetic character of the discourse as a whole. This factor produces the metaphorical setting); taking the command as a real one we can also harmonize it with Jesus' aversion to violence by seeing the intended purpose of the swords as self-defense (Easton, Luke, pp. 328-29; H. Flender, St. Luke, Theologian of Redemptive History, trans. R. H. & I. Fuller (London, 1967), p. 83; Ellis, Luke, p. 256). Jesus' enigmatic reply may still be understood as an indication that the disciples misunderstood his instructions. It was not, however, the mistaking of a metaphorical use of "sword" for a concrete, but rather, misinterpreting a command to make preparations for self-defense as a command to arm oneself to go on the offensive. Again at the arrest the disciples continued to show their misunderstanding. The reason we prefer this interpretation of the command concerning sword is that it allows the sword to be treated in the same way as the other objects in the instructions. They are concrete symbols of a real physical preparation that the disciples must make.

Now that we have sketched out the boundaries of meaning of this OT quotation both in its original context and in Luke we may ask to what use Luke puts it in his immediate context and in the larger context of his passion narrative. We have already discussed briefly the function of the text within its immediate context, when we looked at λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν which introduces the introductory formula.<sup>1</sup> The quotation provides a reason why the disciples will face a changed situation and will need to provide for their own subsistence and defense. The verbs of fulfilment in the introductory formula suggest another role for the quotation as a prophetic promise which will somehow be fulfilled in the passion narrative which follows.<sup>2</sup> How are these two functions related and what does Luke show in his passion narrative to be the fulfilment of Is. 53:12?

Some have sought to subordinate the first function, providing a reason for the instructions, to the second, providing a prophecy to be fulfilled. They claim that Luke disturbed by the disciples' use of swords at Jesus' arrest introduced Jesus' instruction and prediction here. Thus, the disciples were fulfilling Scripture by acting the part of outlaws when they drew swords in the garden (Lk. 22:49/Mk. 14:47).<sup>3</sup> This understanding, however, really compounds the difficulty which it is trying to overcome. Not only do the disciples use swords but they do so at Jesus' command in order to fulfill Scripture. Those who maintain this position must assume that Jesus gave this order in an ironic or at best enigmatic way: he did not mean it, yet at the same time he wanted to mislead his disciples so that

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, p. 263f.

<sup>2</sup>Horne (IV:1, pp. 339ff.) classifies this quotation in his category one: a thing predicted which will be literally accomplished; Scott (p. 59) calls it a direct Messianic prophecy.

<sup>3</sup>Strauss, p. 626; Selwyn, Oracles, pp. 370ff.; most recently P. S. Minear ("A Note on Luke 22:36," NovT, VII (1964-65), pp. 128-134) who is followed by S. G. Wilson, NTS, XVI, p. 335.

they thought that he meant it.<sup>1</sup>

A more satisfactory understanding of the relationship of the quotation's "explanation" function to its "fulfilment" function is to allow each to exist independently and in parallel. The disciples play no essential part in the fulfilment of Is. 53:12 by acting as the transgressors. Rather, the precautions they must take are because they will be placed in a situation analogous to what Jesus will experience when he fulfills Is. 53:12. The argument is based on the identity of the disciples with their master and derives its strength from the relative position of the two. It is argued a maiori ad minus, although the terms of the argument are mentioned in the reverse order. The line of argument runs this way. A disciple should expect no different treatment from his master. Since his master by divine necessity must be reckoned with the transgressors, the disciple should expect no better lot (cf. Lk. 6:40; J. 15:18).<sup>2</sup> He should take precautions against the worst. Although earlier we indicated that in some way Jesus' fulfilment of Is. 53:12 will be the cause of the situation in which the disciples must take precautions, this causal relationship is really established only because of the solidarity of the disciples with their master. As he is treated, so they will be treated.

Having separated the "fulfilment" function from the "explanation" function and thus eliminated the disciples' use of swords at the arrest as the place where this scripture is fulfilled we are free to ask whether Luke saw other specific details of the Passion as the place where this quotation reached fulfilment? The three specific details which have been proposed

---

<sup>1</sup> Minear, NovT, VII, p. 132; cf. R. Summers (Jesus the Universal Savior: Commentary on Luke (Waco, Tex., 1972), p. 282) and F. F. Bruce (This is That, p. 94); Conzelmann (Theology of Luke, p. 83) believes the function of the quotation is to help the disciples avoid the misunderstanding about the use of swords for it interprets the instruction by saying Jesus is one who doesn't fight but willingly is treated as a transgressor.

<sup>2</sup> Klostermann, p. 214; Hooker, p. 86; Voss, p. 111.

as the fulfilment are the arrest;<sup>1</sup> the exchange for Barabbas;<sup>2</sup> and the crucifixion between two criminals.<sup>3</sup>

The first suggestion (Lk. 22:52-Mk. 14:48-49) does not completely satisfy because Luke does nothing in his editing of Mark to show that he wanted Jesus' words here to interpret the arrest as the fulfilment of Is. 53:12. He does not show any verbal agreement with Is. 53:12, for he does not change ληστές to ἀνέμους.<sup>4</sup> However, a material parallelism appears to be present. Jesus asks why the arrest party comes armed as though they were apprehending a dangerous political revolutionary, ληστές. They are reckoning him among transgressors, as an outlaw, by their treatment of him. Still, the fact that closer verbal agreement is not present and, more importantly, that Luke omits the explicit statement that the arrest by an armed band fulfills Scripture (Lk. 22:53/Mk. 14:49) leads us to conclude that Luke did not intend his readers to see in the arrest alone the fulfilment of Jesus' prediction. The exchange of Jesus for Barabbas (Lk. 23:18-25) also lacks clear verbal parallels with Is. 53:12. The material parallelism is not as clear as Lk. 22:52.<sup>5</sup> There is no editorial comment indicating that Scripture has been fulfilled in this incident. We must look elsewhere.

---

<sup>1</sup>Zahn, Lukas, p. 685; A. Loisy, L'Évangile selon Luc (Frankfurt, 1971), p. 533; Thompson, p. 261; Creed (p. 271) thinks that Lk. 22:37 is intended to replace Mk. 14:49b; See below, p. 336.

<sup>2</sup>D. G. Miller, p. 163; cf. Calvin, III, p. 183f.

<sup>3</sup>Rese, Alttestamentliche Motive, p. 156; Goppelt, p. 123; Fleigel, p. 86; Hauck, p. 284; Hillmann, p. 189; Loisy (Luc, p. 555), sees Is. 53:12 as the source of this historical detail; Contrast Weidel, ThStuKr, LXXXV, p. 253; Hooker, p. 91.

<sup>4</sup>Contrast Pilgrim (p. 150, n. 3), who maintains that ληστές is meant in the general sense of transgressor and thus could be viewed as an equivalent of ἀνέμους, and as a result the arrest could be seen as the intended fulfilment of Is. 53:12/Lk. 22:37. One might also argue that Luke's respect for the words of Jesus in his gospel tradition restrained him from an assimilation of the wording to the LXX.

<sup>5</sup>Maurer (ZTK, L, p. 13) contends that Mt. and Lk. by their handling of Mark destroy the material parallelism to Is. 53:6, 12 which Mark's portrayal of the exchange of Jesus for Barabbas effects.

The last suggestion claims the strongest support and has the greatest amount of evidence in its favor. Although all **Synopt**ists record that Jesus was crucified between two criminals (Mt. 27:38; Mk. 15:27; Lk. 23:33; cf. J. 19:18), only Luke reports that two κακῶργοι were led away with Jesus (Lk. 23:32). Only Luke record the conversation with the penitent criminal (23:39-43). While the increased attention given to the two criminals who accompany Jesus to his death is a positive indication that Is. 53:12 has influenced Luke's presentation here, we lack precise verbal agreement (σύν occurs instead of μετά ; κακῶργοι instead of ἄνομοι ).<sup>1</sup> The material parallelism is present. To recognize it, however, we must shift our attention away from the process of reckoning or evaluation, which leads to a certain kind of treatment of Jesus. We must attend to certain circumstantial details which portray that treatment. There are two criminals between whom Jesus is executed. This detail, then, literally fulfills his being numbered with transgressors.<sup>2</sup> Yet, the lack of verbal parallelism or an editorial comment concerning fulfilment forces us to conclude that Lk. 23:32, 33, 39-43, as in the case of Lk. 22:52, can claim no exclusive right as the place where Luke intends us to see Is. 53:12 fulfilled. Possibly we have been misled into thinking that since Luke introduces what

---

<sup>1</sup> Rese (*Alttestamentliche Motive*, p. 156) argues that Luke's use of the general term κακῶργος (cf. J. 19:18, ἄλλους ; Mk. 15:27, ληστοίς ) in his expansion at Lk. 23:32 and in his use of tradition which he may have held in common with John (23:33/J. 19:18), shows that he interpreted this fact as the fulfilment of Is. 53:12 (cf. Hillmann (p. 189), who says that Luke simply chose a general term which signifies the moral evaluation of a person over the more technical term, ληστής ). If Rese's explanation is correct the question still arises why Luke did not go all the way in his verbal parallelism and use ἄνομοι (Pilgrim, p. 150, n. 3). Possibly the fact that ἄνομοι might be misunderstood and be taken to mean "Gentile" motivated Luke's choice of a clearer term. In addition to this difficulty Rese fails to explain why Luke uses σύν instead of the μετά which may already be present in his tradition, since it occurs in J. 19:18.

<sup>2</sup> There is nothing historically improbable about the crucifixion of Jesus with several others. It is a fact open to a number of witnesses and is not against Roman practice. The later interpolation Mk. 15:28 may be evidence for the true causal relationship between Is. 53:12 and the historical detail. The detail suggested the appropriateness of the OT prophecy; the prophecy was not the origin of the detail (Hooker, p. 91).

is to be fulfilled as τὸ τὸ τοῦ γεγραμμένου, then the fulfilment must be an equally definite concrete detail in Jesus' passion. We may have restricted our vision too much and focused on one of the details of the Passion while Luke wants us to see the whole of the Passion, the suffering and death of Jesus, as the single event which fulfills this unit of prophecy.<sup>1</sup>

Besides our lack of success in discovering a detail in the passion narrative which Luke's indicates is the fulfilment of Is. 53:12,<sup>2</sup> Luke's placement of this quotation in his narrative, viewed in the light of his handling of other fulfilment proof-text quotations indicates to us that Luke has the whole Passion in view as the fulfilment. Luke places this quotation at the climax of Jesus' farewell discourse. The discourse has been a mixture of final instructions to the community of the "new covenant" as well as interpretation of the theological significance of the events which are about to take place. The theological perspective on the coming events deals in some instances with specific detail [e.g. Jesus' prediction of Judas' betrayal (Lk. 22:21-23) and Peter's denial (22:31-34)]. Jesus, however, speaks of what he will experience not in terms of detail, which he had done to some degree in the passion predictions (cf. 9:22; 18:31-34). He describes it in general terms of suffering (22:15); blood being shed (22:20); going his way (22:22). It is natural then to take the intended application of Is. 53:12 as general in the sense that no one detail of the

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. Voss (p. 110f.), who observes that the detail of the two criminals should not be seen as the only fulfilment rather the quote is so placed in the narrative that it becomes a "heading" (Überschrift) for the whole Passion; Meyer (II, p. 319) makes a similar comment about finding the fulfilment in the arrest scene: "The completion (the Messianic fulfilment, xviii.31) of the prophecy began with the arrest (ver. 52), and comprehended the whole subsequent treatment until death," cf. Pilgrim, p. 150, n. 3.

<sup>2</sup>Sundberg (NovT, III, p. 278) in his criticism of Dodd's approach to testimonia claims there is a variety of interpretations of Is. 53:12 in the NT. Luke sees the fulfilment in a particular detail. Paul (Ro. 4:24-25), the writer of Hebrews (Hb. 9:28), and the writer of 1 Peter (1 Pt. 2:24) see it referring in general to Jesus' death; Sundberg reveals the weakness of his evaluation of Luke by recognizing his inability to identify that particular detail.

narrative fulfills it.<sup>1</sup> As it stands at the end of Jesus' interpretation of the Passion and at the beginning of the action of the Passion it may then find its fulfilment in the whole course of events. It is interesting that the two events which are most often cited as the place where the fulfilment occurs, the arrest (Lk. 22:47-53) and the crucifixion between two criminals (23:32, 33; 39-43), stand at the beginning and end of the passion history. This could be another indication that Luke intends the whole course of Jesus' suffering to be understood as the fulfilment.

Two of the three other explicit OT quotations in Luke which function as fulfilment proof-texts stand at the head of narratives in which their fulfilment is elaborated. Luke 3:4-6/Is. 40:3-5 precedes the description of John the Baptist's ministry. Luke 4:17-19, 21/Is. 61:1-2; 58:6 is placed at the beginning of Jesus' preaching and healing ministry.<sup>2</sup> And now Lk. 22:37/Is. 53:12 stands at the head of the events in Jesus' passion.

---

<sup>1</sup>McNeile (Cambridge Biblical Essays, p. 240) sees this quotation and its fulfilment in general terms as evidence for his distinction between Jesus' use of Scripture to show fulfilment in general terms and his disciples' use to show fulfilment in specific terms.

<sup>2</sup>Crockett (p. 277) discusses at length the programmatic use of Is. 61:1-2 in Luke's narration of Jesus' ministry. He concludes, "it can be said that while he seems to have drawn many nuances of meaning from the text Is. 61:1-2, he has not taken pains to do this in a mechanically literal way. That is, every phrase in the quotation can be linked up with another passage in the Gospel, but the link is not always obvious." Crockett calls these elaborations, illustrations. While Crockett's understanding of Luke's use agrees in one sense with our own findings so far, in another sense the conclusions that he draws, that Luke does see fulfilment of various parts of Is. 61:1-2 in various passages by way of material parallelism, differs from our findings. The fact that there is more than one thought expressed in Is. 61:1-2; 58:6/Lk. 4:17-19 means that naturally different details of the succeeding narrative will fulfill different parts of the OT passage. Thus comparison with Lk. 22:37/Is. 53:12 with its one thought is unfair. Crockett's understanding of Luke's method of interpretation centers around a midrashic approach that above all seeks to identify in the gospel tradition what is identical with the elements of the OT passage. Thus when considering Lk. 22:37 Crockett (pp. 318ff.) asks about the identity of the ἀδελφοί and being satisfied that they are the disciples he does not inquire further. The fact that Jesus dies as one surrounded by ἀδελφοί including the disciples is the fulfilment of Lk. 22:37. Because he focuses on the identity of the ἀδελφοί Crockett fails to ask the further question: how does Luke show the fulfilment in Jesus himself? Thus, though we would expect a more definite identification of details in the Passion which could be called

The exception is Lk. 7:27/Mal. 3:1; Ex. 23:20, which is part of Jesus' review of John's ministry. Yet, this quotation too provides a general description of John's entire ministry and does not focus on fulfilment in a particular detail.

Once we say that no single detail in the passion narrative fulfills Is. 53:12, but that the whole course of Jesus' suffering and death does, we must still ask how Luke indicates this to us. Bound up with this question is also the matter of Luke's use of the original OT context. This becomes important in several ways. Luke could have intended the brief mention of part of the concluding summary of the Servant Song to be a pointer to the whole of the original context. We would be free then to take up all the themes in Is. 52:13-53:12 as part of Luke's understanding of the theological significance of Jesus' suffering and death. We could search for verbal allusions to other portions of the Isaiah passage. We could identify and analyze them as evidence for the way Luke showed that Is. 53:12 was being fulfilled. This search, however, would be without success. There are no more explicit quotations and only two possible allusions [Jesus' silence (23:9/Is. 53:7); his intercession for his executioners (23:34/Is. 53:12)].<sup>1</sup> Significant is the apparent non-recognition and certain omission of Markan allusions to the Servant Songs. These appear to be omitted either because Luke prefers another source or he stylistically improves Mark (Jesus' silence (Mk. 14:61; 15:4/Is. 53:7; contrast Lk. 22:67f.; 23:3-4; cf. Lk. 23:9); the amazement of the leaders (Mk. 15:5, 39, 44/Is. 52:15; contrast Lk. 23:3, 4, 47, 52); rich Joseph of Arimathea provides a burial place (Mk. 15:43/Is. 53:9; cf. Mt. 26:57, which has closer verbal agreement, contrast Lk. 23:50), and the possible

---

the fulfilment of Lk. 22:37, if only as material and not "mechanically literal" parallels, Crockett finds fulfilment in nothing more specific than the death itself.

<sup>1</sup>Goppelt (p. 123) sees Luke representing Jesus as the Servant interceding for sinners at Lk. 23:34a/Is. 53:12 and Lk. 23:43/Is. 53:11.



allusions to Is. 53:12/Mk. 14:21, 48-49; Lk. 22:22, 52 with which we have already dealt).<sup>1</sup> Luke, then apparently does not show fulfilment by alluding to other portions of the original context throughout his passion narrative.<sup>2</sup>

Another way of showing fulfilment would be to use Is. 53:12/Lk. 22:37 as a "context pointer" without giving any indication by allusions or quotations from Isaiah 53 in the succeeding narrative that the whole of the OT passage should be kept in mind. Dodd would probably maintain for Isaiah 53,<sup>3</sup> in particular, as he does for all instances of testimonia,<sup>4</sup> that this brief quotation should be understood as a pointer to a larger context, whether allusions to that larger OT context are present in the immediate NT context or not. But how may we tell that the larger OT context is indeed intended as part of our understanding? We have already tested Luke's passion narrative to see whether the specific content of Is.

---

<sup>1</sup>Maurer (ZTK, L, pp. 1-38) gives a full discussion of all possible allusions to Isaiah 53 in Mark; cf. Suhl's (pp. 59ff.) critical analysis of Maurer's evidence and conclusions.

<sup>2</sup>Wolff (p. 77) is puzzled by the lack of allusion to Isaiah 53 in Luke in view of his brief explicit quotation from that OT passage. He explains this by the fact that the passage was difficult for Jesus' disciples, let alone the wider circle of the early church, to understand. Jesus only used the passage as a source of pictures and thoughts in his teaching. The early church unconsciously used these as they formed the gospel tradition and later saw Jesus as the fulfilment of that scripture. C. F. D. Moule ("Influences of Circumstances on the Use of Christological Terms," JTS, n.s. X (1959), pp. 247-263; The Birth of the NT, p. 82) also gives reasons why there are not more quotations and allusions to Isaiah 53 and the Servant of the Lord figure. However, he is interested in the NT and the early church's approach in general and not in Luke in particular. He is not fully satisfied with his reasons. He argues that since Isaiah 53 was the heart of the early church's apologetic, the Jewish opposition found a ready defense against it so it fell into disuse. But then he acknowledges that many of the sayings of Jesus are still preserved in the gospel tradition even though they evidently served no contemporary use. Moule comments on the oddity of the situation that "the only clearly redemptive-suffering passage in the Jewish scriptures is only sparingly used. Here is a phenomenon that still awaits explanation." (The Birth of the NT, p. 82).

<sup>3</sup>Dodd, According to the Scriptures, p. 94.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., p. 126.

53:12/Lk. 22:37 was presented as fulfilled in some detail of the narrative. If we had found such a fulfilment, then the question concerning "context pointers" could be answered in the negative. Luke would have intended to present no more OT content for fulfilment than what he quotes. However, we have found reason to believe that it is Jesus' suffering and death which are the locus of fulfilment of this brief statement, "he was reckoned with transgressors." Such a fulfilment is not understood immediately from the content of this phrase, as it might have been from the immediately preceding phrase in Isaiah "he poured out his soul to death" (Is. 53:12c). Luke's use of Is. 53:12d at Lk. 22:37 does seem to involve pointing to the larger original context. For, unless we hold the larger original context in mind we cannot understand the use of the part which is quoted.<sup>1</sup>

Two other suggested tests<sup>2</sup> for the use of a brief text as a "context pointer" may be applied to this quotation. These yield negative results. We have already applied one. We found no large number of allusions or quotations from other portions of Isaiah 53 in the immediate NT context. The other test is the presence of "a unified interpretation... of the whole Isaianic Servant concept"<sup>3</sup> in the first century Jewish exegetical tradition. This would make it reasonable to suppose that the general understanding of this passage by the early church was so influenced by its Jewish theological roots that its own exegetical tradition could use catch-words and phrases from Isaiah 53 with a reasonable expectation of being understood to mean the whole passage. Unfortunately as with most of Jewish exegesis of that period no such unified exegesis of OT passages emerges. Certainly there is no unified interpretation of the mission of

---

<sup>1</sup>This is Sundberg's test for Dodd's thesis (NovT, III, p. 275).

<sup>2</sup>Hooker, pp. 22ff.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

the Servant as reported in the Servant Songs.<sup>1</sup> The Servant of the Lord figure especially as he is presented in Isaiah 53 offers peculiarly difficult problems to those who would present a unified picture of him. In Jewish thinking the concept of the Servant of the Lord derived its content from the glorious aspects of the great ones in Israel, beginning with Moses and culminating with the Messiah. There was no room for the suffering element of Isaiah 53.

There are two expositions of the whole passage with pre-Christian Jewish roots. One identifies the Servant with "the righteous man" (Wsd. 2; 5). The other identifies him as the Messiah (Tg. Is. 52:13-53:12). The first exposition does deal with the Servant's suffering and death as the lot of "the righteous man" but it does not then include the vicarious atonement significance of the suffering (e.g. Wsd. 2:20; 5:1).<sup>2</sup> The second exposition, the targum, avoids assigning to the Messiah many parts of the passage which deal with suffering and death. They may be assigned to Israel (e.g. Tg. Is. 52:14; 53:4, 10); the nations which oppress her (e.g. Tg. Is. 53:3, 8); or the wicked (e.g. Tg. Is. 53:9). Some scenes of the Servant's suffering are transformed into scenes of triumph, in which the Servant delivers the remnant out of suffering and subdues the wicked (e.g. Tg. Is. 53:7-9).<sup>3</sup> The one exception to this transformation

---

<sup>1</sup>Wolff, p. 54.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 45f.

<sup>3</sup>cf. these free translations of our text: Tg. Is. 53:12d, וְיִשְׁמַח בְּיָמָיו וְיִשְׁמַח בְּיָמָיו - "and subjected the rebellious to the law"; Theodotion: καὶ τὸν ἀσέβην καὶ ἀνόμιον; H. Hegermann (Jesaja 53 in Hexapla, Targum und Peschitta (BFTb, LVI; Gütersloh, 1954), pp. 51, 121) attributes these changes to anti-Christian apologetic as well as possible polemic against segments of Jewish thought; cf. also the LXX's softening of the Servant's experiences; See TDNT (V, pp. 687ff.) for a summary of Jewish evidence with the conclusion that Isaiah 53 including its suffering elements was interpreted messianically by Jews in NT times; Contrast P. Seidelin's ("Der 'Ebed Jahwe' und die Messiasgestalt im Jesajatargum," ZNW, XXIV (1936), p. 229) view that originally in the targum only Is. 52:13 where וְיִשְׁמַח בְּיָמָיו was inserted was meant to be interpreted messianically. It was later that the messianic interpretation was extended over the whole passage in a piece meal fashion in order to defend against the suffering Messiah interpretation of Christians.



suffering of Jesus to the Isaianic Servant of the Lord.<sup>1</sup> So in another way we are compelled by the evidence of Luke's writings to be open to the possibility that Lk. 22:37/Is. 53:12 is a pointer to its larger original context.

Having allowed this we must ask the further question, what content of the original context may we identify as part of what Luke intends to imply by his brief citation? The question really is whether we may safely conclude that Luke intends us to think of the vicarious atonement accomplished by the suffering Servant when we hear, "and he was reckoned with the transgressors." Indeed, the vicarious atonement of the Servant's death for the sins of the many is the main theme as well as the unique contribution to OT theology of this passage (Is. 53:4-6; 8, 10-12). Yet the real puzzle in understanding Luke's use of Isaiah 53 has been that he seems to go out of his way to quote those parts of Isaiah 53 which do not refer to the suffering of the Servant for the sins of others (Is. 53:12d/Lk. 22:37, stopping short of member "e" and "f", and not including "c"; Is. 53:7-8/Ac. 8:32-33, stopping short again of a portion that speaks of vicarious atonement, Is. 53:8d).<sup>2</sup> Many, as we have already seen,<sup>3</sup> maintain that Luke does not understand Jesus' death as a vicarious atonement.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>J. L. Price, "The Servant Motif in the Synoptic Gospels: A New Appraisal," Interpretation, XII (1958), p. 33; Caird, Luke, p. 38; F. J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake ("Christology," The Beginnings of Christianity, ed. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake (London, 1920), Vol. I, p. 390) assert that Luke is the first to identify Jesus as the Isaianic Servant.

<sup>2</sup>E. Fascher (Jesaja 53 in christlicher und jüdischer Sicht (Aufsätze und Vorträge zur Theologie und Religionswissenschaft, IV; Berlin, 1956), p. 8) explains that it is not because Luke wants to avoid vicarious atonement in Acts 8, nor because he wants to avoid blaming the Jews that he avoids the last clause of v. 8; but it is because he wants to move directly to the exaltation of Jesus from an exposition of the third member of the verse.

<sup>3</sup>See above, p. 179, n. 1.

<sup>4</sup>e.g. Rese, p. 155; Pilgrim, p. 258; Conzelmann, Theology of Luke, p. 201; E. Lohse (Märtyrer, p. 190) offers reasons for Luke's lack of emphasis on vicarious atonement.

As part of their proof they use Luke's choice of this portion of Isaiah 53. Others, while admitting that the vicarious atonement interpretation of Jesus' death is not explicit in the portion which is quoted, believe there are grounds for seeing an implicit reference to this all-important theme in Isaiah 53.<sup>1</sup> Still others argue more forcefully that the citation of these brief words itself indicates an intention to point to the vicarious atonement significance of the Servant's death which will be fulfilled in Jesus.<sup>2</sup> We have already seen reason to believe that Luke does have an understanding of Jesus' death and its vicarious atonement significance for salvation.<sup>3</sup> So we would not rule out the possibility that such a significance is attached to his use of this verse. However, we must agree that though the words may imply vicarious atonement they do not demand it. Even if the words' fulfilment is seen not in a particular historical detail but the whole course of Jesus' suffering and death, their significance still could be understood without vicarious atonement entering the picture. They could serve merely to show that the ignominious death, one of being numbered with and treated as a transgressor, was at the same time a death destined according to the will of God. This would be to understand Jesus' death as a martyrdom.<sup>4</sup> It would be to understand it christologically in the light of Isaiah 53 but not to understand it soteriologically.<sup>5</sup> However, the way in which Luke shows the fulfilment of Lk. 22:37/Is. 53:12 in his construction and emphases of his passion narrative demands that we see this verse as understood soteriologi-

---

<sup>1</sup>F. F. Bruce, This is That, p. 95; cf. Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, p. 94.

<sup>2</sup>France (Tyn. Bull., XIX, p. 31) and Jeremias (TDNT, V, p. 692) make this point for the use of Jesus and the early church; R. Tannehill (A Study in the Theology of Lk-Acts, "ATR, XLIII (1961), p. 203) maintains this for Luke.

<sup>3</sup>See above, pp. 173ff.

<sup>4</sup>e.g. Talbert, p. 75.

<sup>5</sup>Pilgrim, p. 167.

cally, and thus as a pointer to the main content of the original OT context.

The method by which Luke may have worked out the fulfilment of Is. 53:12 in his passion narrative was to treat the verse as a text, the basis for a theme which will constantly recur throughout the narrative. The narrative of the historical events becomes an interpretive midrash on the text. The theme is Jesus, though innocent, suffers as a condemned criminal according to the action of men and the plan of God. Two special interests of Luke combine to expound this theme: Jesus' innocence and his treatment as a transgressor.

Is. 53:12d is that part of the concluding summary which summarizes these interests in Isaiah 53 (cf. Is. 53:9 for a reference to innocence, and throughout for the description of suffering for the sins of others, which is unjust suffering). It is then the appropriate member of the conclusion to quote as a basis for the exposition of these interests. It should be noted that when we analyzed this concluding summary we said that Is. 53:12d described in more specific terms than its general partner in the first couplet, the objective circumstances of the Servant's experience. The conclusion which one draws from reading the larger context is that the two themes of innocence and suffering as a criminal are so combined and caught up in this phrase "numbered with the transgressors" that we are to understand that this was undeserved unjust treatment. When we proceed to ask for an explanation of why God should so treat the righteous one, we are given the answer by the last couplet, the vicarious atonement for the sins of the many. Luke as we shall try to show also presents the objective facts of Jesus' suffering as the righteous one, innocent yet treated and condemned as a transgressor, in order that his readers too may understand the injustice of his suffering. And because it is presented as suffering according to the will of God in the Scriptures, Luke too drives his readers to ask for an explanation of this God-

ordained injustice. They too are driven to the same conclusion as the second couplet in Isaiah 53:12 presents, though Luke for good reason does not spell out the vicarious atonement significance explicitly in his passion narrative save at Lk. 22:20. How does Luke then lay this foundation of objective fact?

Luke shows the unjustified nature of the treatment of the innocent Jesus as a transgressor both in interpretive comment and in his arrangement of details. Jesus, himself, may give such an interpretation to the events. At his arrest, as recorded by Luke alone, we have the astonished question, "Judas, would you betray the Son of Man with a kiss?" (22:48; cf. Mk. 14:45). At the conclusion of the arrest scene in words which have been seen as the specific fulfilment of Lk. 22:37/Is. 53:12<sup>1</sup>, Jesus again interprets his treatment as a criminal as unjustified, "Have you come out as against a robber, with swords and clubs? When I was with you day after day in the temple, you did not lay hands on me" (Lk. 22:52-53/Mk. 14:48-49). On the way to the cross in words only in Luke, Jesus uses the unjustified treatment he is receiving as a warning to the inhabitants of Jerusalem concerning coming judgment, "For if they do this when the wood is green, what will happen when it is dry?" (Lk. 23:31). Finally, the prayer for his executioners, "Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do" (23:34, only in Luke), seems to assume in part that if the executioners realized that they were causing the innocent to suffer they would not have crucified Jesus. Luke, by pointing out that Jesus so prays, emphasizes again the essential injustice of what has happened.

The clearest interpretation of Jesus' death in this way comes in the words of the penitent criminal as he rebukes his fellow condemned criminal, who is mocking Jesus, "And we indeed justly; for we are receiving the due

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, p. 279.



reward of our deeds: but this man has done nothing wrong" (23:41).<sup>1</sup>

Luke, himself, shows restraint and does not develop this theme by adding his own editorial comments.

Luke has at least two ways of expressing this theme through his organization of the narrative. First, Jesus' treatment as a transgressor is introduced into the narrative abruptly. It occurs without provocation. The mockery of the temple guard takes place before the Sanhedrin hearing and its judgment that Jesus is guilty (Lk. 22:63-65; 66-71; contrast Mk. 14:65; 55-64). In the account of the mockery by the Jewish leaders at the cross Luke omits the recitation of Jesus' claim that he would destroy the temple. Admittedly this charge does not figure in Luke's report of the Sanhedrin hearing because he removes the detail concerning false witnesses from his account. The effect of the omission in both places is to remove even the testimony of false witnesses, which might serve as a basis for justifiable abuse (Lk. 22:66; contrast Mk. 14:56; Lk. 23:35-38; cf. Mk. 15:29-30; cf. the mockery introduced by Luke in

---

<sup>1</sup>Rese (*Alttestamentliche Motive*, pp. 157ff.) sees not only the Lukan understanding of the fulfilment of Is. 53:12 in this episode but also the Lukan expression of the soteriological significance of Jesus' death in these words and Jesus' response. Jesus must be numbered with transgressors so men can recognize themselves as such and be saved. Rese concludes that one can see in Lk. 23:39-43 the Lukan interpretation of Jesus' death on the cross as a vicarious atonement. The cross is the foundation and beginning of salvation. Rese correctly recognizes the significance of Lk. 22:37/Is. 53:12 for Luke's soteriological understanding of Jesus' death. Yet his explanation of the link between Is. 53:12d and salvation does not allow for that part of Luke's theology which looks at Jesus' death as the objective work of God which is both a victory over the power of darkness and the basis on which repentance and forgiveness can be proclaimed to all men (Ac. 26:18; Lk. 24:44-48). For Rese it is the sinner's subjective recognition of his own sin in the light of the fact that the innocent Jesus was numbered with the transgressors which makes the cross a saving event through which forgiveness is made available to the repentant. Though this may be part of the process of salvation it is not the main way Luke appears to link Jesus' unjustified death with forgiveness. Rather, it is the fact of the innocent Jesus suffering as a transgressor before God which makes possible forgiveness, for that fact presented in the light of Isaiah 53 means that God has done the work of salvation through the vicarious atonement effected by his son. Now forgiveness may be proclaimed in his name to all the world (Lk. 24:48; Ac. 5:30, 31; 10:39-43; 13:28, 38).

"the two criminals" episode, which is also unprovoked as the penitent criminal's response shows, Lk. 23:39-41). Lk. 23:11 seems to be an exception. The silence of Jesus appears to provoke Herod and his entourage to ridicule and mistreat Jesus. Yet, the accusations of the Jewish leaders intervene between Jesus' silence and Herod's mockery. Luke, then, shows Jesus' innocence and his unjust suffering through presenting the abuse heaped on Jesus as coming from unprovoked attacks.

Second, Luke consistently presents Jesus' righteous response to his treatment as a transgressor. At his arrest he heals the servant with the severed ear (22:51). On the way to the cross Jesus' concern is for the coming plight of the inhabitants of Jerusalem (23:27-31). He prays for his executioners immediately after being crucified (23:33, 34). In the midst of mockery, he ministers to the penitent criminal (23:35-38, 39-43).

On top of these interpretive comments and ways of organizing his narrative, Luke more than the other **Synopt**ists emphasizes that before the political leaders, Jesus was innocent (23:4, 15, 22; cf. 23:47). Yet Jesus' innocence is seen in not just political, legal, or even moral terms. The witnesses to Jesus' innocence at the cross show that they understood that he was innocent before God. The penitent criminal's request indicates that he considered Jesus as righteous before God, who would vindicate him with the glory of the messianic kingdom (23:40-42). The centurion glorifies God when he says, "Certainly, this man was innocent!" (23:47). The mourning repentance of the crowd returning from the crucifixion (23:48) points to the coming judgment of God on those who have condemned one who was righteous. In explicit and implicit ways, then, Luke tells his readers to view Jesus' innocence within the context of God's justice as well as man's.

It is because of this development of these theological themes that we may appropriately see the basic content of Is. 53:12d as the foundation

and a pointer to the soteriological significance of Jesus' suffering. Luke shows us an innocent Jesus suffering as a guilty transgressor before God. This is the objective historical basis for the doctrine of vicarious atonement on the basis of which forgiveness of sin may now be offered. It is interesting to note that though the connection is not fully spelled out by Luke even in the interpretive description of the death of Christ in the preaching and teaching in Acts (cf. Ac. 20:28), still the basic elements for constructing such a soteriology are always present. The offer of forgiveness is always preceded by a declaration of the innocence of Jesus and his disgraceful death on the cross (Ac. 5:30, 31; 10:39-43; 13:28, 38). Such suffering of an innocent one in punishment for sin could only bring forgiveness to the sinner if it were vicarious. Luke lays the groundwork for such an interpretation by presenting clearly all the historical facts and placing them consciously within the framework of the plan of God.

If this then is how Luke uses Is. 53:12d, that is, to present the objective basis for the soteriological significance of the death of Jesus, the question still arises why Luke did not explicitly spell out this theological significance. The reason is probably to be found in the basic historical perspective from which Luke wants us to view these events. As we have noted before in our discussion of Lk. 22:21<sup>1</sup>, Luke wants us to see the plan of salvation history unfold before our eyes as we read. He does not have the backward look of a Mt. who informs us by his editorial quotations that the Scriptures were indeed fulfilled in given details of Jesus ministry. To do this for Luke would be to destroy the perspective from which he desires his readers to view the unfolding drama of salvation history as it advances to fulfilment.

It would be possible for Luke to take this quote which was already

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, p. 195.

in his source as on the lips of Jesus and to lengthen it in order to bring in the soteriological interpretation of Jesus' death without having to resort to editorial comment from that other perspective (cf. Luke's lengthening of 3:5-6/Is. 40:4, 5; Mk. 1:3). Two other factors may have prevented such an expansion: respect for the content of the words of Jesus and Luke's emphasis on the fact that the fulfilment of the event, the death and resurrection, had to take place before the disciples would understand its true theological significance. If Luke stresses that the disciples could not comprehend the simple God-appointed necessity of Jesus' suffering (Lk. 18:34; cf. Mk. 10:34), it would go against his sense of history and his intention to show how the story unfolds if he introduced a theological interpretation of the cross' saving significance into a pre-cross conversation (cf. Lk. 22:20). The time for the full exposition would come later (Lk. 24:25-27; 44-48). It must be reported in its correct place in the historical sequence.

The other question of context with which we must deal is whether in Luke's use of Is. 53:12d he respects, supersedes, or violates its original grammatical and historical context. It is plain that Luke does not violate but respects the basic grammatical sense of Is. 53:12d at Lk. 22:37. Our judgment on the matter of the historical sense, the intended meaning of the passage in its historical context, depends on whom we think the prophet identified as the Servant (cf. Ac. 8:34). After a period of immense activity issuing in the production of a multitude of theories concerning the Servant's identity,<sup>1</sup> the fact that the Servant Songs are so rich in reminiscences of king, prophet, Israel, and the individual righteous man has led to the conclusion that an eclectic approach to the question is most productive. At best only a rough sketch of the essential characteristics of the Servant is possible. Two characteristics of the Servant's mission: the provision of salvation through vicarious atone-

---

<sup>1</sup>See C. R. North's (The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah, 2nd ed. (London, 1956), pp. 1-116) survey of the proposals.

ment for the people and the extension of salvation to the Gentiles, point us forward to a radical new era in the history of the mission of a Servant of the Lord. No contemporary of the prophet including the prophet himself and no one in Jewish history down to the time of Jesus fulfilled that mission. No Jewish interpretation proclaims such fulfilment because, as we have seen, Jewish exegesis failed to grasp the full range of significance of the figure. One may well conclude with North,

But since there appears to be no intermediate link between the Servant as the Prophet described him, and the Servant as Jesus fulfilled the description - no writer between the Exile and the Advent took it up and expanded it and what fleeting references there are to it show that its significance was not grasped at all -- I find it hard to believe that the Prophet in his moments of deepest insight intended one thing and the Holy Spirit another. It seems more natural to conclude that both intended the same. Original and Fulfilment join hands across the centuries.

This outlook accords with what Luke records of the early church's approach in interpretation by identification (e.g. Ac. 2:29f.; 8:34f.). It is not necessary to establish a connection by means of a messianic interpretation of the Isaianic Servant's and Jesus' mission in order to assure that the original context is not violated.<sup>2</sup> Rather, the office Servant of the Lord, which includes prophets, the righteous man, and the Messiah, is what the Isaianic Servant and Jesus have in common. Although some would say that the introductory formula *οὗτοι τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί* allows for a historical context and identifies Jesus as an anti-type,<sup>3</sup> the import of that formula may be exactly the opposite. It may point to Jesus as the intended fulfilment of the prophecy. In making this claim Jesus respected the original context.<sup>4</sup>

A final question in our discussion of this quotation is: What was its

---

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 218f.

<sup>2</sup> Contrast Venard, *Dictionnaire de la Bible*, Supplément, II, ¶ 41.

<sup>3</sup> Meyer, II, p. 319.

<sup>4</sup> Mead (*NTS*, X, p. 280) classifies Lk. 22:37 as a use of a quotation, which is detached from the original context; cf. Lindars, p. 84.

ultimate source? Did it come from Jesus, the early church, or Luke? Since we have dealt with this question in the introduction to this section and found that there is good reason to see that a literary source stands behind Luke's writing here, we may refine our question to a choice between Jesus and the early church. The arguments of those who see the early church as the source are based on both anti-supernaturalist pre-suppositions and silence. Passion predictions including Lk. 22:37 are historically inherently improbable.<sup>1</sup> Therefore Jesus probably didn't quote the passage at that time for that purpose. There is no supporting evidence from other words of Jesus that he understood his mission in terms of the suffering Servant who vicariously atones for sins of the people.<sup>2</sup> Our passage must be viewed as the exception which proves the rule. And some claim as we have seen that even this quotation does not express the central message of Isaiah 53, vicarious suffering.<sup>3</sup>

In our discussion, however, we have discovered evidence for viewing Is. 53:12 as an OT foundation of Jesus' understanding of his death as the suffering Servant including vicarious atonement. Though we have noted how Luke molds his narrative, we have been aware that he is using pre-Lukan material. Aside from being open to the historical possibility that Jesus could have predicted his death, the very character of the account in which we find our quotation points to a pre-Easter life situation. The anticipated persecution of the disciples, which did not take place with such gravity immediately after Easter; the disciples' failure to understand Jesus; their militant attitude; even the restraint with which the introductory formula relates the quotation to Jesus (ἐν ἐμοί instead of περὶ ἐμοῦ), all make it unlikely that the tradition was

---

<sup>1</sup>R. Bultmann, Theology of the NT, trans. K. Grobel (London, 1952), Vol. I, p. 31.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Hooker, p. 86; Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts, p. 280.

created by the early church after the fact.<sup>1</sup> We have seen that Luke rarely presents the salvation significance of Jesus' death in the pre-Easter part of his narrative. This was partly to accord with what took place historically. But the lack of supporting evidence in the sayings of Jesus doesn't mean that Jesus could not have seen and spoken of his death in the light of OT Scripture. Though Lk. 22:37 is the single testimony to that fact in the form of an explicit OT quotation, it is nonetheless present and should be given its full weight as a witness to Jesus' thoughts as he approached his death. "No satisfactory reason can be given why He should not have thought deeply about the work and the destiny of the Servant and have found a parallel in His own tragic story."<sup>2</sup> Jesus is the most probable source of this quotation which Luke appropriated as a text for his passion narrative.

#### Old Testament Allusion

The disciples' response and Jesus' abrupt conclusion of the farewell discourse have been suggested as words which contain OT allusions.<sup>3</sup> The production of the swords after Jesus' instructions is supposed to be another instance of Jesus' preparation to fulfill Scripture. The instructions concerning the colt and festival lodging were previous instances (20:30/Zech. 9:9; 22:10/1 Km. 10:1ff.). The Scripture, in this case, which will find its fulfilment in the disciples' use of swords at the arrest (Lk. 22:49, 50) is Zech. 10:3ff.; Zech. 14:3.<sup>4</sup> We shall discuss

---

<sup>1</sup>Taylor, Behind the Third Gospel, p. 267f.; Jeremias, NT Theology, trans. J. Bowden (NT Library; London, 1971), Vol. I-The Proclamation of Jesus, p. 240.

<sup>2</sup>Taylor, Behind the Third Gospel, p. 267f.

<sup>3</sup>Selwyn, Oracles, p. 381f.; Crockett, p. 318; Hühn (p. 65) suggests that in v. 35 we see Ps. 22(23):1; 32(33):18, 19; 33(34):11 as non-messianic reminiscences, but none of these have either the verbal or material parallelism necessary to qualify as an allusion.

<sup>4</sup>Selwyn, Oracles, p. 381f.; M. M. Goguel (The Life of Jesus, trans. O. Wyon (London, 1933), p. 453) proposes that the number of the swords, two, has been inspired by Judg. 7:20, Πομάχια τῷ κυρίῳ καὶ τῷ ἱερέει, (the only mention in the OT of two swords); Aside from the fact that there

this proposed allusion below at the place where it is said to be fulfilled.<sup>1</sup> Whether this be viewed as a preparation for that depends on how we understand Jesus' enigmatic response to the disciples' provision: *ἱκανόν ἐστίν* (Lk. 22:38).<sup>2</sup> If it signifies Jesus' satisfaction then it may show his preparation for fulfilment. If it shows his disapproval, then the use of the "sword" detail to show scriptural fulfilment is probably the early church's or Luke's idea.<sup>3</sup>

Jesus' enigmatic response has been seen as an allusion to 3 Km. 19:4-8.<sup>4</sup> It is claimed that just as Luke relates an Isaiah Servant passage and the figure of Elijah at the beginning of Jesus' ministry (Lk. 4:18, 19, 26), so here an Isaiah passage is related to Elijah who among other things said to God, *Ἰκανούσθω νῦν, λαβὲ δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν μου ἀπ' ἐμοῦ* (3 Km. 19:4). While the figure of the prophet Elijah does play a role in the way Luke portrays the mission of Jesus,<sup>5</sup> it is difficult to discover the importance of an allusion to Elijah established merely through the use of a similar idea, "It is enough." Unless we are going to say

---

is no verbal parallelism, the material parallelism breaks down because the swords have an offensive use in the OT and a defensive use in the NT. The origin of the numerical detail does raise a question since the arrest scene for which it prepares reports the use of only one sword. The detail, however, does seem to play a necessary role in its immediate context. Jesus' response, *ἱκανόν ἐστίν*, points out the sufficiency of the number in terms of defensive but not in terms of offensive use. Thus it is better to take the detail as historical, a necessary part of the progress of the narrative, rather than as inspired by the OT. H. W. Bartsch ("Jesu Schwertwort, Lukas xxii. 35-38: Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien," *NTS*, XX (1973-74), p. 200) believes that the OT quotation (22:37), which he sees as fulfilled in Jesus' crucifixion between two criminals, determines the reference to two swords. By connecting OT prophecy and the command concerning swords Luke softens the scandalous nature of the command. This understanding of the Isaiah quotation's relationship to the "sword word" is based on the assumption that Jesus' crucifixion between two criminals fulfills that prophecy. This we have seen reason to doubt.

<sup>1</sup>See below, p. 342, n. 1.

<sup>2</sup>cf. the Western text which has the more clearly intelligible *ἄρκει*.

<sup>3</sup>Selwyn, *Oracles*, p. 381f.; Schürmann (*III-Jesu Abschiedsrede*, p. 131) sees no conscious preparation by Luke for Lk. 22:49 at Lk. 22:38.

<sup>4</sup>Crockett, p. 318.

<sup>5</sup>cf. P. Hinnebusch, "Jesus, the New Elijah, in St. Luke," *Bible Today*, XXXI (1967), pp. 2175-2182; XXXII (1967), pp. 2237-2244.



that allusion to the Elijah figure takes place in matters of incidental detail as well as in matters that are significantly analogous, then this allusion seems to serve no evident purpose in the narrative.<sup>1</sup> There do not appear to be any allusions to the OT in this passage.

#### Old Testament Idea

The two clusters of OT ideas in this section come in Luke's introductory formula and the response of Jesus which ends the discourse.<sup>2</sup> None of the words in the introductory formula would by themselves, save possibly for Τελέω, have a claim to be understood as having a primarily OT usage at this point. This is mainly because, though the idea of a fulfilled prophetic word given by the prophets of Israel is distinctive to the OT and the NT, the frequency with which the LXX uses the terms in our introductory formula to express fulfilment is so low that it is difficult to identify a distinctive OT meaning for these terms. Even acknowledging this, the cumulative effect of the terms is such that the OT understanding of the effective fulfilment of Scripture is communicated.

The substantive participle Τούτο τὸ γεγραμμένον, though it does have the meaning, "a law," in secular Greek and the OT,<sup>3</sup> in OT and Jewish usage may signify the other main content of Scripture, prophecy (Jer. 25:13;

---

<sup>1</sup>Crockett (p. 319) does try to relate Lk. 22:35-38 to Elijah by saying that just as the Servant is numbered with transgressors (whom Crockett interprets as the disciples) and found to be the only one still faithful to God, so Elijah finds himself the only one faithful in Israel. Though this comparison is convincing the relationship of ἰκανόν ἐστιν and ἰκανούσθω does not add anything to it. In fact it detracts from it. In Elijah's case it is an expression of despair and discontent at the situation. In Jesus' case, the statement at least implies a dissatisfaction with the disciples' show of faithlessness and is another evidence of his own faithfulness.

<sup>2</sup>We have already considered the OT background of the wording of the quotation itself.

<sup>3</sup>Plato, Leg. VI:754e, "despise not the laws-that which is written, for the sake of gain"; e.g. Dt. 28:58; 2 Ch. 34:21.

Bar. 2:2; Da. 9:13).<sup>1</sup> In Jeremiah it is the forward view which is presented. That which is written against the nations will come on Israel also. In Baruch and Daniel it is the backward glance as Baruch recognizes that what was written by Jeremiah has come to pass. Daniel sees the fulfilment of God's promise of cursing on a disobedient covenant people. "That which is written" in Moses comes to pass in the punishment of the Babylonian exile. As we have noted, the perfect tense seems to communicate the continuing effectiveness into the present of a law which has been written and is still in force, and of a prophetic promise which has been written and will surely come to fulfilment.

Of the six times this substantive occurs in Luke-Acts the adjective "all" appears with it four times (Lk. 18:31; 21:22; 24:44; Ac. 13:29). Our passage is one of the exceptions. When it is compared with the other exception (Lk. 20:17/Mk. 12:10), which is an editorial replacement for Mark's *τὴν γραφήν*, we see that this was one of Luke's preferred ways of speaking of a passage or verse of Scripture (cf. *γραφὴ*, Lk. 4:21; Ac. 1:16; 8:35). In all of these instances it is a prophetic word, not a legal word, from the OT, which is so signified. Again the fulfilment of Scripture which is spoken of in the NT context is complemented by the perfect tense of the participle which indicates that what has been written continues in effect until it is fulfilled.

The OT background of the idea of scriptural fulfilment can be found mainly in the use of two verbs in the LXX (*πληρώω* and *τελέω*). The idea that the OT Scriptures, particularly the writings of the prophets, could and would be fulfilled developed from the understanding of the role of a prophet. He would speak a word of the Lord, whether promise of blessing or judgment, and if it were truly from the Lord it would come to

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. the rabbis *היה מן המעשה* (M. Ex. 17:14) and Josephus' (*Ant.* XI:6) report that when Cyrus read the prophecy of Isaiah he had a strong desire to do what was written.

pass in subsequent events. It would be fulfilled or rather God would fulfill it (πληρώω, 3 Km. 2:27; 8:15, 24; 2 Ch. 6:4, 15). This understanding of the effectiveness of a prophetic utterance was also applied to the oracles of the prophets after they had been committed to writing (e.g. Jer. 25:13; Bar. 2:2; Da. 9:13), although there is no use of the common NT verbs of fulfilment with a reference to written Scripture alone. The emphasis in the use of both τελέω and πληρώω is on the word spoken through the prophet (cf. references above and 2 Ch. 36:21, 22; τελέω, 2 Esdr. 1:1; Is. 55:11; cf. Tob. 14:4) whether the oracle has been committed to writing (as in the case of Jeremiah) or not. Because πληρώω translates verbs of fulfilment more often in the LXX than τελέω it is difficult to sketch out a distinctive LXX use for τελέω, except to say that where it is used it fully shares in the characteristics of the OT understanding of prophetic fulfilment as shown in πληρώω.

Luke's use of τελέω (Lk. 12:50; 18:31; 22:37; Ac. 13:29), when it has τοῦτο τὸ γεγραμμένον as its subject, takes over the OT understanding of the fulfilment of a word of the Lord to the prophets.

Any significance as an OT idea in Luke's use of δεῖ is also drawn from the OT idea of scriptural fulfilment present in the immediate Lukan context. There is only limited use of this impersonal verb in the OT to denote the divine necessity of historical events (Da. 2:28, 29: 2:45 θ; 6:16 θ).<sup>1</sup> The distinctive thing about the OT use in contrast to the extra-Biblical Greek usage<sup>2</sup> is that it is not the impersonal fates but

<sup>1</sup>E. Fascher, "Theologische Beobachtungen zu δεῖ im Alten Testament," ZNW, XLV (1954), pp. 245-252.

<sup>2</sup>Herodotus (I:91) says that all stand under μοῖρα; τύχη; εἶδει - τὴν πεπωμένην μοῖραν ἀδύνατά ἐστιν ἀποφυγεῖν καὶ θεῶν...; cf. I:90; VIII:53; See Fascher (NT Studien, pp. 233ff.) for a discussion of the difference. In view of this difference Schulz (Die Stunde der Botschaft, 2nd ed. (Hamburg, 1970), p. 280) believes that the use Luke makes of the expression should be compared rather with the Roman idea of historical necessity where, for example in the Aeneid, Jupiter has history in his power and promises to judge Vergil according to the moral order, virtue (Praebere se fato).

rather the personal God of Israel who has determined that these things shall be. Though the OT evidence all comes from the apocalyptic book Daniel, this does not mean that the OT understanding of  $\delta\epsilon\iota$  must always include an eschatological perspective.

Luke's use of  $\delta\epsilon\iota$  includes reference to a divine compulsion under which Jesus and Paul completed their missions (e.g. Lk. 2:49; 13:33; cf. 19:5; Ac. 9:16; 19:21; cf. 18:21, the D and Byzantine longer reading). Jesus is portrayed as a prophet and proclaimer of God's kingdom who consciously fulfills the will of God, whether revealed directly to him or established in the Scriptures (Lk. 4:43; 9:22; 17:25; 22:37; 24:7, 26, 44). It is as part of the pattern of Luke's usage, whereby he shows that Jesus' life, death, and resurrection were according to God's plan of salvation, that he includes  $\delta\epsilon\iota$  at this point.<sup>1</sup> It reinforces his emphasis on the dynamic unfolding of that salvation in Jesus' life according to prophetic Scripture. It thus gives further impetus to the dynamic of fulfilment indicated by  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega$ . Its immediate context indicates that it is to be understood according to its OT usage. It is a personal God who speaks a word to his servants, the prophets, and in that way makes his will known. This will must necessarily come to pass in history.

The absolute use of  $\acute{\kappa}\alpha\nu\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$  in the response of Jesus,  $\acute{\kappa}\alpha\nu\acute{\omicron}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\iota\nu$  (22:38), has at least two meanings for which we may find rough equivalents in the OT. It may include an ironic twist such as the accusatory, "It was not enough for you to do that but you have done this also" (Gen. 30:15; 3 Km. 16:31). The irony consists in the speaker's expressed satisfaction with what he does not approve of at all. The second use involves the imperative of the verb  $\acute{\kappa}\alpha\nu\acute{\omicron}\omega$ , which translates an exclamatory use of the adjective  $\lambda$  as, "Let it be enough for you; Enough of it!" (Dt.

---

<sup>1</sup>Luke's use does not place the divinely ordained event within an eschatological framework (contrast Schelkle, p. 110) but in the realm of redemptive history (Conzelmann, Theology of Luke, p. 153, n. 3).

3:26; 3 Km. 19:4; 1 Ch. 21:15; Ezk. 44:6; 45:9; 34:18).

Luke's use here as far as meaning is concerned appears to be in line with the semitic idiom, אֵן used as an exclamation,<sup>1</sup> though its Greek form does not accord with the LXX method of translating the idiom. The fact that Luke doesn't refine this exclamation into the normal LXX mode of expression may indicate that he wanted to preserve the exact wording of Jesus' speech taken over from his source. Also, he desired to leave the statement more enigmatic than a straight command to have done with collecting swords would allow. Luke wants to communicate that Jesus said to the disciples that they had done the right thing for the wrong purpose. So he raises a question in their minds by simply saying that two will be sufficient. They would need many more for the offensive purposes<sup>2</sup> which they had in mind, but no more for the defensive purposes for which Jesus intended them. The imperatival form of the exclamation would have been stronger and better if Luke wanted to show Jesus' complete disapproval of their response. In its Lukan form the construction involves more irony than disapproval though it does serve to effectively end the conversation.<sup>3</sup>

The introductory formula contains favorite words of Luke which he has introduced into his narrative elsewhere (δεῖ ; τελέω ; τὸ γεγραμμένου),

---

<sup>1</sup>Creed, p. 271; Zahn, Lukas, p. 686; Though it appears from the exclamation's usage in Dt. 3:26 that one of its functions is to break off a conversation (Creed, p. 271), this role is only incidental to the main use of the exclamation: to command a halt to the activity or the conversation of the one addressed (cf. 3 Km. 19:4; 1 Ch. 21:15); Bornhäuser (p. 60) suggests that Jesus' response is actually a reference to God, calling him by the LXX technical term for the "All powerful" - ὁ ἰκανός (cf. Ruth 1:20, 21; Job 21:15; 31:2 translating יְיָ). Attractive though this explanation is, the lack of a definite article before ἰκανός in Luke makes Bornhäuser's explanation unlikely.

<sup>2</sup>TDNT, III, p. 295.

<sup>3</sup>One other term, which might owe some of its meaning to the LXX is ἀπέσπελα (Lk. 22:35). However, nothing from the NT context would suggest this (TDNT, I, pp. 400ff.).

and it thus seems probable that it reflects heavy Lukan redaction.<sup>1</sup> The possibly semitically colored response (22:38) probably comes from Luke's source.<sup>2</sup> We have seen in the first cluster how the OT content of one term can have a cumulative effect on terms in its immediate NT context.

#### Old Testament Style

There is very little in this section which shows that Luke was consciously imitating LXX style. The subject-predicate word order is consistently non-semitic (6X:subject-verb-object; 1X:subject-object-verb; none:verb-subject-object). The use of coordinating conjunctions is almost evenly divided between δέ (4X) and καί (6X). Though the structure of the perikope does show some parataxis (22:36, 37), the distribution of δέ and καί is such that this feature is not emphasized.

As far as particular constructions are concerned, the use of the exclamation ὁὖ (Lk. 22:38) derives none of its meaning at this point from the LXX use.<sup>3</sup> The same may be said for κύριε (22:38).<sup>4</sup>

One particular construction which merits attention is καὶ ἐπεὶ δέ (22:36). In the LXX this was one of the ways of translating וְכֵן (καὶ ἐπεὶ is the more normal way). Though it is used predominately by the translators of Genesis and Exodus 1-20, it occurs frequently enough throughout the rest of the LXX to be understood as a LXXism (cf. Ruth 3:1, 5, 9; 2 Km. 18:12; Esth. 6:3; Job 2:6; cf. Tob. 7:9; 1 Macc. 4:36).<sup>5</sup> Luke uses this construction throughout his gospel and in all portions of Acts (e.g. Ac. 5:3; 18:9; 27:35) so that we may describe it as an element

<sup>1</sup>Schürmann, III- Jesu Abschiedsrede, p. 125.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 133; Schürmann detects some Lukan redaction and cautions against the acceptance of semitic background for the phrase.

<sup>3</sup>cf. above, p. 128.

<sup>4</sup>See below, p. 362f.

<sup>5</sup>Schürmann (III- Jesu Abschiedsrede, p. 120) calls it characteristic of Genesis and Exodus style only.

in his style.<sup>1</sup> The occurrences in his gospel are predominantly from material not paralleled in the other Synoptic Gospels. There are, however, enough examples of his editorial introduction of this construction into Mark (e.g. Lk. 6:8, 9/Mk. 3:3, 4; Lk. 8:25/Mk. 4:40; Lk. 20:13/Mk. 12:6; Lk. 20:41/Mk. 12:35) that even in material for which Luke's sources are not extant we might just as plausibly conclude that Luke himself introduced the construction. In our present case it seems less likely that the construction is due to Luke's source for the prevailing pattern for the use of  $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu$  in the perikope is  $\delta' \delta\epsilon \epsilon\tilde{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu$  (Lk. 22:35; 38-2X).<sup>2</sup> The reason Luke would introduce the construction at this point in the dialogue is that the instructions of Jesus which follow are new and important. He wants from the LXX coloring of the introductory words to add at least the implied weight of OT authority to Jesus' authority as he speaks (e.g. 4:24; 6:8, 9; 11:2; 17:1). Or possibly, as some of these examples show, Luke just wants to stress the continuity of sacred history and remind the reader that even in these instructions there is significance for God's dealings with men just as the OT narrative always presents itself from a more or less consciously theological perspective. We shall note other uses of this construction throughout the passion narrative and see if any pattern develops (22:52; 60, 67, 70).

---

<sup>1</sup>Cadbury, The Style and, p. 169; Hawkins, Horae Synopticae, p. 16.

<sup>2</sup>Note the text variant at v. 36 which seeks to assimilate the  $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu \delta\epsilon'$  to this construction;  $\delta' \delta\epsilon \epsilon\tilde{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu$  : Alexandrian-  $\chi^*$ ; Caesarean-  $\theta$ ; Western- D; it<sup>e</sup>; also Chrysostom. However,  $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu \delta\epsilon'$ , the shorter and more difficult from the point of view of smooth style is well attested by ancient and geographically diverse witnesses: Alexandrian- p<sup>75</sup>;  $\chi$ <sup>corr</sup>; B; L; T; 579; cop<sup>sa, bo</sup>; Caesarean- f<sup>13</sup>; Byzantine-  $\Psi$ ; the majority of later Byzantine witnesses have  $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu \alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\nu$ . We take  $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu \delta\epsilon'$  as original; Schürmann (III-Jesu Abschiedsrede, p. 121) calls Lk. 22:36 ( $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu \delta\epsilon' \alpha\tilde{\upsilon}\tau\alpha\tilde{\iota}\varsigma$ ) Lukan redaction of a pre-Lukan text.

## CHAPTER VIII

## LUKE 22:39-46: DECISION IN THE GARDEN

## Introduction

Luke's report of Jesus' period of prayer in the garden, although it lacks some of the verbal allusions contained in Mark, does contain a number of OT ideas and images. It is also replete with examples of LXX style. In addition to the normal questions about Luke's literary sources, of particular interest in this section is the textual problem of vv. 43-44.

The manuscript evidence<sup>1</sup> presents a pattern of witness which at first sight favors the shorter reading: the omission of the verses. The fact that the ancient Alexandrian witness does not contain the verses, that there is some fluidity in the placement of the piece, whether in Mt. or Luke, and that some mss introduce it only with a set of obeli to show its spurious nature speak for its inauthenticity.<sup>2</sup> However, references to the incident in the early church fathers and the fact that the inclusion reading is widely distributed geographically lend weight to the extrinsic probability in favor of the longer reading.<sup>3</sup> Since the longer reading

---

<sup>1</sup>omit vv. 43-44: Alexandrian- p<sup>75</sup>;  $\alpha^a$ ; B; T; cop<sup>sa</sup>, bo; Clement; Athanasius; Cyril; Caesarean- 1071<sup>a</sup>; syr<sup>s</sup>; geo; Origen<sup>mss</sup> acc to Hilary; John of Damascus; Western- it<sup>f</sup>; Marcion; Ambrose<sup>mss</sup> acc. to Epiphanius, mss acc. to Jerome; Byzantine- A; W; Lect 1<sup>69</sup> pt, 70 pt, 211 pt, 1127 pt. include vv. 43-44: Alexandrian-  $\chi^a$ ,  $\delta^b$ ; L; 892<sup>a</sup>; 1241; Dionysius; Arius acc. to Epiphanius; Didymus; Caesarean-  $\theta$ ; f<sup>1</sup>; 565; 700; 1071<sup>mg</sup>; syr<sup>pal</sup>, c; Caesarius-Nazianzus; Gregory-Nazianzus; Chrysostom; Western- D; it<sup>a</sup>, aur, b, c, d, e, ff<sup>2</sup>, i, l, q, r; vg; syr<sup>p</sup>, h; Diatessaron; Justin; Irenaeus; Hippolytus; Hilary; Leontius; Byzantine- K; X;  $\Delta^a$ ;  $\pi^a$ ;  $\psi$ ; Lect, 1<sup>184</sup>, 211pt; arm; eth; other minuscules and fathers. include vv. 43-44 with asterisks or obeli: Alexandrian- 892<sup>c</sup> in mg; cop<sup>bo</sup> mss; Byzantine-  $\Delta$  c;  $\pi$  c; 1079, 1195; 1216. transpose vv. 43-44 to after Mt. 26:39: Caesarean- f<sup>13</sup>. transpose vv. 43-45a to after Mt. 26:39: Byzantine- Lect, 1<sup>60</sup>, 69, 70, 127.

<sup>2</sup>Metzger, Commentary, p. 177; W. F. Arndt (The Gospel According to St. Luke (St. Louis, 1956), p. 448) points out that witnesses to its inclusion are not totally absent from the Alexandrian family.

<sup>3</sup>A. Harnack, "Probleme im Texte der Leidensgeschichte Jesu," Sitzungsberichte Akademie Berlin, I (1901), p. 253; Metzger (Commentary,



contains vocabulary which is distinctly Lukan ( $\epsilon\nu\iota\sigma\chi\upsilon\omega$ , only here and Ac. 9:19;  $\epsilon\kappa\tau\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma$  only here and Ac. 12:5, cf. Ac. 26:7), and manifests a perspective which accords with Luke's purpose in his passion narrative, in that it shows the real struggle of the man Jesus in making his decision to go to the cross (cf. Lk. 22:15; 12:50; 13:31-33; cf. 18:31ff.),<sup>1</sup> the question must be solved mainly on the grounds of transcriptional probabilities. Docetic scribes may have omitted these verses because they were offended by the human weakness of Jesus which they present.<sup>2</sup> The fact that Jesus was ministered to by an angel may have offended some copyists' understanding of Jesus' deity.<sup>3</sup> More generally, the ~~late~~ post-Nicene controversy may have caused the omission in the Alexandrian witnesses, since these verses seemed to detract from their theological position, which espoused the full divinity of Jesus.<sup>4</sup> No satisfactory explanations have been presented for its later insertion.<sup>5</sup> On the basis of the balanced extrinsic probabilities, the fact that nothing in the longer reading is uncongenial with Lukan style or theology, and the satisfactory explanations on transcriptional grounds for its later omission,

---

p. 177) says that the evidence of the early fathers is the only witness to the ancient origin of this extra-Biblical tradition; But cf. Hb. 5:7.

<sup>1</sup>Montefiore (II, p. 609) believes that this portrayal of a struggle is "out of tune with Luke's apparent desire elsewhere not to delineate or allow any struggle in Jesus' complete readiness to accept the divine will". Although Montefiore is correct to see in Luke's portrayal Jesus' willingness to do the divine will, he does not reckon with both the fact that this willingness still involved a hard decision and that the struggle may have been of a different nature, the desire even compulsion to do the will of God met with the temptation of the "power of darkness" in Jesus experience at that decisive moment.

<sup>2</sup>C. S. C. Williams, Alterations to the Text of the Synoptic Gospels and Acts (Oxford, 1951), p. 6; See below, n. 5.

<sup>3</sup>Harnack, Sitzungsberichte, I, p. 254; Harnack also notes that the blood sweat may have indicated to some that Jesus was unwilling to die and therefore the verse was omitted.

<sup>4</sup>Williams, p. 7.

<sup>5</sup>cf. Metzger (Commentary, p. 177), who flatly states that it is less likely that it was deleted than that it was added, but does not explain why; Ellis (Luke, p. 257) sees Docetism as the controversy which provoked its introduction in the 2nd century by orthodox scribes who wanted to emphasize Jesus' humanity.

we take the longer reading as authentic. It may be that the readings of  $x^a$ ,  $x^b$ ,  $x^c$  show in microcosm the history of the text.

The question of the basic literary source of this narrative has been answered just as strongly in favor of Mark as in favor of an independent source.<sup>1</sup> The difficulty in making the determination consists in the isolation of the Markan and non-Markan parts of the account, so that one source may be seen as an insertion into the other.<sup>2</sup> A further complication is that those features which Luke has in common with Mark are so basic to the narrative that they may be a matter of dependence on the one historical event more than a matter of literary dependence.

The differences between Luke and Mark may be accounted for by Luke's desire to abbreviate the narrative and remove any emphasis on the disciples' lack of watchfulness.<sup>3</sup> The new material may be isolated to vv. 43-44 and elements in vv. 40, 41. It is more reasonable, then, to accept that Luke uses Mark as his basic source. Having read his non-Markan source(s) along side it, he abbreviates Mark and inserts from the non-Markan source those elements which suit his purpose.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Rese (Die "Stunde," p. 135, n. 1, 2) lists those who have taken these views; e.g. Mark as basic-Rese, Die "Stunde," p. 135; non-Markan source as basic-Taylor, The Passion Narrative, pp. 69ff.

<sup>2</sup>E. Linnemann, Studien zur Passionsgeschichte (FRLANT, CII; Göttingen, 1970), p. 35; Taylor (The Passion Narrative, p. 70) isolates v. 46a as "a Markan pendant," while Dodd (Historical Tradition, p. 66) says that the similarities between Mark and Luke can be isolated to the content of Jesus' prayer (22:42) and his warning to the disciples (22:46a). However, these features are so basic to the narrative of this episode that they could reasonably have been preserved in independent forms of the tradition. The similarities of wording occur in the reported words of Jesus which would probably have been handed on in the tradition with much care. Different forms of the tradition might easily show similar wording without being dependent on one another.

<sup>3</sup>Hauck, p. 268; Dodd (Historical Tradition, p. 66) views the phrase "a stone's throw" as evidence that Luke does not intend to abbreviate Mark's narrative, but rather uses a non-Markan source; He fails to consider that the abbreviation is undertaken not only for the purpose of composition but also because of Luke's theological purposes, to excuse the disciples. Thus, select parts of the Markan narrative are removed.

<sup>4</sup>cf. Montefiore, II, 608.

### Old Testament Allusion

Many suggestions concerning possible OT allusions in this passage have been made. There are at least two in Mark which Luke does not take over. Most of those proposed for Luke have to do either with psalms which describe the suffering of the righteous and their petitions to God, or with a particular figure in the OT: Elijah or the righteous martyr. Because there are no eye-witnesses to the circumstances of Jesus' agony in the garden, for the disciples were at some distance from Jesus and fell asleep, and since many of the features are supernatural, e.g. the appearance of the angel (22:43), it is often proposed that the OT serves as the true source for most of the specific content of this event. After looking at the specific allusions which have been identified, we shall look at the questions of the relationship between the historicity of the details and the OT.

Luke does not take over two Markan OT allusions (παραδόντος ἑστίν τῇ ψυχῇ μου, Mk. 14:34/Ps. 41(42):6, 12; 42(43):5<sup>1</sup>; cf. Jon. 4:9<sup>2</sup>; the material allusion at Mk. 14:38b/Ps. 51:12, 14).<sup>3</sup> Scholars usually explain that Luke eliminates the allusion in Mk. 14:34/Ps. 41(42):6 for theological reasons. Luke portrays Jesus as one who without struggle

---

<sup>1</sup>France (Jesus and the OT, p. 260) labels it as a "possible verbal allusion" although he recognizes (p. 57) that it "may be no more than a selection of appropriate form of words from the OT to express Jesus' feelings"; Suhl (p. 49) says the wording is possibly not exact enough to be a conscious allusion, but at least it is the presentation of a detail in OT coloring.

<sup>2</sup>J. Héring, "Simple remarques sur la prière à Gethsemane," RHPR, XXXIX (1959), p. 99.

<sup>3</sup>C. E. B. Cranfield (The Gospel According to St. Mark CGTC; Cambridge 1959), p. 434) sees in Mk. 14:38b "perhaps an echo of Ps. 50(51):12." Gundry (The Use of the OT in Mt., p. 59) sees it as an allusion to Ps. 50(51):14; K. G. Kuhn ("Jesus in Gethsemane," EvTh, XII (1952), p. 278) sees Qumran anthropology and not Psalm 50(51) as the background to Mk. 14:38b.

willingly faces his death in obedience to the will of God, confident that God will give him the victory.<sup>1</sup> The hour of temptation is the disciples' and not Jesus', for he suffers no sense of abandonment by God (cf. Lk. 23:45/Mk. 15:34). Though all of this is a true representation of some of Luke's theological themes, we do Luke an injustice if we do not also recognize that he also sees Jesus himself going through a time of temptation in his passion. Indeed, it is the last great temptation by Satan to thwart Jesus in his messianic mission (Lk. 22:3; 22:53; 23:35-38). It is not so much that Jesus knows no tragedy in his suffering, it is a tragedy expressed in different terms and with a different emphasis from those in Mark. Luke wishes to show Jesus struggling through his suffering as one who is innocent; who maintains an exemplary confidence in the Father's will and care (23:46); who is in a battle with the forces of evil right the way through. Thus, the suffering is presented in active negative terms, in terms of the aggression of the leaders and the people against him. The passive oppression of God abandoning him so that he despairs of life is not portrayed. This is also because such despairing of life might be misunderstood by Luke's readers as a sign of Jesus' lack of confidence in God, rather than as it really was, a plain statement of Jesus' human response to the circumstances which drove him to prayer. Because of the possible misunderstanding of the exclamation and also because Luke in his abbreviation of the text has eliminated the scene with the three disciples at which these words were spoken, we do not have this allusion to the Psalms.

Luke does not allude to Ps. 50(51):12, 14 at Lk. 22:46 not so much because he has a later Christianized understanding of "spirit," the Holy Spirit, which does not accord well with this more primitive conceptualization of the struggle with temptation, which is akin to Qumran thought.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Rese, Alttestamentliche Motive, p. 200.

<sup>2</sup>cf. Kuhn (EvTh, XII, p. 284), who says that Luke uses a later source than Mark at this point which has been so Christianized.

Luke can use "spirit" to describe a part of human nature (1:47; 8:55/Mk. 5:42; Lk. 23:46; Ac. 7:59, 17:16). It is rather that Luke perceives the temptation more as an onslaught by Satan from without rather than by weakness from within.<sup>1</sup> Besides, Luke is interested in presenting the disciples in as favorable a light as possible. To speak of weak flesh would imply that they had already fallen into temptation in their slumber. By excusing their sleep ( $\alpha\pi\omicron\tau\eta\varsigma\ \lambda\omicron\upsilon\pi\eta\varsigma$ , Lk. 22:45) and by presenting Jesus' command as a simple call to continual watchfulness (22:40, 46), Luke seeks to avoid this implication. These two non-allusions then are created not primarily by Luke's conscious disregard for the OT but by the fact that the OT allusions did not serve his theological purposes and thus, like any other content of his sources, were eliminated.

The proposed allusions to the OT from this passage are to be found in the basic setting of the scene (a mountain with Jesus removed from his disciples), the wording of Jesus' prayer, and the various elements in vv. 43-44. It has been noted that Mark's staging of the drama with the separate positioning of a larger and then a smaller band of disciples and finally Jesus praying by himself, may be a typological representation based on the practice of Moses in receiving the law (Ex. 24:1, 2).<sup>2</sup> He too left a larger band, the company of Israel, went up a mountain taking a smaller band the leaders with him, and then left them to go on and be alone with God. Luke too portrays Jesus praying alone, which is in concert with Jesus' practice during his ministry, a practice which Luke emphasized (Lk. 5:16; 6:12; 9:18; 11:1). But the fact that there is no verbal parallelism with the Exodus account and that an important member of the material parallelism, the smaller group of disciples, is removed, indicates that Luke did not intend even a material allusion typologically

---

<sup>1</sup>Brown, p. 24; Ott, p. 83.

<sup>2</sup>Weidel, ThStuKr, LXXXV, p. 209.

understood. At the most Jesus is reflecting a practice of piety common in Israel. When one deals with God personally in prayer, he does it alone.<sup>1</sup>

The wording of Jesus' prayer is one of the chief places in the passion narrative where we might expect that the OT would have served as the source, since there were not necessarily any eye-witnesses within ear shot. Yet we do not find a single OT passage providing the content.<sup>2</sup> There are at least three OT ideas, "cup"=destiny (e.g. Ps. 10(11):6; Is. 51:22);<sup>3</sup> God's omnipotence (not present in Luke, Job 42:2); and the obedient submission to the will of God (Ps. 39(40):8, 9), which converge in the synoptic wording. It must rather be on the level of ideas that the use of the OT takes place here.

The details of Lk. 22:43-44 have been said to allude to many OT figures. The problem is to find one OT figure, or a series of OT references, which may be said to be consistently alluded to by Luke. Most suggestions either focus on the agony and bloody sweat or on the strength given by the angel. Those who find OT allusions in the agony and the bloody sweat identify Jesus with either Adam (Gen. 3:19),<sup>4</sup> the Servant (Is. 53:3, 10),<sup>5</sup> or the Righteous Sufferer of the Psalms (Ps. 22(22):2, 3,

---

<sup>1</sup>E. Schweizer (The Good News According to Mark, trans. D. H. Madvig (London, 1971), p. 311) says that Jesus' action in praying alone may simply be parallel to Gen. 22:5; Ex. 24:14; The position of Jesus during prayer, his falling on the ground (Mk. 14:35), is taken by Dibelius ("Gethsemane," Botschaft und Geschichte (Tübingen, 1953), Vol. I, p. 270) as an indication that Ps. 30(31):23 is the source of this detail and indeed of the whole scene. He notes that Luke does not preserve the allusion (Suhl (p. 50) doubts that it is an allusion in Mark), but makes the description milder.

<sup>2</sup>Selwyn's (Oracles, p. 389) suggestion of Ps. 88(89):9 does not have the verbal similarity of even Job 42:2, which Coppelt (p. 121) says is close but not parallel enough to be called an allusion.

<sup>3</sup>Hahn, p. 65.

<sup>4</sup>Selwyn, Oracles, p. 367.

<sup>5</sup>E. St. G. Baldwin, "Gethsemane: The Fulfillment of Prophecy," Bibliotheca Sacra, LXXVII (1920), p. 431.

15)<sup>1</sup> The angelic intervention may be either an allusion to Elijah (3 Km. 19:5, 7)<sup>2</sup> a feature of a martyrdom (Da. 3:92(25); 10:18),<sup>3</sup> or an allusion to Ps. 90(91):11 (cf. Lk. 4:10f.).<sup>4</sup> Of these possible alternatives we may leave to one side the alleged allusion to the Psalms since neither Psalm 90(91) nor Psalm 21(22) has elements in it which account for all the details. If they were to be taken in conjunction as a sort of detached midrash on Jesus' sufferings they might become an attractive explanation of the OT background. The key words which connect the two psalms in the NT writer's thinking might be ἄγγελος ἐνσχύων. The first points to Ps. 90(91):11 (ἄγγελοις), while the second in describing the angel's role may point to the need of the sufferer which is expressed in terms of strength failing and thirst (Ps. 21(22):15, ἐξηράνθη . . . τῆς ἰσχύος μου). However, as with almost all attempts to reconstruct the detached midrash behind the gospel tradition we cannot arrive at a very convincing positive conclusion. It is probably better to look for a case where stronger verbal and material parallelism is present.

The appearance of the angel is one of the more important pieces of evidence for those who see Luke's presentation of Jesus' death as a martyrdom. Yet, in view of the appearance of angels in the OT as messengers to strengthen God's people<sup>5</sup> (Daniel and Elijah may not properly be

---

<sup>1</sup>Loisy, Luc, p. 528; J-S. Javet (Commentaire de L'Évangile de Luc (Geneva, 1957), p. 253) says the agony reminds one of Abraham's trial (Genesis 22); Justin (Dial. 103:7-8) identifies the bloody sweat as fulfillment of Ps. 21(22):15, the heart melting as wax; Dibelius (Botschaft, I, p. 270) is not convinced.

<sup>2</sup>Hinnebusch, Bible Today, XXXI, p. 2178.

<sup>3</sup>J. Downing, "Jesus and Martyrdom," JTS, n.s. XIV (1963), p. 289; cf. Grundmann (p. 412), who also mentions the Jewish exegetical tradition that it was Michael the angel of the Lord who strengthened the three martyrs in the fiery furnace (Gen. R. 44 on Gen. 15:7).

<sup>4</sup>Loisy, Luc, p. 528.

<sup>5</sup>Navone, p. 123, n. 20.

called martyrs), one would have to produce evidence of divine aid as a necessary part of the martyrdom literary form, before one can say that Lk. 22:43-44 must necessarily be understood within a martyrdom context. Another factor which reduces the probability that a special martyrdom significance should be attached to this detail is Luke's general interest in angels and his mention of them in various contexts (e.g. Lk. 1:11, 26; Ac. 5:19; 8:26). Martyrdom is not the reason for this mention of an angel.

The content of Lk. 22:43-44 has a material and some inexact verbal parallels with 3 Km. 19:5, 7, 8. In both cases it is a situation of distress. Both prophets face imminent death. An angel provides strength for them (3 Km. 19:8, ἐπιρρέουσιν ἐν τῇ ἰσχύϊ τῆς βρώσεως).<sup>1</sup> The important difference which really eliminates Elijah as the necessary parallel here is the attitude of the two men concerned. Jesus willingly faces death at the hands of his enemies, while Elijah wishes to avoid it or at least face it under the hand of God not at the hands of his enemies. The purpose of the aid is then different as far as its intended effect on the motivation of the recipient is concerned. For Elijah, it is meant to strengthen him and encourage him to respond to God's care by willingly obeying him. For Jesus the strength is vital but it is not a matter of mercy intended to evoke the right attitude. Elijah does not serve as a very good type for which Jesus could serve as anti-type. Thus, there is probably no intended allusion to him here.

Of the remaining proposals, we may say that the identification of Jesus with Adam on the basis of "the bloody sweat" does not contain sufficient verbal or material parallelism to be convincing. We have to assume that Luke consciously set out to present Jesus as the Second Adam (cf. Lk. 3:38). In the light of that we could see the "bloody sweat"

---

<sup>1</sup>Hinnebusch, Bible Today, XXXI, p. 2181.



as evidence that Jesus suffers under the curse, yet not as punishment but in order to bring salvation. The only feature of Luke's portrayal of the passion narrative which would be aided by such a typological usage here is the context of a struggle against Satan in which Luke places his story. Since the sweat is evidence, not of punishment, but of the agonizing effort to do the will of God in the face of the temptations to save one's own life, it could only be, as in the case of Elijah, by contrast with Adam that any allusion could be drawn. We think it unlikely that such an allusion is present.

That Jesus' agony was in fact the distress of the suffering Servant (Is. 53:3, 10), as far as Luke was concerned, is doubtful for we have no verbal parallelism with that passage and the material parallelism is not clear. We cannot be sure that in either case the distress which is described has been caused by disease. There is, however, in the use of the term ἐνίσχυσις in an earlier Servant song (Is. 42:6) and in Daniel (Da. 10:18) possibly the key to understanding on the one hand the OT model for the verses as well as the true parallel as far as the thought of the passage is concerned.

Daniel's experience seems to be the appropriate pattern for Jesus'. They are both alone and in communion with the Almighty (Da. 10:2ff.); both are strengthened (ὅτι ἐνίσχυσέν με, Da. 10:18) by a heavenly messenger; both are concerned with the will of God as it will be played out in future events; and both having received knowledge of God's will find themselves in need of strength, physical restoration. Daniel needs help not only because he has been fasting (Da. 10:2) and has been overwhelmed by his ecstatic experience, but also because he is apprehensive about what the future holds for his people, Israel. Jesus needs strengthening because he is in anguish caused by what he knows to be the will of God for him, the death of one numbered with the transgressors.

The suffering Servant of the Isaiah Servant Songs may well be seen as the other equally important OT figure who is referred to in these

verses. In each of the four Servant Songs it is either stated or implied that the Servant willingly chooses to suffer hardship in order to accomplish the task appointed to him by God (Is. 42:4; 49:4; 50:5, 6; 52:13-53:12 throughout). A parallel theme is that God honors the Servant's obedience by strengthening him (Is. 42:6 - ἐνισχύω σε; 50:7; 49:4, 6; 53:11ff.). It is again this word ἐνισχύω which is the key link between Daniel, Isaiah, and Luke. However, there are many in the OT whom God strengthens in order that they may do his will (Eglon: Judg. 3:12; the king of Babylon: Ezk. 30:25; the weak: Ezk. 34:16; Cyrus: Is. 45:5 in the B-text; Israel: Is. 41:10; Hg. 2:23 in the A-text; and Daniel: Da. 10:19; cf. Ps. Sol. 16:12, the righteous made poor). We may not safely contend on grounds of verbal parallelism alone that Luke points to the suffering Servant. On the grounds of material parallelism, the fact that Luke sees Jesus during his Passion in the role of the suffering Servant, leads us to cautiously conclude that there is an allusion not so much to Is. 42:6, in particular, as to the figure of the Servant in general. This may more properly be considered under the heading of Luke's use of OT ideas since the OT material which forms the basis for the NT reference cannot be isolated to one OT passage. We find then in this account of Jesus' agony in the garden no OT allusions either verbal or material. However, as we have seen from the many suggestions, OT ideas abound.

If there are no OT allusions in Luke and yet much OT content is present in the form of ideas, what may we conclude about the relationship of the OT to the historicity of the account? We have seen how in none of the particular details of the account may definite OT passages be identified as the objects of allusions. In fact, the creative use of the OT ideas in the NT context precludes understanding their use as the result of a simple transfer from the OT to the NT context according to the interpretive scheme of promise and fulfilment. For instance, in the very wording of Jesus' prayer, "nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done" (Lk. 22:42), though this submission to the will of God is

paralleled in the OT description of the righteous man (e.g. Ps. 39(40):9; 142(143):10; cf. Sir. 16:3 in the S-text), in the OT such submission to the will of God is never stated in this way: i.e. in the request that God should perform his will.

It is difficult, then, to understand how any of the details<sup>1</sup> of this section could find its original source in the OT and not in history. The one detail which could almost claim such support is the appearance of the angel. However, the OT does not provide a definite allusion. Though the lack of eye-witnesses and the supernatural nature of the appearance would for many lower the historical plausibility of the detail, we recognize that we probably have the witness of the Risen Lord to this detail.<sup>2</sup> The detail, as the history of the textual tradition shows, does not perform the task usually assigned to the legendary, the glorification of Jesus. It shows his weakness and humanity below the angels. Thus, it is more likely to be the early church's report of tradition based on Jesus' testimony than an invention of the early church based on the experience of a prophet, Elijah, or of martyrs, the three young men.

The main contenders for the OT as the origin of this narrative base their claims on this proposed origin and purpose of the narrative: the petition of a suffering Jesus was first inspired by the Christians' read-

---

<sup>1</sup> Boman *NTS*, X, p. 262) notes that the detail of the sleep of the disciples has been seen as an allusion to and to have its origin in Ps. 3:6; 4:9. But, he points out that such a detail unfavorable to the disciples would probably not have been introduced; Daube (pp. 333ff.) strongly contends that the command to stay awake, to watch, has parallels in the Passover practice. Passover custom, then, may be seen to confirm the historical situation claimed for the account.

<sup>2</sup> Contrast Gilmour (*Interpreter's Bible*, VIII, p. 388), who sees the lack of eye-witnesses as an insuperable difficulty to the historicity. He chooses an unconvincing half-way house between historical fact and myth by claiming that the whole account should be classified as a legend, growing out of the disciples' impression that Jesus was at a crisis point on that last night. Still, it should not be seen as an invention of the early church. It is hard to see the real difference in matters of historical content between legendary development from an impression and pure invention.

ing of the Psalms, the lamentation psalms in particular; the narrative sought to show in Jesus their fulfilment (Ps. 30(31):23; 38(39):13; 21(22):2, 3).<sup>1</sup> The difficulty in seeing OT psalms of lamentation as the source for the account is that this explanation does not really account for the main content and purpose of Jesus' prayer, to be released from having to face suffering.<sup>2</sup> Even Mark's allusion to Ps. 41(42):6, 12 (Mk. 14:34) cannot qualify as the OT kernel from which the whole NT narrative developed.<sup>3</sup> It does not contain in itself or its immediate context the same content or purpose that Jesus' NT prayer has.

Having found no suitable OT passage that could serve as the source for the whole account and recognizing that such suffering on the part of Jesus, particularly his anguished request that the cup be removed, would not be a likely invention of the early church,<sup>4</sup> and further seeing that the command to watch, though not present in Luke, does have a relationship to the Passover practice,<sup>5</sup> it is reasonable to take historical events and not the OT as the source of the narrative. Possibly Luke was aware of the difficulty concerning eye-witnesses to the event for he includes a note that there was some distance between the disciples and Jesus, "a stone's throw" (Lk. 22:41).<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Dibelius, *Botschaft*, I, pp. 261ff.; Loisy, *Luc*, p. 528.

<sup>2</sup>Barbour (*NTS*, XVI, p. 235) disagrees with Dibelius.

<sup>3</sup>Boman, *NTS*, X, p. 270.

<sup>4</sup>Gilmour, *Interpreter's Bible*, VIII, p. 388.

<sup>5</sup>cf. Pes. 10:8, which indicates that falling asleep breaks the Passover fellowship: R. Jose says, "... but if they fell into a deep sleep they may not eat [again]"; Daube (p. 335) observes that Luke abandons the law concerning Passover *chabburah* and does not retain the command to watch (cf. Mk. 14:38), either because he did not understand the rabbinic background or knew his readers would not. However, in discarding it Luke resists the temptation of turning these details into legendary features, from which theological significance could be drawn, rather he treats them as historical facts, which because they would not be understood were dropped.

<sup>6</sup>Contrast Grundmann (p. 411), who maintains that Luke intends to indicate by this that the disciples were within earshot and thus could have served as eye-witnesses.

There are, then, no insuperable obstacles to the historicity of the account. The account's relation to the OT as far as Luke is concerned is not a matter of allusions vital to a promise and fulfilment scheme. Rather, in attempting to interpret the words and actions of Jesus, Luke takes them as they are, especially in their uniqueness, and allows the OT ideas which are their foundation to serve as the basic context in which they are to be understood. The OT, however, does not seem to influence either the creation or expression of the historical details in Luke's narrative of the agony in the garden. Still, in the selection of the details and the emphases given to them the pattern created by the characteristics of the suffering Servant in Isaiah may have had an influence. But this was clearly secondary and to some extent not easily imposed on the basic facts which Luke received in his gospel tradition. In this instance the historical facts seem to be primary and the interpretation according to an OT pattern is secondary.

#### Old Testament Idea

Again, as often before, we find the OT ideas of this section concentrated in the words of Jesus: his instructions to the disciples, his own prayer. In addition to these the OT idea of the appearance of the angel to strengthen and the general OT figure after whom the whole section is modeled, whether the righteous martyr or the Isaianic Servant of the Lord, should be discussed.

Jesus' instruction to his disciples, "pray that you may not enter into temptation" (22:40; cf. Mt. 6:13; Lk. 11:4) contains some OT background. There are few examples in the LXX of prayers of deliverance before a time of trial comes (e.g. Tob. 6:18; 8:4, 5; Ps. 31(32):6, 7). The prayer in the Psalm 31(32) is for forgiveness of sins so that in the time of trial the forgiven man may be preserved. Jesus' command for precautionary prayer is unique, though we should compare the contemporary Jewish practice of including in morning and evening prayers, "Don't

bring me into the power of temptation."<sup>1</sup> The difference between Jesus' instruction and the prayer of the rabbis is the source of the temptation. For Jesus it is not primarily the inner weakness of the flesh, the evil ἡσυχία, which brings temptation.<sup>2</sup> Rather, it is the external circumstances which Satan uses to make his attack. These may become an occasion for temptation if the disciples do not guard against it by prayer (cf. Lk. 8:13). The OT background does not contribute much to Luke's use of πειρασμός in the singular here. Since the main model for the OT and Jewish understanding is Abraham (Genesis 22), a person whom God puts to the test in order to find him faithful, the OT understanding of πειρασμός is positive. It is a test or trial, an occasion when faithfulness and endurance may be shown.<sup>3</sup> The negative connotation, "temptation," a test intended to produce faithlessness, probably needs to be attached to πειρασμός in its Lukan usage, if the prayer of the disciples is to be intelligible. This does not come out of the OT usage.<sup>4</sup> What the OT does contribute is the idea of an evil tempter, Satan, who puts men like Job to the test.<sup>5</sup>

Jesus' prayer begins with an address to God as Father (Lk. 22:42). The form of address is taken over from Mark so that we have no special indication of Luke's editing and theological interest. Yet this occurrence of πάτερ forms part of a pattern of the way Jesus addresses God in prayer (10:21; 22:42; 23:34, 46; cf. 11:2). This in turn is part of

---

<sup>1</sup>SBK's (I, p. 422) quotation of Ber. 60<sup>b</sup>.

<sup>2</sup>Ott, p. 83.

<sup>3</sup>See above, p. 219f.

<sup>4</sup>Leaney's (p. 272) suggests that Jesus means the fiery trial which is to precede the End-time, the eschatological tribulation (Da. 12:1, 10; Zech. 13:9; 14:1-3; Zeph. 1:15; Hab. 3:16; cf. 1 En. 94:5; 96:2f). All these references present this time of trial without the negative connotation of temptation. It is a time of hardship, true, but one which will purify the righteous who pass through it. An evil tempter is not involved.

<sup>5</sup>See above, p. 241.

a larger Christological scheme whereby Jesus is presented as the Son of God. Although we must deal fully with both these ideas and their OT background later,<sup>1</sup> we might briefly describe Luke's use of the idea of sonship in the passion narrative as the way he expresses the fullness, novelty, and mystery of obedience to death.<sup>2</sup> The OT basis of the father-son relationship which Jesus has with God is, as we have seen,<sup>3</sup> the royal messianic sonship to which God has anointed Jesus. What the form of address signifies is the relationship which exists and the willingness of Jesus to be obedient to his calling which created that relationship.<sup>4</sup> Though only once in the OT is God addressed as Father in prayer (1 Ch. 29:10), Luke proceeds on the basis of the messianic sonship of Jesus to create this pattern.

The petition of Jesus' prayer (Lk. 22:42) contains OT ideas in Luke's use of *βούλομαι*, *τὸ ποιῆριον*, and *τὸ θέλημα*. In secular Greek the expression *εἰ βούλει* is a polite or mild form of the imperative (e.g. Sophocles, *Ant.* 1168; Philo, *Abr.* 251).<sup>5</sup> However, both this and the stronger form in Jewish prayers, *יְיָ יִשְׁרָאֵל* (Ber. 19a)<sup>6</sup> do not express either the total dependence of Jesus or the omnipotence of the divine will in its execution, which seems to be demanded by Luke's use here. Admittedly throughout Luke-Acts there is only one other use of the verb with God as the subject (Lk. 10:22/Mt. 11:27; cf. the non-theological use throughout Acts, e.g. Ac. 5:28, 33; 19:30; 28:18). Yet, there is a consistent use of the cognate, *βουλή*, to signify the will of

<sup>1</sup> See below, pp. 426, 608.

<sup>2</sup> George, *RB*, LXXII, p. 208.

<sup>3</sup> See above, p. 221.

<sup>4</sup> Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice*, p. 38.

<sup>5</sup> *TDNT*, I, p. 632.

<sup>6</sup> *SBK*, I, p. 607.

God (Lk. 7:30; Ac. 2:23; 4:28; 13:36; 20:27). This is then, a strong theological motif in Luke. The presence of such a motif, in turn, demands a stronger use of the verb at this point. Although secular Greek can again provide parallels for the use of the verb with deity as subject (e.g. Homer, *Od.* 4:353; Euripides, *Iph. Aul.* 33, *τὰ θεῶν οὕτω βουλόμεν' ἔσται* ), it is the LXX use of *βούλομαι* with God as its subject that provides the proper meaning for Jesus' use here. Not only does the OT use the verb to emphasize God's omnipotence, his ability to do what he wishes (Ps. 113:11(115:3); Job 34:14; Judg. 13:23), but it stresses in contrast to the arbitrary power of the Greek gods that the God of Israel only wishes or desires what is in accord with his will which is revealed in his covenants and the moral order which they establish (1 Km. 2:25; 2 Ch. 21:7; Is. 1:11; 65:12; 66:4; Job 35:13; 36:12). It is interesting to note that a number of the times when God desires or wishes something in the OT, it has to do with the life or death of a person (Judg. 13:23; 1 Km. 2:25; 2 Ch. 21:7; Job 34:14). In 2 Ch. 21:7 it is reported that because of the covenant he has made with David, the Lord does not desire to destroy the house of David even though a certain descendant of David has acted wickedly. God also takes no delight in evil (Job 35:13; 1 Km. 2:25). We should also note that God desires or wills to bruise the suffering Servant (Is. 53:10 MT, but the LXX changes the sense to make it milder, *καὶ κύριος βούλεται καθαρῶς αὐτόν* ).

When Luke reports that Jesus introduces his prayer, "if thou art willing," he is taking the common Greek understanding of the ability of a divine being to do what he desires or wills and qualifies it by the OT understanding of the limits which God's foreordained counsel, *βουλή*, places on his action (cf. Ps. 32(33):11; Is. 19:17). In this case it is the divine plan and purpose for salvation (Ac. 2:23; 4:28) which God desires, wills to come to fulfilment. Luke shows that Jesus even in this request still desires to stand under the will of God. According to Luke Jesus states that the one condition for the granting of his



request is that it be in accordance with the will of God. This is in contrast to the way Jesus presents his petition according to Mark. There God's omnipotence is an argument for the granting of Jesus' request (Mk. 14:36). Luke presents Jesus in continuing submission to the will of God.

The key word in the request is ποτήριον. The use of the word in the rest of Luke and the Gospels does not give us much of a clue as to its meaning here (Lk. 11:39; 22:17, 20). Jesus' description of his mission as a baptism with which to be baptized and a cup to be drunk (Mk. 10:38, 39; cf. Lk. 12:50), however, does indicate from its context that the cup is going to entail hardship. If we look to the OT to find a significance for the metaphorical use of "cup," we discover the general meaning "destiny" (Ps. 10(11):6; 15(16):5; 22(23):5; 74(75):9; Jer. 28(51):7), which might include the notion of judgment; or the more specific meaning, "God's wrath or judgment" (Hab. 2:16; Is. 51:17, 22; Jer. 30:6(49:12); 32(25):15, 28; Lam. 4:21; Ezk. 23:31-33).

When these meanings are applied to the Lukan context, they may be understood in terms of Jesus as a martyr taking his allotted portion, cup, which is to experience God's wrath, which is directed against sinful Israel.<sup>1</sup> Or, the "cup" may signify the once for all outpouring of God's wrath in judgment against the sins of all men.<sup>2</sup> In this second sense "the cup" indicates much more than just Jesus' personal fate, his death,<sup>3</sup> it points to the eschatological wrath of God coming down finally

---

<sup>1</sup>Stüger (p. 247), as do others, uses Martyrdom of Isaiah 5:13 as evidence that the term "cup" is the symbol for suffering and martyrdom, cf. Korn, p. 67; The difficulty with this view is that the use in the Martyrdom of Isaiah probably depends on Is. 51:22 and the general OT usage of "cup" in a metaphorical sense. No necessary connection between martyrdom and "cup" can be established. There is no other evidence of this term being used in martyrdom literature. Besides, few scholars seem to reckon with the fact the "cup" is not peculiar to Luke but is present in the other Gospels which are not regarded as martyrological presentations.

<sup>2</sup>Bertram, p. 44; cf. Hühn (p. 66), who cites Is. 51:22 as an allusion and Selwyn, Oracles, p. 389, who cites Ps. 74(75):9 and Is. 51:17 as the source of the words.

<sup>3</sup>Leaney, p. 273; Contrast Linnemann, Studien, p. 40; Rengstorff (p. 250)

on the one who is numbered with the transgressors. The second sense is more appropriate to Luke's theological purposes as he shows the universal saving significance of Jesus' death. The cup of wrath as a cup which justly comes from God on the transgressor must now be taken by the one who though innocent is to be treated as a transgressor. Jesus has already stated that this is the will of God according to the Scriptures (Lk. 22:37). But the fact that it is God's will does not lessen the horrible prospect of the suffering and death which it will entail. Luke indicates the terrible suffering that will be involved by his portrayal of Jesus' struggle in that prayer (vv. 43-44). The OT image of the "cup" as God's wrath makes the content of the prayer and the struggle intelligible.

The concluding words of the prayer, "nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done" (22:42), are based on the OT understanding of the will of God and man's relation to it. The LXX uses θέλημα to express both what is the delight of God and what is his purpose or will (Ps. 29(30):6, 8; Is. 44:28).<sup>1</sup> Rarely does the LXX refer to God performing his purposes, doing what is his will (Is. 48:14; 1 Macc. 3:60). Normally it is human agents who do God's will (Ps. 39(40):9; Ps. 142(143):10; Sir. 16:3 in the S-text). Thus, Jesus' prayer, "Let thy will be done," is unusual by OT standards. However, if it is understood from the OT perspective where the will of God, his purposes, are normally performed by those who actively obey it, then the attitude behind Jesus' prayer is transformed from one of fatalistic resignation to one of willing active obedience. But in the process the OT understanding of the will of God has been changed. It is no longer primarily a revealed plan or purpose which human agents undertake to perform, though that meaning is still

---

comments that it is not only Jesus' death but the complete rejection of him and his messianic claims by his people which is the content of the cup.

<sup>1</sup>Swete (p. 453) sees θέλημα as a part of NT religious vocabulary which has definitely been influenced by the LXX.

present in Luke (Ac. 22:14; 13:22). It now has a vitality of its own in which human agents can willingly participate (Ac. 21:14). As in the case of *βούλομαι* the OT meaning has been taken over and transformed.

The method of use in both cases must center uniquely in the tradition of the words of Jesus. They are the result of an understanding of the relationship between God's will and man's obedience which is perceived for the first time steadily and clearly by the only one who lived in the perfect harmony of that relationship. Though his followers might imitate such perfect obedience (Ac. 21:14), such an understanding of it could only come from Jesus, himself. The part Luke played in the use of the OT idea was first to allow the OT meaning to continue to exist side by side with the new meaning (cf. Ac. 13:22; 21:14; 22:14). Beyond that, in our own passage Luke brings out most forcibly the unity of the Son with the Father in their commitment to the accomplishment of God's will (cf. Lk. 23:25 and the contrast to 22:42 which it creates). In doing so he emphasizes the close relationship between active obedience and the self-actualizing will of God.

The description of the supernatural help which Jesus receives (22:43) is presented by a number of words with OT background. Though both Luke and the OT may use *ἄγγελος* (MT, *mal'ak*) to signify a human messenger (e.g. 2 Km. 2:5; Lk. 7:24), the immediate context clearly shows us that at Lk. 22:43 a supernatural being, a heavenly messenger, is meant.<sup>1</sup> His activity, *ὑποθῆναι* and *ἐνισχύων*, is somewhat typical of angels in the OT. While the intransitive aorist passive of *ὁράω* is used in secular Greek to describe the appearance of supernatural beings (Josephus, *Ant.*

---

<sup>1</sup>Deissmann (p. 83) sees *ἄγγελος* as an example of vocabulary present in both *koiné* and LXX Greek and therefore not strictly OT in origin; Plummer (p. lxi) observes that this word with others, "although Greek in origin are used by him . . . in a sense which is due to Hebrew influence."

II:7; PGM IV:3090, *ἐὼς ὁ θεὸς σοι ὥφθη*),<sup>1</sup> it is much more frequently used in the LXX to indicate all manner of manifestations of the divine in human experience. Angels appear to various persons (Ex. 3:2; Judg. 6:12; 13:3, 20-21; cf. Tob. 12:22). By this is meant that the humans visually perceive the presence of the angel, but the perception is only made possible by the one who is appearing, manifesting himself (cf. Lk. 24:16, 31, 34).<sup>2</sup>

Luke's use of *ὁράω* and especially *ὥφθη* accords with the OT usage. It covers the same range of supernatural events from the appearance of the Lord God himself (e.g. Gen. 12:7; 17:1; Ac. 7:2), through angelophanies (Lk. 22:43; 1:11, 22), to visions and dreams (Gen. 41:15; 37:20; Ac. 2:3; 16:9; Lk. 9:31). One special category is the appearances of the Risen Lord (24:34; Ac. 9:17; 13:31; 26:16). Again the verb signifies in all appearances that the ability to perceive was controlled by the object manifesting itself. But, the appearance does include visual perception. This was the case when the angel appeared from heaven to Jesus in the garden. Jesus, more than just knowing his presence, did

---

<sup>1</sup>Antoniadis (p. 189) calls the usage rare in classical Greek; she compares Aeschylus, *Eum.* 411 and Plato, *R.* VII:517B, *ἐν τῷ γνωστῷ τελευτάῳ ἢ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἰδέα καὶ μόρις ὁραῖται, ὁφθεῖσθαι δὲ συλλογιστέα εἶναι*

<sup>2</sup>TDNT, V, p. 330; Michaelis argues that this aorist passive intransitive when it is used with the dative and not *ὑπὸ τινός* bears this emphasis: "the one who constitutes the subject is the one who acts, i.e. appears, shows himself, with no special emphasis on the resultant action of the person in the dative, namely that he sees or perceives." He observes that in the OT, except in the case of 2 Macc. 3:25 and Da. 8:10, an angelophany or other kinds of prophetic visions, when they are meant to be understood as something that was seen, are described by *ὁράω* with the accusative or *εἶδον καὶ ἰδοὺ*, but never by *ὥφθη*. Though this might be maintained for Ex. 3:2 and Judg. 6:12 there is either an explicit statement or a definite implication in Judg. 13:3, 6 and Tob. 12:15, 22 that when an angel appears in the OT he is visually perceived. Unless the context indicates otherwise it may be assumed that the OT understands supernatural appearances as involving visual perception by the human witness (e.g. Gen. 21:17; 22:11, 15). Thus, Michaelis' distinction between presenting oneself to the eyes for sense perception and "to manifest oneself as present" (p. 331) cannot necessarily be maintained in the case of OT usage concerning angelophany.

see him and receive strength from him.<sup>1</sup>

The primary duty of an angel in the OT is to be a messenger from heaven to men, to proclaim to them the will of God (e.g. Gen. 16:7ff; Ex. 3:2ff; Judg. 6:12ff.). Sometimes this message directs the human recipient to aid which is at hand (Gen. 21:17-19; 22:11-14). This is what happened to Elijah (3 Km. 19:7). More unusual is the direct granting of strength by an angel or heavenly being (ἐνισχύω, Da. 10:19; Hos. 12:4, 5 probably describes the wrestling of Jacob, Gen. 32:25). The same emphasis on angels as messengers may be seen in their role in Luke (Lk. 1:11, 26; 2:9; 24:4-7; Ac. 1:10, 11, 8:26; 10:3; 12:7; 27:23), though here too there is some mention of angels providing aid (Ac. 5:19; but cf. Lk. 4:13; Mt. 4:11; Mk. 1:13 where at the conclusion of the temptation Mk. and Mt. report that angels minister to Jesus while Luke eliminates this detail possibly because of his emphasis on the power of the Holy Spirit which is Jesus' portion in his earthly ministry, Lk. 4:1, 14).

The role of the angel who strengthens Jesus is not so much to provide physical strength on an analogy with Elijah, although that may be involved,<sup>2</sup> as to give an answer to Jesus' prayer. The strengthening angel provides insight. His presence confirms that taking the cup is indeed still the will of God. Jesus' numbering with the transgressors is still necessary.<sup>3</sup> Luke not only includes angels in his report of

---

<sup>1</sup> Contrast Michaelis' (TDNT, V, p. 330) comment, "... the ἔρχομαι here simply denotes the coming and presence of the angel (and αὐτῷ does not mean that Jesus saw an angel but that the angel came to help Him)." But, the angelophanies in Luke which use ἔρχομαι indicate from their content, the reaction of those involved, even the description of the angel, that the human beings to whom they came saw them. Even the brief description in Lk. 22:43 does not eliminate the probability that Jesus saw the angel. If not, how does one distinguish the non-visual, and in this case non-verbal, succouring presence of an angel from the strengthening presence of God?

<sup>2</sup> F. Rienecker, Das Evangelium des Lukas, 2nd ed. (Wuppertaler Studien Bibel; Wuppertal, 1966), p. 509.

<sup>3</sup> Grundmann, p. 412.

important events, the birth of Jesus and his resurrection. He also presents supernatural manifestations of God's presence at the beginning and end of Jesus' ministry (3:22; 22:43). These confirm to men what God's will is. This creates a pattern which is taken up again in God's dealing with the church (Ac. 2:3; 27:23). God confirms to Jesus by an angel that he must perform his will. The OT role of the angel is used fully in Luke's theology without significant change.

Although, as we have seen, this strengthening has been understood in a martyr context<sup>1</sup> (the struggle which follows also has been understood as a description of the martyr's lot<sup>2</sup>), the figure from the OT which is best described by this passage is Isaiah's suffering Servant of the Lord. The martyrdom context fails to account for the unique features of Jesus' death, the fact that it is unprecedented in history and universal in its significance.<sup>3</sup> Again only the figure of the suffering Servant of the Lord provides a wide enough context of significance which can accommodate the full thrust of the significance Luke sees in Jesus' death.<sup>4</sup> What is interesting is that the elements of this passage are also present in the description of the Servant's task so that we may see the Servant of the Lord figure reflected in Luke's presentation of Jesus in the Garden. Throughout the Servant Songs there is the theme of the Servant's obedient performance of the will of God, which involves hardship and suffering, and which on the face of it hardly provides just compensation for the service rendered (Is. 42:4; 49:4; 50:5, 6; 52:13-

---

<sup>1</sup>Dibelius (Botschaft, I, p. 270) compares the angel incident with the voice from heaven to Polycarp (Martyrdom of Polycarp, 9:1); cf. J. 12:28-30.

<sup>2</sup>Dibelius, Botschaft, I, p. 270.

<sup>3</sup>Barbour, NTS, XVI, p. 239; Barbour also notes that Luke of all the evangelists hardly presents Jesus' suffering in his passion in so graphic a way that it could be fairly described as a martyrological struggle.

<sup>4</sup>See above, p. 160.

53:12). Along with the presentation of the Servant's experiences of suffering and unjust treatment as he performs the divinely ordained task to which he is committed, the songs relate the promise of God's strength for the Servant (Is. 42:6, the Lord says to the Servant ἐνισχύσω σε; 49:4; 50:7; 53:10ff.). We can see all of these elements in the way Luke has constructed his narrative of the struggle in the garden. Whether he thought of the relationship in terms of promise and fulfilment is determined more by Lk. 22:37 than anything else. However, the way he portrays promise and fulfilment is again not in specific allusion but thematic development. Lk. 22:39-46 is the way in which one, who saw Jesus as the person in whom Is. 53:12 must be fulfilled, would portray his submission to that fulfilment. Jesus is one who struggles with what lies before him (Lk. 22:42-44; Is. 49:4), but submits himself obediently to the will of God (Lk. 22:42; Is. 50:5, 6). In that submission he finds that God answers by strengthening him (Lk. 22:43; Is. 42:6). Jesus is now fully prepared to be numbered with the transgressors.

#### Old Testament Style

In addition to the basic syntactical structure of the passage: the use of connectives and word order, what draws our attention in this section is the presence of pleonastic participles.

More than in previous sections (Lk. 22:15-38), we find a consistent use of καί instead of δέ as the coordinating conjunction (καί, 7X; δέ, 3X; cf. Mk. καί, 20X; δέ, 0X). However, this predominance seems to come more from Luke's sources than from his own editing of Mark. Besides a number of καί's which are eliminated through his general abbreviation, Luke removes four instances of parataxis (καί to δέ, Lk. 22:40/Mk. 14:32; finite verb plus καί plus finite verb to participle plus finite verb, Lk. 22:42/Mk. 14:36; Lk. 22:45/Mk. 14:37; Lk. 22:46/Mk. 14:38). Again we have cases where Luke to meet his twin purposes of improving the style of his source and retaining all the elements in his source creates pleonastic participles subordinated to main verbs.

In so doing he produces by either design or similarity of method, a style which imitates the LXX. As far as word order is concerned we also find that the semitic order verb-subject-object once more predominates (verb-subject-object, 3X; subject-verb-object, 1X; Mk. verb-subject-object, 4X; subject-object-verb, 2X). There are no instances where Luke appears to adjust this word order when he takes material from his sources. There is one occurrence of post-positive μου (22:42) which may be due to Luke's redaction of Mark, possibly under the influence of a non-Markan source.

The reason for the reappearance of these indicators of LXX imitation style seems due more to Luke's sources and the fact that this passage includes narrative as well as dialogue. Dialogue seems to offer less opportunity for the use of these elements of LXX style than narrative. But we must emphasize that though Luke does not multiply examples of LXX style imitation in word order, parataxis, or the use of καί over δέ, at least he leaves what he takes over from his sources and allows these examples of LXX style to exist. When he does destroy parataxis, the pleonastic participial construction which replaces it also is an instance of LXX style.

The three pleonastic participles, ἐξελεθών (22:39); λέγων (22:42); ἀναστάντες (22:46), which are the result of the practice of avoiding parataxis and, yet, preserving all the elements of a literary source, may all be paralleled in the LXX. Though there is only one example of λέγων with προσεύχομαι in the LXX (Is. 44:17), the LXX use of the pleonastic λέγων (rendering לְהַגִּיד) with verbs of speaking is frequent enough to classify it as a LXXism.<sup>1</sup> Its use in Luke may be recognized as an imitation of LXX style.<sup>2</sup> However, as we have noted, this con-

<sup>1</sup>Swete, p. 308.

<sup>2</sup>Turner, Kilpatrick Festschrift, p. 17; See below, p. 370; cf. the use of verbs of speaking with προσεύχομαι Ac. 1:24; but cf. Lk. 18:11.



struction at Lk. 22:41-42 is a secondary consequence of Luke's conversion of parataxis into more acceptable Greek. Still a feature of LXX style results. Though it probably is not significant, this is the only place in the passion narrative where λέγων is used with a verb of speaking to introduce Jesus' speech.

The two remaining pleonastic participles, which are verbs of motion used with finite verbs of action, qualify as examples of both Lukan and LXX style. Luke's abbreviation of Mark (Mk. 14:26, 32, ἐξῆλθον . . . καὶ ἐρχονται into καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἐπορεύθη, Lk. 22:39) is in line with Luke's treatment of paratactical constructions involving ἐξέρχεσθαι elsewhere in Mark (4:42/Mk. 1:35). This pleonastic participle is a feature of Luke's style throughout his two works (Lk. 1:22; 14:18; 15:28; Ac. 12:9, 10, 17; 15:24; 21:8; contrast his removal of the construction, Lk. 5:15/Mk. 1:45; Lk. 24:9/Mk. 16:8). The LXX use of ἐξέρχεσθαι as a pleonastic participle is not great (11X) and almost entirely limited to the Pentateuch (exceptions, 2 Km. 18:2; Jer. 45(38):17). While these exceptions involve the translation of infinitive absolutes and participles, the Pentateuchal usage is predominantly the result of the LXX translation's avoidance of parataxis by translating the finite (Gen. 43:31; Ex. 34:34; Lev. 9:23; 16:24) or imperatival form of  $\chi\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  by the participle of ἐξέρχεσθαι. That the resulting construction should be considered a LXXism is seen not only from the fact that it originates as part of the practice of translating the LXX, but also from fact that such a construction is inserted into the LXX twice (Gen. 9:22; Ex. 17:10). Possibly some of the OT apocryphal books have it as a matter of copying the LXX style (Tob. 8:14; Judith 2:10; Bel. 14θ; 1 Macc. 2:33; 16:3). There is no essential theological significance to be drawn from the construction. It is just part of the cumulative evidence that in the handling of his sources Luke imitates LXX style.

A more certain example of both Lukan and LXX style is the pleonastic



Luke's style is καὶ αὐτός (22:41).<sup>1</sup> The prepositional phrase ἐπὶ τοῦ τοῦ (22:40) appears at first sight to be an example of LXX style imitation.<sup>2</sup> The LXX frequently employs τὸ τόπος to render ⲓⲣⲏ. Yet the whole phrase is without frequent parallel in the LXX and therefore need not be seen as a LXX stylistic element which Luke imitated.<sup>3</sup>

The LXX style imitation is evenly distributed throughout the section without any concentration either in the beginning, the end, or the words of Jesus.

---

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 209.

<sup>2</sup> TDNT, VIII, p. 202.

<sup>3</sup> See below, p. 545, n. 2.

## CHAPTER IX

## LUKE 22:47-53: THE ARREST

## Introduction

While Jesus' agony in the garden (Lk. 22:39-46) presents his decision to accept the Father's will and be numbered with the transgressors, the account of the arrest portrays the decisive action of those who play a key role in the accomplishment of the divine plan. Beyond that, Luke's portrayal of the arrest places in the forefront Jesus' own putting into effect that decision by not resisting arrest but willingly accepting it.<sup>1</sup> There are differences in language and content between Mk. and Lk. which may best be accounted for by a non-Markan source.<sup>2</sup> The wording of this passage which is paralleled in Mark may be isolated to a few verses (22:47, 52b-53a; Mk. 14:43ff., 48), which can be understood as insertions.<sup>3</sup> From this evidence we may conclude that for this section Luke's basic source is a non-Markan one (cf. J. 18:10/Lk. 22:50) into which Markan material has been inserted.

There are no quotations in this section. The one general reference to the OT in Mark (Mk. 14:49) has been replaced in Luke by a statement which contains a number of OT ideas (Lk. 22:53). Many of the details of the arrest scene have been understood as having their origin in OT prophecy. Thus the question of the relation of the account's historicity to the OT is again raised. OT ideas are used by Jesus as he interprets the theological significance of his betrayal and arrest first to Judas (22:48) and then to the arrest party (22:52, 53). Touches of LXX style

---

<sup>1</sup> Rese, Die "Stunde," p. 142.

<sup>2</sup> Rehkopf, pp. 31-82; contrast Rese (Die "Stunde," pp. 139-143), who tries to explain the differences on the grounds of Luke's theological purposes, which control his editing of Mark. He explains expansions as natural developments of existing material (e.g. the sword incident is built on Lk. 22:35-38); Klostermann (p. 215) sees the new material in Luke as either independent tradition or Lukan formations inserted into Mark.

<sup>3</sup> Taylor, The Passion Narrative, p. 76.

appear both in dialogue and narration.

#### Old Testament Allusion

The one general reference to scriptural fulfilment with which Jesus interprets his arrest (Mk. 14:49) is eliminated in Luke. This we must attempt to explain. The approach of Judas, the betrayer (Lk. 22:47); his movement to kiss Jesus (22:47, 48); the disciples' question (22:49); the severing of the ear and its restoration (22:50-51); and in Mark the flight of the naked disciple (Mk. 14:51-52) have all been explained as originating from the OT. These details need to be tested to see whether in Luke they function as allusions and whether they do actually originate from the OT.

Mark views the manner of Jesus' arrest as a fulfilment of prophecy (Mk. 14:48-49). The arrest party comes out against Jesus as against a *Ἀγίτης*. Mark gives no indication of the specific OT passage which he has in mind but simply reports that Jesus makes the general statement, "But let the Scriptures be fulfilled." If a specific passage was in mind, it is usually conjectured to have been Is. 53:12.<sup>1</sup>

Although Luke records the same words of Jesus which describe his arrest, he does not include the interpretative words concerning the fulfilment of Scripture. The reasons for this non-allusion may be found in Luke's literary method and his theological purposes. If Is. 53:12 is taken as the precise OT reference of Mark's general statement, then Luke's explicit quotation of it earlier in his narrative (Lk. 22:37) makes allusion to it unnecessary now. This is true whether the details of Mk. 14:48, 49; 15:27, 28, understood as allusions to Is. 53:12, are regarded as the source of the material in Lk. 22:37,<sup>2</sup> or whether Lk. 22:35-38 is

---

<sup>1</sup>Maurer, *ZTK*, L, p. 9; Taylor (*Mark*, p. 561) is not so sure and says that it may be just a general statement as Mk. 9:13; 14:21; Rese (*Alttestamentliche Motive*, p. 159) questions whether there is any connection at all between Mark's report of Jesus' description of the manner of his arrest and Is. 53:12.

<sup>2</sup>Cadbury, *The Style*, p. 79; cf. Karnetzki (p. 5), who sees

understood to come from another source.<sup>1</sup> What this removal of a reference to scriptural fulfilment also effectively does is eliminate the probability that Luke saw in the manner of Jesus' arrest the fulfilment of Lk. 22:37.<sup>2</sup> These explanations from literary method, however, do not completely satisfy for they rest on the assumption that Mark in this general statement is indeed referring specifically to Isaiah 53. This is an assumption which can not be maintained with certainty.

The theological themes which may govern Luke's non-allusion are the relationship between the momentary triumph of the power of darkness and the divine plan for salvation prophesied in Scripture; the relationship of scriptural fulfilment to divine providence; and the kind of perspective from which Luke wishes his readers to view salvation history.

Luke in using the statement from his non-Markan source, "But this is your hour and the power of darkness," indicates that the arrest signals his delivery into the hands of sinful men who are instruments of the power of darkness (Lk. 22:53). It is claimed that this is incon-

---

Mk. 14:48; 15:27 as an example of the use of Is. 53:12 at an earlier stage in the history of tradition when it was expressed simply in the form of a factual detail. He sees Lk. 22:37 as an example of its use at a later stage of the history of tradition when the allusion becomes an explicit quotation.

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 255f.; Boismard (II, p. 396) contends that one of Mark's sources which Luke also used did not contain the saying about fulfilment of Scripture. He claims that it is actually on the basis of Lk. 22:37 that the final redactors of Mt. and Mk. introduce the saying at the arrest. It is unlikely that Mt. and Mk., who show such close verbal agreement at this point (Mt. 26:55, 56/Mk. 14:48, 49), have independently formulated this portion of the saying based on Lk. 22:37. In fact neither Mt. nor Mk. has any verbal parallels at this point with Lk. 22:37.

<sup>2</sup> Rese (*Alttestamentliche Motive*, p. 159) contends that it is because of the lack of such a clear allusion to Is. 53:12 in Mark's general statement, that Luke has no such allusion. If it were present Luke would have certainly altered the noun *ἁγιῶς* to *κακοῦργος* (cf. Lk. 23:32, 33/Mk. 15:27; Lk. 23:39). However, this is an argument from silence and assumes that it is Isaiah 53 which caused Luke's changes in wording in the crucifixion scene; Maurer (*ZTK*, L, p. 8f.) believes that Mark is alluding to the MT of Is. 53:12 and because the allusion was not understandable to Luke he did not retain it. However, the fact that Luke explicitly quotes that verse, which finds its clear fulfilment in Jesus' treatment as a *ἁγιῶς*, seems to be evidence enough that Luke would have understood such an allusion if it were present. There must be another more positive reason for such an elimination of Mark's reference to scriptural fulfilment.

gruous with Mark's statement that God is sovereign in this act, since it fulfills Scripture. Thus, Luke could not very well, having just declared that the hour was the time when the power of darkness has full sway, then go on to say that the hour is God's also for his promises are fulfilled in it.<sup>1</sup> This explanation, however, does not take into account that Luke does juxtapose the ascendancy of the power of evil and the divine necessity of its seeming triumph in other portions of the passion narrative (22:22; 22:31-38).

An explanation, which in one of its forms assumes that Luke was writing to Gentiles,<sup>2</sup> states that Luke prefers a clear statement about the mysterious power of evil within the undiscoverable will of God to the simple statement that Scripture was being fulfilled<sup>3</sup> in this dominance of evil. Though as we have seen Luke can on occasion eliminate reference to the fulfilment of Scripture in historical events (cf. 22:22),<sup>4</sup> his overall emphasis on the necessity of scriptural fulfilment as an expression of the assured accomplishment of the determined will of God prevents us from seeing Luke's replacement of Mark's statement simply on the grounds that fulfilment of Scripture was not important to him.

The probable reason for the change is to be found both in the perspective<sup>5</sup> from which Luke wanted his readers to view the events of the

<sup>1</sup>Baumbach, p. 190; Pilgrim, p. 251.

<sup>2</sup>J. Dillersberger, Lukas, Das Evangelium des heiligen Lukas in theologischer und heilsgeschichtlicher Schau (Salzburg, 1949), Vol. VI, p. 130.

<sup>3</sup>Loisy, Les Évangiles Synoptiques, II, p. 588; Ungern-Sternberg (p. 288) explains the change as a movement away from a clear statement that the Scriptures are fulfilled toward a treatment of the incident as an evidence of a mystery of God's providence understood only by Christian gnosis (cf. above, p. 195, n. 1).

<sup>4</sup>See above, p. 194f.

<sup>5</sup>A. Vanhoye, Structure and Theology of the Accounts of the Passion in the Synoptic Gospels. (Bible Today Supplement Series, I; Collegeville, Minn., 1967), p. 53.

Passion and his emphasis on the voluntary nature of Jesus' suffering.<sup>1</sup> As in the case of Lk. 22:22 (cf. Mk. 14:21), Luke is interested to have his readers relive the events of salvation history as they happen. To speak of the fulfilment of prophecy means that the reader must adopt a different stance, a more reflective one. Such an interpretive comment reminds the reader that he already knows the outcome of the story and breaks the "spell" of experiencing the events actually unfolding before him. Thus, when fulfilment is spoken of in Luke's passion narrative it is always in the context of predictions made (Lk. 22:22, 37). The interpretation of the events as they happen is expressed by Jesus in terms of the relationship between the actors in the divine drama (22:22, the Son of Man goes as it is appointed by God; 22:53, the arrest takes place when in that appointment theirs is the hour and power of darkness).

Possibly another factor in this concern with the reliving of salvation history in historical sequence is Luke's consciousness of "the successive stages of revelation."<sup>2</sup> He accurately reports that, in the main, Jesus, though presenting his death and resurrection as events predicted in Scripture, does not indulge in a proclamation of their fulfilment until after the events have occurred. It is in the resurrection appearance narratives of Luke 24 (24:25-27; 44-48) that Jesus interprets to his disciples in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself. So it is inappropriate here to speak of the manner of the arrest as that which is fulfilled. If it is observed that the event which is to be fulfilled has already occurred and Jesus is justifiably commenting on it as a fulfilment, then we would have to reply that Luke evidently did not view Is. 53:12 (Lk. 22:37) as having been fulfilled in that historical detail and so for that reason the saying was removed.

There is also the consideration that a "fulfilment of Scripture"

---

<sup>1</sup>Rese, Die "Stunde", p. 142.

<sup>2</sup>Vanhoye, p. 12.



saying places the emphasis so strongly on the necessary will of God that one loses sight of the voluntary nature of Jesus' acceptance of the arrest and subsequent suffering. But Luke continues to provide for this theological theme in his presentation of salvation history as a dynamic interplay of supernatural and human persons, which he wants his readers to relive. Thus, the reference to the fulfilment of Scripture is removed.

The description of Judas' betrayal has two features which are supposed to be related to the OT.<sup>1</sup> Besides Judas' approach, the intention to kiss Jesus is seen by some to have its origins in Joab's kiss of treachery (2 Km. 20:9, τοῦ καταφιλήσαι αὐτόν; Mk. 14:45, κατεφίλησεν αὐτόν; Lk. 22:47, φιλήσας αὐτόν . . . φιλήματι).<sup>2</sup> The Lukan wording which is probably due to his non-Markan source<sup>3</sup> removes the verbal parallelism and to some extent the material parallelism with 2 Km. 20:9. By not explaining the significance of the kiss as the sign of identification and, hence, betrayal (Luke does not include Mk. 14:44), the kiss is reduced to the significance of a greeting and its treacherous nature lost.<sup>4</sup> However, Jesus' question (Lk. 22:48) still keeps before us the ironic if not treacherous nature of the kiss. If the kiss does not have

---

<sup>1</sup>Selwyn (Oracles, p. 393) observes that Luke "seems to have before him Ps. 38<sup>10f</sup>". Therefore Luke has made 'Judas draw near to Jesus to kiss him. . .'. Selwyn doesn't take into account the fact that ἐγγίψεν is a characteristic feature of Luke's style, so that its presence here is not unique. Also, he does not note that Psalm 37(38) does not deal with any mention of treachery or betrayal by the psalmist's friends. The only other verbal link that he can forge between Luke and the psalm is Ps. 37(38):12, ἀπὸ μακρόθεν, and Luke's description of Peter (Lk. 22:54, μακρόθεν). While this second suggestion may have merit (cf. 23:49; cf. below pp. 361, 595), it is hardly closely related to Lk. 22:47. Because of the commonness of the verb in Luke and the lack of any material parallelism between Ps. 37(38):12 and Lk. 22:47, 48, we do not see this as an identifiable allusion.

<sup>2</sup>Hühn (p. 66) calls it a messianic allusion and compares Ps. 54(55):13-15, 21f.; Pr. 27:6; Bultmann (History of the Synoptic Tradition, p. 281) and Finegan (p. 71) see the origin of the detail in Pr. 27:6; Karnetzki (p. 85) classifies the detail as an unconscious factual parallel with several OT passages, which does not qualify as an allusion.

<sup>3</sup>Rehkopf, p. 42; It is unlikely that Luke would have removed a prefix from the verb he found in Mark (but cf. Lk. 20:26/Mk. 12:17; Lk. 9:39/Mk. 9:18).

<sup>4</sup>Rehkopf, p. 48f.

the same significance for Luke's report as it does in Joab's deed (2 Km. 20:9), the lack of verbal parallelism shows Luke's disregard of this possible allusion.<sup>1</sup> One other account of a kiss of deceit in the OT (Gen. 27:27) uses φιλέω.

Neither the description in 2 Km. 20:9 and Gen 27:27, nor the general maxim of Pr. 27:6 have sufficient material parallelism with Lk. 22:47 to make it an OT allusion. The kiss of deceit in Genesis does not involve the betrayal of Isaac into the hands of a third party. The Joab incident has closer material parallelism. Still, we have to suppose an atomistic proof-text approach to the OT in order to understand how the detail from that incident could have been applied to the NT account. The detail would have to have been seized upon without consideration for the original OT context. What the OT and NT incidents have in common is a kiss as an act of treachery. If the treachery were committed against David, there might be a case for seeing a typological understanding governing the gospel writers' use of this detail. He can allude to an incident in the life of David and see it typologically fulfilled or at least re-enacted in the life of Jesus, the messianic son of David. However, the OT passage provides no grounds for such a typology. The treacherous Joab is David's faithful general and he betrays with a kiss a rebel against David. Aside from a lack of fertile OT ground from which this detail could have originated, the fact that the kiss is in accord with ancient Jewish custom among disciples and their rabbinic masters<sup>2</sup> and that it plays a necessary role, in the account as the actual act of betrayal show that this is probably a historical detail. That the OT may have had some part in assur-

---

<sup>1</sup>Weidel (ThStuKr, LXXXV, p. 221) explains that Luke removes this allusion because he is indignant at the thought of the betrayer kissing Jesus for such a purpose; cf. Cadbury (The Style and, p. 94), who says that Luke avoids mention of physical contact between Jesus and other persons.

<sup>2</sup>cf. SBK (I, p. 995), which cites the custom of Rabban Gamaliel (R. H. 2:9) and R. Johanan b. Zakkai (Hag. 14b).

ing that this detail was remembered must remain a possibility because, though the kiss seems to play a historically necessary role in the Synoptic Gospels, it does not figure at all in John's report of the betrayal (J. 18:2-5).

It has been proposed that the severing of the ear and its restoration owe their origin to the OT.<sup>1</sup> Further, the embellishments which Luke appears to add to the story: the disciples' question and the restoration

---

<sup>1</sup>J. W. Doeve, "Die Gefangennahme Jesu in Gethsemane. Eine traditions-geschichtliche Untersuchung," Studia Evangelica, Vol. I; ed. K. Aland et al (TU, LXXIII; Berlin, 1959), pp. 458-80; S. C. Hall, "Swords of Offense," Studia Evangelica, Vol. I; ed. K. Aland et al (TU, LXXIII; Berlin, 1959), pp. 499-502; cf. Selwyn (Oracles, p. 381), who suggested that Dt. 32:44 was applied by Luke to the arrest scene. However, the only thing which this OT passage has in common with Lk. 22:49-51 is the word "ear." This is not enough to build a case for the origin of the details about the severing and restoration of the ear in that OT passage. Selwyn's other proposal that the use of swords has its origin in Zech. 10:3ff.; 14:3 (Oracles, p. 381f.) can be maintained neither on the grounds of verbal parallelism nor material parallelism. The only material point of contact is that as God takes vengeance on unfaithful religious leaders, the shepherds, so the disciples take action against their contemporary religious leaders. However, the motive is clearly different for the disciples act in self-defense. Luke makes this clear by placing the physical arrest after the incident (Lk. 22:49-51, 54; cf. Mk. 14:46-47). The outcome is different for Jesus halts their violence and nullifies it through the restoration of the ear. The only way that these OT passages could have served as a basis for the detail is if they were intended to justify the violence of the disciples by an appeal to God's acts of violence. But this presupposes that the scandalous act took place independent of the OT, which later was used to justify it; Hall (Studia Evangelica, I, p. 502) suggests that Ps. 39(40):7 is the origin of the "severing of the ear" detail. He bases his argument on the Christological use of this psalm in the rest of the NT (Hb. 10:5-10; Eph. 5:2) and a suggested translation of אָרָא = ἀπαραισ from the root אָרָא instead of אָרָא. It is true that there is a translation variant of אָרָא, which renders it as אָרָא (mss. BSA; cf. Hb. 10:5). This indicates some difficulty in translation. There is no Greek translation variant which supports Hall's suggestion for the verb. The normal understanding of אָרָא = to prepare, καταρτίζω, makes good sense in the context. It is in harmony with other references in the OT to God's provision of revelation and the desire for obedient hearing and heeding of his will, which are expressed by ears that are open by him and toward him (1 Km. 9:15; 2 Km. 7:27; Is. 50:5; cf. 55:3). Thus it does not seem likely that Mark, who does not allude to Psalm 39 (40) in the wording of the Gethsemane prayer (Mk. 14:36; cf. Ps. 39(40):9; Lk. 22:42), should have been concerned to use Ps. 39(40):7 as the basis for this detail as part of his solution of a translation difficulty.

of the severed ear, have been called **legendary** expansions.<sup>1</sup> This view is maintained mostly by those who consider Mark to be the basic source for the narrative and who think that Luke is responsible for any new material. Since we have reason to believe that a non-Markan source is basic to the narrative, we do not necessarily see the non-Markan material as Lukan invention. Still, the question of these details' historicity and their relation to the OT arises when we ask about how these details came into his non-Markan source. Doeve proposes a midrash which combined Ps. 90 (91):8, 5, 6, 13 with Am. 3:12 as the source of the new material in Luke.<sup>2</sup> He interestingly reconstructs the way Psalm 90(91) can account for the disciples' question (Ps. 90(91):8/Lk. 22:49) and the words about the hour and power of darkness (Ps. 90(91):5, 6/Lk. 22:53). He then goes on to show how the theme of non-retribution (Ps. 90(91):13) was developed by Luke with the help of Am. 3:12 into the detail of the healing of the ear. The link word in the two accounts is "lion."

The difficulty with Doeve's reconstruction is that he must assume unusual meanings for various items in both the OT and NT contexts in order to make his midrash work. The disciples' question (Lk. 22:49) must arise from a motivation of retribution. The motivation, however, is defense as the editorial comment in Luke indicates. The significance of the imagery of treading on the lion (Ps. 90(91):13) and extricating an animal from the lion's mouth (Am. 3:12) is taken to mean that for the lion no retribution is exacted. Yet, in the first case the imagery describes mastery over the lion. In the second, the rescue of the one, who is almost wholly devoured by the lion and only has an ear showing, indicates at least deliverance from the lion. In neither case does the idea of forbearing to show retribution on an enemy come to the fore. Thus, the midrashic link is not convincing on these grounds. Besides, the

---

<sup>1</sup>Bultmann, History of the Synoptic Tradition, p. 283.

<sup>2</sup>Doeve, Studia Evangelica, 1, pp. 470ff.

rescue of the nation Israel in Am. 3:12 is portrayed by the image of the part of the ear in order to signify, not Israel's restoration of lost members, but the power of God the deliverer to achieve a rescue when hope is almost fully gone. If these explanations from the OT are not based on even the plain sense of the OT and NT passages, it is hard to accept that the OT was the true origin of these details. The disciples' question is natural in the narrative and is at least pre-Lukan if Lk. 22:35-38 may be said to have prepared for it. Although it is curious that the other synoptic writers and John do not record the incident of the healing of the ear, this fact should not bring its historicity into total doubt. At least the OT does not seem to play a role in its origin.

The thumbnail sketch of the man, who followed the arrest party for a while and then fled away naked after he was accosted (Mk. 14:51f.) has had Am. 2:16 attributed to it as its origin.<sup>1</sup> There is nothing in the way Mark relates the incident which would show that he intended us to see in this detail an allusion to the OT. It functions in the narrative as a possible indicator that the writer of the gospel, who may have been that young man, was an eyewitness to the events. More immediately, the detail serves to emphasize both the power of the arrest party and the fear of the disciples. The writer of Mark may in a way be excusing the disciples' flight by showing how intense was the animosity against the band that even one following along was accosted and could only struggle free by leaving his garment behind. The detail is quite plausible historically. Whether the OT influenced its preservation in the tradition must be kept open as a possibility. The OT passage shows greater material parallelism to the NT incident in the MT than the LXX which translates וַיֵּרָץ by διώξεται (cf. Is. 13:14, the one other instance in the LXX of

---

<sup>1</sup>Weidel, ThStuKr, XXXV, p. 222; Finegan (p. 71) says that Am. 2:16 probably influenced the wording and inclusion of the detail; Contrast Bultmann (History of the Synoptic Tradition, p. 269, n. 4.), who says that it is not an OT allusion which shows fulfilled prophecy.

such a rendering). Aside from the fact that Am. 2:16 is the only OT passage with the idea of the naked fleeing in terror, what commends the verse as a possible OT testimonium is the prophetic context in which the description occurs, for what immediately follows is the phrase, "in that day." This was one of the indicators to early Christians that an OT passage was going to be fulfilled in the latter days which they believed had now arrived (cf. Ac. 2:18/Jo. 3:2). Thus, the terror which was to happen "in that day," could be said to have been fulfilled by the terror of the flight of the disciples. Such reasoning may have been one of the motives for preserving the detail. The reason why Luke did not include this detail, which might be taken to have some contact with the OT, was not that he did not understand it or did not see its messianic significance,<sup>1</sup> but because in his purpose to present the disciples in a favorable light he removes this reference to flight (cf. the clear non-allusion Mk. 14:27 deleted for the same reason).<sup>2</sup> There is nothing intrinsically improbable about the detail which would make us doubt its historicity and find in the OT its true origin. There are then in Luke's report of the arrest no clearly identifiable OT allusions.

#### OT Idea

Luke presents in Jesus' interpretation of the act of betrayal (Lk. 22:48) and arrest (22:53) two clusters of OT ideas: betrayal, Son of Man, hour and power of darkness.

We have already seen that there are fairly good grounds for seeing Da. 7:25 as the proper OT background for the idea of a suffering Son of Man. At Lk. 22:48 *τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίωξ* emphasizes the treachery of Judas' act. Jesus appears to do this in order to point out again the seriousness of the act to Judas and give him space to repent.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Loisy, *Luc*, p. 534.

<sup>2</sup>cf. above, p. 239.

<sup>3</sup>e.g. Maddox, *NTS*, XV, p. 72; Arndt, p. 451; See above, p. 209.

Jesus' question may also function literarily as the dramatic climax to the various predictions of the Son of Man being handed over (9:44; 18:32; 22:22).<sup>1</sup> The basic meaning for *παράδοσθαι* at this point is difficult to decide. "To betray" fits well with the ironic contrast which Jesus intends when he asks about the kiss. Yet, Luke's choice of source has meant the elimination of the explanation of the betrayal function of the kiss (Mk. 14:44). The immediately following context (Lk. 22:49f.) shows that the effect of Judas' action was to deliver Jesus into the hands of the arrest party. The contrast could equally well be between the seemingly innocent act of affection, the brotherly kiss, and the equally sinister act of handing him over, admittedly through a betrayal, to his enemies. In view of the restraint which Luke shows in the use of this term throughout his passion narrative (cf. especially its absence at the Lukan passages which are equivalent to Mk. 14:41-42, 44; 15:1, 10, 15) and the use to which he puts it at Lk. 23:25, it is reasonable to see the emphasis at this climactic point (22:48) on the general effect of the act, being handed over, than on the mode of act, betrayal. By not referring to a definite dative the question emphasizes the action but does not clearly indicate that "betrayal," as opposed to "delivering over," is the intended meaning. The lack of the dative may indicate that the transcendent dimension should be considered. The Son of Man is not only delivered over into the hands of sinful men but into the power of Satan whose instrument Judas is (22:53, 2). Again it is the lack of explicit objects accompanying the verb which allows us to infer the act's transcendent dimension. The use of Son of Man also plays a part in presenting this transcendent dimension for it is no ordinary *ἄνθρωπος* who is being apprehended. The source of this OT idea probably is pre-Lukan. Luke,

---

<sup>1</sup> A. J. B. Higgins, Jesus and the Son of Man (Lutterworth Library; London, 1964), p. 80.

nowhere else introduces a suffering Son of Man saying into Mark.<sup>1</sup> It is due to his other source which stresses the opportunity for repentance that Judas has. Luke takes the idea over and places it within a salvation history framework, which stresses not so much the soteriological significance of the suffering Son of Man concept as its Christological significance. It is according to the will of God (22:22) that the Son of Man is handed over into the hands of men and the power of darkness. It takes Isaiah 53 with its vicarious atonement theme to so complement Luke's presentation that we may come to understand the full significance of Jesus' death. It is a pre-determined handing over and a voluntary numbering with transgressors so that the just suffering for the unjust may make possible the forgiveness of sins. When Jesus asks Judas the question he again places the act of betrayal in its proper salvation history perspective.

Another interpretive word which brings such a perspective to the fore is ἀλλ' αὕτη ἐστὶν ὁμῶν ἢ ὥρα καὶ ἡ ἐξουσία τοῦ σκοτοῦς (Lk. 22:53). A question of grammar in this sentence is, which word or words do the genitives ὁμῶν and τοῦ σκοτοῦς modify? Should ὁμῶν be applied only to ὥρα?<sup>2</sup> Should σκοτοῦς be applied only to ἐξουσία?<sup>3</sup> Or do each of them modify both nominative nouns in the sentence? It does seem quite probable that ὁμῶν is intended to modify both nouns and that it should be regarded as a predicate genitive of relationship following a "verb to be." The verb may then be translated, "to belong to" (e.g. Ac. 1:7; 27:23; Lk. 18:16/Mk. 10:14). From these examples we see that the pronoun

<sup>1</sup>Rehkopf, p. 56; Borsch, p. 337, n. 3; Contrast Rese (*Die "Stunde,"* p. 140), who says that Luke has reproduced Mk. 14:41 here; Contrast Lk. 24:7; See above (pp. 195ff.) for a full discussion of Luke's use of the concept, the suffering Son of Man.

<sup>2</sup>cf. the omission (X\* and a few minuscules) or the different placement (ἀλλ' αὕτη ὁμῶν ἐστὶν) of the ὁμῶν in the text tradition, which indicates the difficulty in understanding the grammar of the text as it stands.

<sup>3</sup>cf. the Western wording- ἡ ὥρα καὶ ἐξουσία τοῦ σκοτοῦς, which indicates that the construction was taken as an epexegetical use of the genitive. Another explanation for this reading is that the copyist under



may be placed either before or after the verb, while the subject usually follows the verb. Although not necessary, a demonstrative pronoun may come in the subject position before the verb. In our case *αὕτη* (a feminine assimilation to *ώρα* and *ἐξουσία*)<sup>1</sup> is present to provide contrast with the *καθ' ἡμέραν* at the beginning of the verse.<sup>2</sup> We would translate this statement as follows: ". . . but this belongs to you, the hour and the power of darkness." That "darkness" modifies both hour and power may be recognized if the construction is taken as a tautology,<sup>3</sup> hendiadys, or the stating in paratactical form of an hyperbaton.<sup>4</sup> The reason for the expression of the thought in these slightly ambiguous ways is the desire to emphasize the words, "yours" and "hour." Luke wants us to know that it is through the instrumentality of the arrest party, who now have Jesus in their control, that the brief hour of victory, when the power of the cosmic forces of darkness will be fully unleashed, has come. Possibly it is part of a play on the fact that the arrest occurs at night<sup>5</sup> that "the hour" and "the power" are placed in parallel. The construction also gives the same weight to the ideas of "the hour" and "the power" and relates them equally to "darkness."

The OT ideas in this statement come from the phrase, "the hour and the power of darkness." Luke uses *ώρα* in three ways in his gospel and Acts: a point in time (e.g. Lk. 7:21; 10:21; 13:31; 20:19; 23:44; 24:33;

---

the influence of the Old Latin (d) understood *tenebrae* as nominative and not genitive and reproduced the Greek in the nominative.

<sup>1</sup>Robertson, p. 704.

<sup>2</sup>Rehkopf (p. 80) says it has no significance save to fill the normal subject position in the sentence.

<sup>3</sup>R. Morgenthaler (*Die Lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis* (ATHANT, XIV-XV; Zürich, 1948), Vol. I, p. 22) gives further examples, 1:17, 35; 4:6, 36; 9:1; 20:20.

<sup>4</sup>cf. Antoniadiis (p. 427), who says that the normal way of expressing it is *αὕτη ἐστὶν ὑμῖν ἡ ὥρα τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σκότους* . . .

<sup>5</sup>Montefiore, II, p. 611.

Ac. 2:15; 16:33); an appointed time for religious or social practices (e.g. Lk. 1:10; 2:38; 14:17; 22:14; Ac. 3:1); a point or period in time which is opportune (Lk. 12:12, 39, 40, 46; cf. the use of καρπός, 4:13; 20:10). **The Lk. 22:53** usage combines the second and third meanings.

What makes that hour opportune is not just the ideal circumstances for betrayal and arrest: darkness and a solitary place. It is that this hour has been appointed by God to be given over to sinful men as the Son of Man now is delivered over into their power (22:22, 35-38). This is where the OT use of the term aids us in our understanding. In Daniel phrases referring to the completion of the appointed will of God in the End-time are translated with the help of ώρα (Da. 8:17; 11:40, שְׁעָרַיִם = ώρα καιρῶν (συντελείας); Da. 11:35; 8:19, תְּהִי הָעֵרָא = ώρας (καιρῶν); cf. 11:45; 12:13). It stands for a time at the End when the will of God will be done. The same general significance of the appointed nature of the action according to the will of God is implied by Jesus' use here.<sup>1</sup> Whether we should go on to say that soteriological significance should also be attached to Luke's use is not certain. Although the determined will of God, which establishes appointed times, orders all things to effect his salvation, there is nothing in the immediate context which would cause us to know that salvation will issue from this arrest. Rather, the usage points out the sovereignty of God in appointing an hour when evil will seem to have victory. It also indicates the voluntary nature of Jesus' arrest. He goes with them after he tells them why it is necessary that he do so.

In Luke ἐξουσία denotes both political authority (e.g. Lk. 22:25; 23:7; Ac. 9:14; cf. Lk. 7:8) and spiritual authority (e.g. God's Ac. 1:7; cf. Lk. 4:32; Satan's, 4:6; Ac. 26:18). If the genitive "of darkness" were not present then it might be possible to take this term in a strictly

---

<sup>1</sup>Rehkopf, p. 81; Schelkle, p. 75.

legal or political sense. It would mean that Jesus admits they have the power derived from their authority as religious and political leaders. The fact that they are heavily armed means that they have the power to back up that authority. All Jesus can say is "This is your opportunity; you evidently have the upper hand."

The OT adds three special meanings to the term ἐξουσία which help us understand correctly what Jesus is saying. Besides using it in a religious context<sup>1</sup> and ascribing ἐξουσία to God, the LXX translation enriches the word when it employs it to render ܐܬܝܫܬܐܝܢ = sphere of power, realm (e.g. 4 Km. 20:13; Is. 39:2L; Ps. 113(114):2) and cognates of the Aramaic root ܐܬܝܫ = unrestricted sovereignty, a word which combines the thoughts of authority, a sphere of power, and the manifestation of that power (e.g. Da. 4:14, 22, 29).<sup>2</sup> Thus, the meaning of ἐξουσία is expanded. Authority may now be a prerogative of God. Its nature is more than just the exercise of power through pronouncements which are authoritative and will be obeyed.<sup>3</sup> It may stand for the geographical and temporal area over which such authority is exercised. More than this the LXX usage may combine the previous two usages with a third, "power." Thus it is possible to use ἐξουσία in such a way that the sphere of authority and the power within that sphere may not readily be distinguished (e.g. Da. 4:14).

The genitive "of darkness" so qualifies ἐξουσία that the phrase is immediately placed in a spiritual context. Whether τοῦ σκότους should be identified as Satan,<sup>4</sup> the "underworld" over which he rules

<sup>1</sup>Swete (p. 453) classifies this as one of the religious vocabulary which the LXX has influenced; e.g. Ps. 113(114):2.

<sup>2</sup>TDNT, II, p. 564.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 563.

<sup>4</sup>W. Manson, p. 250.

which is characterized by evil,<sup>1</sup> or the night time in which Satan works,<sup>2</sup> affects what meaning we see in ἐξουσία. Also, the probable meaning of ἐξουσία determines the character of τοῦ σκοταύς. Since we have seen that ὕμῶν applies equally to ῥῶα and ἐξουσία, it does not make much sense to say that ἐξουσία means sphere of power. That would mean that human agents now possessed sovereignty over the realm which is Satan's principality. Rather, it is the power, authority of darkness which they exercise. When Jesus willingly places himself in their hands, as he is handed over, it is true that he enters the realm of darkness. But, it is the active power of darkness which the arrest party exercises, that Luke is emphasizing in this statement. Both meanings, "sphere" and "power," are involved. It is probably the second of the OT special meanings, the compound meaning, which is the basis for the usage here.

The OT context which may be the best for understanding the use of ἐξουσία at Lk. 22:53 is not surprisingly Daniel 7. There the authority of evil kings to whom the saints are delivered over (Da. 7:25) is described as ἐξουσία (Da. 7:12, 26, יְחִיזְכְּרִי; cf. v. 14). It renders one of the semitic words which combines the ideas of sphere of power and exercise of power. In Daniel 7 the ἐξουσία of the evil kings is used to persecute the saints as part of the campaign of the forces of evil against God, for the battle is presented on two planes earthly and heavenly. Yet, their ἐξουσία is limited and under God's control for he determines when it shall end (Da. 7:12, 26). In contrast the ἐξουσία of the Son of Man and the saints of the Most High will never end (Da. 7:14, 27).

In Lk. 22:53 we have the natural complement of Lk. 22:48, "Do you hand the Son of Man over. . . yours is the authority, the power of darkness." Luke's use of the term here points out what the term ῥῶα did. The hour and power of evil though powerful is still under the sovereign

<sup>1</sup> TDNT, VII, p. 439.

<sup>2</sup> Godet, II, p. 311.

will of God. In this instance, Luke takes not only the OT religious use of the term but also the expanded meaning and applies it to his NT context. The appropriateness of the use is bound up in the suitability of the eschatological or apocalyptic context to the portrayal of Jesus' passion. This as we have seen from another discussion<sup>1</sup> of Daniel 7 is done within a salvation history framework.

Luke uses "darkness" both in a literal (Lk. 12:3; 23:44, 45; Ac. 2:20; 13:11) and figurative sense (Lk. 1:79; 11:35; Ac. 26:18). While Lk. 22:53 may be taken in the literal sense,<sup>2</sup> the use of the term in a phrase parallel with ἐξουσία τοῦ Σατανᾶ elsewhere in Luke (Ac. 26:18)<sup>3</sup> and also the connotation of evil attached to the figurative use of the term in Luke (Lk. 11:35; cf. 1:79), lead us to see the figurative use as possibly appropriate here. What gives certainty is that this statement is at the climactic transition where Jesus voluntarily relinquishes his freedom and is handed over into the hands of sinful men (24:7). A simple comment on the time of the arrest without reference to the spiritual forces at work in it seems out of character with Luke's presentation thus far. But what does the "darkness" stand for in the kingdom of evil and why was this particular term used? Can the OT use of "darkness" help us?

The OT and Jewish literature use "darkness"<sup>4</sup> in a figurative sense to denote evil (Pr. 4:19; Ps. 73(74):20; Is. 45:3; 29:15; cf. 1 En. 58:6; 62:10). They do not use it as a synonym for Satan (cf. Is. 14:12-15; 1 En. 10:4), though Satan and those who do his will dwell in darkness. It may be the darkness of a life of sin (Ps. 106(107):10; Is. 42:7; Mic.

---

<sup>1</sup>See above, pp. 197ff.

<sup>2</sup>Zahn, Lukas, p. 691.

<sup>3</sup>Baumbach, p. 190.

<sup>4</sup>cf. S. Aalen, Die Begriffe 'Licht' und 'Finsternis' im AT, im Spätjudentum, und im Rabbinismus (Skrifter utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi, Historisk-Filosofisk Klasse II:1; Oslo, 1951), for a full discussion of the evidence.

7:8), or the darkness of death in Satan's underworld (cf. 1 En. 108:14').

In OT and Jewish thought darkness so characterizes Satan's activity and his sphere of power that those who manifestly are doing evil may be said to be using the power of Satan when they are using the power of darkness (cf. 1 QS 3:21, 22 all who are in the hand of  $\text{לְיָדוֹ שֶׁלֹּאֵלִים}$  are  $\text{לְיָדוֹ שֶׁלֹּאֵלִים}$ ).<sup>1</sup>

The OT, then, does not give us much help in arriving at a precise understanding of the use Luke may be making of the term at Lk. 22:53. We have no OT or Jewish precedent for seeing "darkness" as a synonym for Satan, though his activity and sphere of influence are associated with it. Yet, this use of darkness as a description of the very nature of his activity and the activity of those who do evil, the sons of darkness (e.g. 1 QS 1:10; 1 QM 1:16), is never associated with the idea of authority in such a way that "darkness" becomes the active power of evil. The DSS for all their concern with dualism and the activity of Satan and his followers, the sons of darkness, never describe their activity or their power as the power of darkness.<sup>2</sup> Luke's use though it may share in some of the OT meaning, darkness=evil, also demands that we see this term as referring to the one who creates or inspires the creation of that darkness, Satan himself.<sup>3</sup> Luke retained this term, which was probably in his source, since he does not develop this idea through inserting the term elsewhere in his work. He uses this term and not Satan because he wants to emphasize the human involvement in the act and the evil nature of it. Possibly the contrast with the opportunity for apprehension in the day (Lk. 22:52f.) makes the reference to physical darkness, though not primary,

<sup>1</sup> Ibid., pp. 171ff.; Aalen (p. 344) claims that the ethical quality of darkness as evil occurs seldom in OT but is much developed in Inter-testamental Judaism.

<sup>2</sup> 1 QH 12:6 -  $\text{לְיָדוֹ שֶׁלֹּאֵלִים}$  simply describes figuratively night time probably in imitation of the Psalms; cf. Ps. 135(136):8, 9 where the moon is said to have  $\text{עָשָׂה לָנוּ יְיָ הָאֱלֹהִים}$ .

<sup>3</sup> G. Schneider (Verleugnung, Verspottung und Verhör Jesu nach Lukas 22, 54-71 (Stud. zANT, XXII; Munich, 1969), p. 184) says that Ac. 26:18 proves Luke sees a material parallel between darkness and Satan.

at least a supplementary consideration.<sup>1</sup> This statement, "this belongs to you the hour and the power of darkness," then interprets the Passion "in terms of a conflict between the Spirit of God and the powers of evil."<sup>2</sup> The conflict is stated in such a way that one is always assured that the hour is appointed by God and the power is ultimately under his sovereign control. Salvation will issue from this evil work in which the innocent is numbered with the transgressors.<sup>3</sup>

#### Old Testament Style

Elements of LXX style imitation are evenly distributed throughout this section. They occur both in narrative and dialogue. There is not much in the general syntactical structure which shows a definite attempt to imitate LXX style. There is an equal use of ὅτι and καί as coordinating conjunctions (ὅτι -4X; καί -4X plus 5X in other uses).<sup>4</sup> There is one instance of the avoidance of parataxis where Luke is inserting Mark (22:53/Mk. 14:49; but cf. Lk. 22:50).<sup>5</sup> In the area of word order the relation of subject to verb shows no tendency toward LXX style imitation (verb-subject-object, 3X; subject-verb-object, 4X). There is one instance of a post-positive use of possessive pronoun and adjective (τὸ οὗτοῦ αὐτοῦ τὸ δεξιόν, 22:50), which is probably due to Luke's source although Luke himself is capable of such word order (e.g. 2:7; 6:6; 20:13).<sup>6</sup>

The particular grammatical constructions which concern us involve

---

<sup>1</sup> Gilmour, Interpreter's Bible, VIII, p. 392.

<sup>2</sup> R. H. Fuller, Luke's Witness to Jesus Christ (World Christian Books, 2nd ser. XXVI; London, 1958), p. 69; Schneider (p. 183) says that the arrangement of the denial and the scourging episodes shows that Luke intends them to be seen as temptations of Satan.

<sup>3</sup> Loisy, Les Évangiles Synoptiques, II, p. 588.

<sup>4</sup> The lack of a conjunction at Lk. 22:47 (cf. Mk. 14:43) may indicate a semiticizing feature of an old tradition in Luke's source; Rehkopf, p. 34.

<sup>5</sup> Rehkopf, p. 74.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., p. 69f.

mainly verbs. Aside from the redundant use of ἀποκριθεῖς (22:51), most of the semitic elements involve either the use of prepositions or formulas which are familiar in the OT.

When Luke introduces the arrival of the arrest party by ἐτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος, he is using the LXX equivalent of the Hebrew construction וַיְהִי (e.g. Gen. 29:9; 3 Km. 1:42; Da. 9:21; the only exception Is. 58:9).<sup>1</sup> This formula occurs elsewhere in Luke but not frequently enough to be classified as part of his style (Lk. 8:49/Mk. 5:35; Lk. 22:60 cf. Mk. 14:72; Ac. 10:44). That this is an imitation of LXX style may be seen from the fact that Luke like the LXX at times (Job. 1:16, 17, 18) does not translate the וַיְהִי which normally links this construction to the rest of the Hebrew sentence.

Another feature of Luke's introduction, the use of ἰδοὺ, also is an example of LXX style for it is often used in connection with the preceding formula (6 of the 13 LXX occurrences). Normally it is preceded by καί and followed by a finite verb (e.g. 3 Km. 1:42; 4 Km. 6:33; ἰδοὺ is introduced into the construction at Da. 9:21; at Gen. 29:6 ἐτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος is introduced between καί and ἰδοὺ in the A-text). In Luke we may explain the absence of the καί as LXX style presenting itself as acceptable Greek. The use of ἰδοὺ without a καί preceding or some verb form following it, however, is not customary LXX style. There are, however, a few instances in the OT where ἰδοὺ functions as both an interjection and the main verb of a clause (e.g. Gen. 29:2; 3 Km. 19:6, 9; Ex. 16:14; 2 Km. 19:16; 25:36). Again in all of these instances the ἰδοὺ is preceded by καί (Judg. 18:12 is one exception).

Because of these deviations from normal LXX style it is uncertain whether this construction taken as a whole can be said to be conscious LXX style imitation by Luke. At best, it is the appropriation of the

<sup>1</sup>H. Jaschke, "Ialein bei Lukas: Ein Beitrag zur lukanischen Theologie," BZ, XV (1971), p. 112.



translation Greek of Luke's source, which in certain respects shows affinity to LXX style.<sup>1</sup>

We have already pointed out that the ἰδοὺ may serve as a pointer to the fulfilment of Lk. 22:21-23, which was also introduced by ἰδοὺ.<sup>2</sup> We should probably not see, however, any special significance in the use of ἰδοὺ here.<sup>3</sup> Its proper function is understood, when it is seen as naturally following on from the preceding statement. It serves to emphasize that Jesus is interrupted by the intervention of the arrest party. At most the LXX style just operates, as it does in OT narrative, to dramatize the interrupting event. The placement of this phrasing at the beginning of the perikope may also be a signal that the following events should be understood within a salvation history context.

The next cluster of LXX style features is in v. 49. The use of ἐί as a sign for direct and indirect questions is a semitic element which may qualify as LXX style.<sup>4</sup> It translates the Hebrew sign of the interrogative ( אִי, e.g. Gen. 17:17; 24:23; 2 Km. 2:1; Ps. 72(73):11; אִי, e.g. 1 Km. 6:9; Gen. 17:17). It can also qualify as a component of Luke's LXX imitation style.<sup>5</sup> He uses it throughout Acts as well as inserting it into his gospel sources (Ac. 1:6; 10:18; 19:2; 21:37; 22:25; Lk. 6:9 cf. Mk. 3:4). Whether this feature at Lk. 22:49 was originally due to

---

<sup>1</sup>cf. Rehkopf (p. 34), who maintains that these constructions are not Luke's editing since he never introduces ἰδοὺ in narrative without an accompanying καί; Doeve (Studia Evangelica, I, p. 462) sees the construction, ἰδοὺ functioning as the main verb, as evidence of translation Greek from Aramaic tradition.

<sup>2</sup>See above, p. 205.

<sup>3</sup>Fiedler (p. 65) suggests that the ἰδοὺ links this passage with others in Luke that deal with the work of Satan (9:38f.; 10:19; 13:16, 32; 22:21, 31). He does not take into account the function of ἰδοὺ in relation to ἐτι αὐτοῦ λαλοῦντος which may satisfactorily explain its presence here.

<sup>4</sup>Johnson, JBL, LVI, p. 340; Turner (Kilpatrick Festschrift, p. 10) sees it as evidence for his peculiar Biblical Greek language. This feature he says ultimately comes from the LXX.

<sup>5</sup>Tabachovitz, p. 75; cf. Turner, Kilpatrick Festschrift, p. 10.

Luke or to his source<sup>1</sup> is difficult to determine. In either case its presence serves to strengthen the LXX coloring of this portion of the narrative.

The other LXXism at this point is the instrumental use of ἐν with μάχαρα [in the LXX it renders לְ e.g. Gen. 48:22; observe that the simple dative also renders that prepositional phrase, e.g. Ex. 22:23(24)]<sup>2</sup>. This is the one occurrence of the instrumental ἐν with the dative of μάχαρα in Luke (cf. instrumental dative use at Ac. 12:2; cf. Lk. 21:24). When seen in connection with the interrogative εἰ the instrumental dative may be understood as a component in the presentation of the narrative in LXX style.<sup>3</sup> Again it is uncertain whether the source<sup>4</sup> or Luke is originally responsible for the LXX style element. The use of LXX style here does not seem to have any specific theological purpose.

Besides the redundant participle, ἀποκριθεὶς with a verb of speaking (22:51),<sup>5</sup> and the use of πρός with a verb of speaking,<sup>6</sup> which are

<sup>1</sup>Rehkopf, p. 59.

<sup>2</sup>Johnson, JBL, LVI, p. 341; Guillemard, Appendix, p. 56; Rehkopf (p. 60, n. 12) notes that 19X ἐν plus the dative and 25X the simple dative of μάχαρα is used in the OT cf. πατάσσει ἐν, 4 Km. 19:37; πατάσσει with the simple dative, Is. 37:38; Jer. 33(26):23; Moulton (I, p. 11) argues that since he finds the phrase ἐν μάχαρη in a koiné papyrus it may no longer be considered a Hebraism. But surely the facts that in the LXX the ἐν is a literal translation of its Hebrew equivalent לְ and that this construction is quite frequent in that translation override the significance of its occurrence in extra-Biblical Greek and maintain it as an example of LXX style.

<sup>3</sup>Tabachovitz, p. 75.

<sup>4</sup>Rehkopf, p. 60.

<sup>5</sup>See below, p. 446; Luke probably takes this feature over from his source at this point. It serves to smooth the transition between narrative and dialogue and also to give OT coloring to this part of the section.

<sup>6</sup>See below, p. 445; Luke's selective use of πρός with a verb of speaking at the beginning of the farewell discourse (22:15) and here may indicate an emphasis Luke wants to place on the words spoken. Also, the preposition is used to signify address to a group of people (cf. 23:14, 22). This construction which is part of another which we have noted, εἰπεν δέ (22:35; see above, p. 305) probably comes from Luke's source. The εἰπεν δέ serves an understandable function in the narrative. It marks a transition from Jesus' action, the attention directed to the disciples and the healing, to his word to the arrest party. Some OT color

both features of LXX style, another semitic element in the narrative is the clause ἐξτείνετε τὰς χεῖρας ἐπ' ἐμέ. (in the LXX it renders יָדַי (יָדַי) מִן הַמָּוֶת or מִן הַמָּוֶת, e.g. Ex. 7:5; Ps. 137(138):7). This example of the use of a part of the body to indicate the whole person may be termed a LXX stylistic element. It is a literal translation of a Hebrew expression for hostility, which occurs quite frequently in the LXX (19X throughout the work). Though the expression is possible in secular Greek,<sup>1</sup> what is common and unique to the Lukan and OT use is the implication of hostile intent (cf. however, Josephus, Ant. VII:327). Luke's dislike of κρατέω (cf. his removal of it, Mk. 1:31/Lk. 4:39; Mk. 9:27/Lk. 9:42; Mk. 12:12/Lk. 20:19; Mk. 14:1/Lk. 22:2) probably paved the way for his replacement of it with this OT expression which he uses elsewhere (using the verb, ἐπιβάλλω, 21:12; Ac. 5:18; 21:27).<sup>2</sup> This phrase may be used either to emphasize the solemnity of the moment or simply make the description of the action more vivid.<sup>3</sup> The fact that in the OT the expression is often used to describe the coming of God's judgment against a people (e.g. Ex. 7:5; Ps. 137(138):7; Zeph. 1:4; Ezk. 6:14; 13:9) may mean that its use here is again intended to bring to mind the theological context in which the arrest is taking place. It complements the interpretation of the arrest which Jesus goes on to give (Lk. 22:53b). Thus, although this expression does lend vividness to the narrative, its primary function as an element of LXX style imitation is to show that those in the arrest party are stretching out their hands against Jesus within the plan of salvation history, even though they do it at the behest of the

---

is also provided by the construction which helps to place Jesus' statement in a salvation history context. The content of Jesus' statement is appropriate to that context.

<sup>1</sup> cf. Polybius I:3:6, ἐθάρροσαν ἐπὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τὰς χεῖρας ἐκτείνεν.

<sup>2</sup> Rehkopf, p. 76f.; Klostermann, p. 216.

<sup>3</sup> TDNT (II, p. 460) chooses the latter purpose.

power of darkness.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>We should note that the name of the betrayer, Ἰουδᾶς (22:3, 47, 48), is the declinable LXX transliteration form of the proper name, יְהוּדָה (e.g. Gen. 37:26).

## CHAPTER X

## LUKE 22:54-62: PETER'S DENIAL

## Introduction

The truth of Jesus' evaluation of the situation becomes apparent in the episode immediately following the arrest. The hour and the power of darkness extend even to Jesus' most ardent companions. Satan does sift Peter and though his faith does not completely fail, Peter abandons his faithfulness to Jesus and denies that he knows him. Such rejection is appropriate treatment for a transgressor (Lk. 22:37), though hardly merited by the innocent Jesus.<sup>1</sup>

All the differences in style and basic content of the Markan and Lukan narratives may not readily be explained by Luke's modification of Mark for stylistic and theological reasons. Over half of the words in the narrative are shared by Mark and Luke. Their distribution is fairly even so that Markan and for that matter non-Markan source insertions cannot readily be recognized.<sup>2</sup> Yet there does seem to be greater Markan influence at the beginning (22:54/Mk. 14:53-54) and the end (Lk. 22:60b-62/Mk. 14:72) of the perikope. These could be viewed as Markan insertions into a non-Markan source.<sup>3</sup> What is crucial, however, is the difference in content: the geographical position of the accusers, their gender, the content of their statements, the persons they address, and Peter's

---

<sup>1</sup>Maurer (ZTK, L, p. 17) contends that Luke did not fully understand the OT significance which Mark intended to convey in his placement of the Sanhedrin trial, Jesus' faithful confession, in juxtaposition to Peter's faithless denial. This was Mark's way of expressing the theme of the vicarious atonement of the suffering Servant. Luke destroys that contrast by the different arrangement of the events in his report. There is, however, enough of a contrast inherent in the act of denial itself, that the unjust treatment of Jesus, part of the theme of being numbered with the transgressors, can still be communicated; Cadbury (The Style, p. 77) sees Luke's placement of the entire episode before the trial as evidence for Luke's "desire to conclude at once a subject when it has been introduced" (cf. 3:15-20).

<sup>2</sup>Taylor, The Passion Narrative, p. 77f.

<sup>3</sup>Perry, p. 44.

answers. There has been no thoroughly satisfactory explanation for these changes.<sup>1</sup> The agreement of Luke and John concerning basic content over against Mark (e.g. the gender of the second accuser, Lk. 22:58/J. 18:25; contrast Mk. 14:69; the place of the accusation, same verse) tends to confirm that Luke had a non-Markan source at his disposal.<sup>2</sup> That this non-Markan source was basic rests on the fact that so many details essential to the course of the narrative are different from Mark. No, sufficient reason can be found in Luke's editorial method for his introduction of these changes by altering Mark. We believe they are best explained as the elements of a non-Markan source which Luke used as his basic source for this perikope. Though there have been a few suggestions for OT allusions, the real interest in this section seems to center around LXX style. No quotations and very few OT ideas occur. This is negative evidence for the fact that it is primarily the words and activity of Jesus which advance Luke's theology and the OT ideas which are part of its foundation.

#### Old Testament Allusion

The one possible OT allusion proposed for a detail of this passage is Ps. 37(38):12, ἀπὸ μακρόθεν (Mk. 14:54/Mt. 26:58; cf. Lk. 22:54, μακρόθεν).<sup>3</sup> Peter follows at a distance just as the acquaintances of the suffering righteous man in the psalm stand at a distance. Luke in taking over Mark does not, however, reproduce the ἀπὸ. This reduces any verbal parallelism that Mark may be intending. The material parallelism between Ps. 37(38):12 and Lk. 22:54 fails on two important points.

---

<sup>1</sup>D. R. Catchpole, The Trial of Jesus (Studia Post-Biblica, XVIII; Leiden, 1971), pp. 160-174; Contrast Schneider's (p. 136) close study which concludes that Mark is the basic source.

<sup>2</sup>Rengstorff, p. 256.

<sup>3</sup>Rose, Le Psautier, p. 318f.; Selwyn, Oracles, p. 393; Hühn (p. 66) suggests as non-messianic reminiscences Lk. 22:55/Jer. 43(36):22; Lk. 22:62/Is. 22:4; 33:7b. The former which refers to fire for heating does not possess either allusion or OT idea value; the latter should be considered under OT ideas.

In the psalm the distance between the psalmist and his acquaintances is created by the repugnance of the psalmist's suffering, while in Luke, Peter follows at a distance from caution. The distance seems to be treated in the psalm in a negative fashion as a sign that the acquaintances have abandoned the sufferer. In Luke, Peter still accompanies Jesus, though at a distance. It is more for his own safety than as a positive rejection of Jesus that he does so. It does not seem appropriate to see an allusion here. The detail does play an understandable though not essential part in the narrative (cf. J. 18:15). It does not need to find its ultimate origin in the OT. The way Luke edits Mark shows no indication that he views it as an allusion worth preserving.<sup>1</sup>

#### Old Testament Idea

A characteristic of Lukan Christology is his use of ὁ κύριος to refer to Jesus in the third person during the narrative of Jesus' earthly ministry. This practice is different from the custom of the other gospel writers who do not refer to Jesus in this way. It also seems to be out of line with the theology of the early church and of Luke himself. They saw the events of the resurrection and exaltation as the manifestation of Jesus' lordship (Ac. 2:36; cf. the fact that except for Lk. 2:11 the use of κύριος with Jesus or Christ occurs in Luke's writing only after the resurrection, 24:3, throughout Acts). Luke's unusual practice needs some explanation.

There are three instances where Luke has inserted the term into Mark (22:61 cf. Mk. 14:72) or Q (Lk. 7:19 cf. Mt. 11:2; Lk. 12:42 cf. Mt. 24:45). The rest occur in material peculiar to Luke (contrast Lk. 19:31/Mk. 11:3). A stylistic reason may be given for some of the uses of this title. Several times ὁ κύριος is used to describe Jesus as he responds to someone who has addressed him as κύριε (Lk. 10:40, 41; 12:42). At

---

<sup>1</sup>See below (p. 595) for discussion of another possible allusion to this OT passage at Lk. 23:49.

other times κύριος exists in the immediate context and may have influenced Luke's writing (e.g. 7:6, 13; 9:61; 10:1).

The reason for Luke's use of the title in his gospel is also connected with what the title says about Jesus' basic nature as Lord. The OT use of the title, which seems to provide the most immediate parallel with Luke's use, included the LXX translators' practice of rendering יהוה by κύριος. It is disputed whether this was the actual practice of the LXX translators themselves and not rather the practice of Christian copyists of the LXX text.<sup>1</sup> However, Philo's explanation of κύριος as a divine title meaning βασιλικῆς δυνάμεως (De Somniis I:163) and the fact that κύριος used as a divine title is sometimes inserted into the LXX when there is no יהוה in the MT (e.g. Ex. 8:24; 16:23; 1 Km. 7:13) seems to open the way to seeing the use of κύριος as a translation of יהוה, as a conceivable practice of the Hellenistic Jewish translators. The practice in synagogue worship of saying יהוה: when the text read יהוה may have been the origin of the LXX translators' choice of κύριος to render that divine title.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>S. Schulz ("Maranatha und Kyrios Jesus," ZNW, LIII (1962), pp. 125-144) bases his argument on the fact that in pre-Christian Jewish fragments of LXX mss nowhere is יהוה replaced by κύριος. Other methods of rendering יהוה are used (cf. P. Vielhauer, "Ein Weg zur Neutestamentlichen Christologie?" Aufsätze zur NT (Münich, 1965), p. 148). It was the Christians who replaced the יהוה with κύριος when the tetragrammaton was not understood anymore; Rese (Alttestamentliche Motive, p. 60) reassesses the evidence and does not find sufficient reason for assigning the creation of the translation equivalent יהוה = κύριος to Christians.

<sup>2</sup>O. Cullmann, The Christology of the NT, trans. S. C. Guthrie and G. A. M. Hall (London, 1959), p. 201; Cullmann discounts the other explanation for the origin of the LXX translators' choice of κύριος: the use of the term in Hellenistic Greek to designate the gods, e.g. P. Fay 127<sup>5</sup> (213 A.D.) "to make a prayer πρὸς τῷ κυρίῳ Σαρράπιδι" (J. H. Moulton and G. Milligan, The Vocabulary of the Greek NT illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-literary Sources (London, 1914-1929), p. 365); Contrast W. Bousset (Kyrios Christos: Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus, 3rd ed. (FRIANT, XXI; Göttingen, 1926), p. 98f.), who accepts this explanation for the origin of the use of κύριος both among LXX translators with respect to God and among Christians with respect to Jesus. Bousset and those following him



Luke does use ὁ Κύριος as a divine title for God in the manner of the LXX (e.g. Lk. 1:15, 76; Ac. 2:39; 12:7). His use of the title as a

---

see the Christian Κύριος usage as one adapted from the Hellenistic religious environment without reference to the LXX. However, they fail to appreciate the differences that exist between the LXX or Christian use and the Hellenistic use. In the Hellenistic environment the term Κύριος is almost always used as an honorific title attached to the name of the god as in the example cited above. Its use absolutely, either in address or in a third person description, is rare. Neither Bousset, Moulton and Milligan following Deissmann, nor Liddell and Scott give any examples from Hellenistic religious usage of Κύριος used absolutely either in the vocative or other cases as a title for a god. But in the LXX the term "Lord" translates the name of God, יהוה, and thus may be used absolutely in the vocative or in other cases to designate God. Though we have the phrase "Lord God" in the OT the terms actually function in the opposite way from the way they are used in the phrase "Lord Sarapis." In the latter the term "Lord" raises the bearer of the name Sarapis to the level of deity. In the former the term "God" identifies as divine the one who bears the name "Lord" (cf. throughout the OT where the MT יהוה ייחיד is rendered in the LXX as Κύριος ὁ Θεός and where the simple יהוה or יהוה ייחיד is also rendered in the LXX by Κύριος ὁ Θεός). Though the use of Κύριος Ἰησοῦς may rightly be seen as a parallel of the Hellenistic religious usage, the use of ὁ Κύριος to refer to him does not appear to have its origin anywhere except in the LXX rendering of יהוה.

The most probable causal relationship between the two ways of designating Jesus' divinity is not that since Jesus functions as Lord in the cult for the Hellenistic Christians, as the gods do in the Hellenistic religions, so he beginning with Hellenistic Christians receives this title "Lord Jesus." Then later as the Christians read the Scriptures with this belief, they begin to appropriate to Jesus everything that is predicated of the Lord, יהוה (Bousset, p. 99f.). Rather, during his earthly ministry Jesus began to sow the seeds of the thought that he was "the Lord" in the OT sense of יהוה. He took to himself authority concerning forgiveness of sins (Lk. 5:24), the Sabbath (6:5), and the use of others property for theological purposes (19:31). His question about the nature or the relationship between David and the Messiah who is his Lord (20:42, 44) doesn't necessarily serve as the basis for the subsequent use of Κύριος as a divine title by Christians (Dalman, Words, p. 329). Yet it does question the accepted understanding of the Messiah as merely the human descendant of David. It opens the way to considering him as more than that, as "the Lord." The early church in the light of the resurrection and exaltation realized that Jesus, the risen Christ, was the divine heavenly Lord. Their monotheism was not shattered. Rather, its revealed content was increased. Luke's ambiguous use of ὁ Κύριος shows how Christians employing the OT title for God were able to understand that the Father and the Son were both God. That God now had another name, Jesus, was made clear by the Hellenistic use of Κύριος in the title "Lord Jesus." It is better then to see the development of the use of the title "Lord" as beginning with the recognition of Jesus as divine and therefore mysteriously the God of the Jews, "the Lord," and growing to the supplemental title "Lord Jesus" which expresses the basic identity of the earthly Jesus and this risen Lord. It is more difficult to understand how starting with the Hellenistic religious vocabulary the use of the title "Lord Jesus" could have issued in the absolute use "the Lord." Only with the LXX יהוה = Κύριος as their foundation could the early Christians have come to use ὁ Κύριος of Jesus in its fully divine sense.

designation of Jesus, normally distinguishes itself from the use for God by the employment of a definite article.<sup>1</sup> However, Luke often does not go out of his way to avoid ambiguity (cf. Lk. 1:43, 76; Ac. 13:47). We readily gain the impression that Luke uses this title to declare Jesus' divinity.<sup>2</sup> Although Luke's use of *ὁ κύριος* may be said to merely grow out of the OT use of the title, the question arises whether he saw anything in the OT which gave him the warrant for understanding the divinity of Jesus, for identifying Jesus with "the Lord" of the OT. Here the evidence is difficult to evaluate. It can convincingly be argued that Luke applies the role of "the Lord" in some OT Scriptures to Jesus because on the grounds of the resurrection and exaltation he believes Jesus is "the Lord." And, just as convincingly some of the OT passages contain descriptions of "the Lord's" activity which Jesus so perfectly fulfilled that on reading them the early church could have received the conviction that Jesus was that Lord (cf. Lk. 3:4ff.; Ac. 2:21, 36, 38). Yet there is one OT text which Luke declares that the early church took up from the gospel tradition and used to show the appropriateness of naming Jesus "Lord" (Ps. 109(110):1/Ac. 2:33-36). It is probably with the aid of this OT text that Luke understands Jesus, the one with God at the right hand, as "the Lord."<sup>3</sup> Jesus raised the question (Lk. 20:42, 44) and the early church interpreted the solution in the light of the resurrection and exaltation. They then went on to see in the OT those passages which spoke of God (the Lord) bringing salvation in the Last Days an announcement of what the Lord (Jesus) had done.

If "the Lord" is for Luke not only a title which shows the nature of Jesus' relationship with men, but also his essential nature as God,

---

<sup>1</sup>Rese, Alttestamentliche Motive, p. 60.

<sup>2</sup>A. Hastings, Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem: A Study in the Teaching of St. Luke (London, 1958), p. 152.

<sup>3</sup>Contrast Rese, Alttestamentliche Motive, p. 205.

what if any of that second significance comes through in Luke's use of ὁ κύριος at Lk. 22:61? We might say that generally this is just one of many instances which show that Luke wants us to understand the identity of the earthly Jesus and the exalted Lord.<sup>1</sup> More than this, Luke's use may show that he sees Jesus as the Messiah designate in whom God's power is at work during his earthly ministry and thus who may rightly be called by the OT name for God, "the Lord."<sup>2</sup> But it should be stressed that Luke still uses restraint in his employment of such a designation in his gospel. He reports that Jesus still refers to God as "the Lord" (10:2; 20:13, 15; 37). Only once does he report that Jesus used it of himself and then in a not unambiguous way (19:31). To see "in the earthly master the Lord exalted to God's right hand," still demands faith.<sup>3</sup>

From these general observations the only significance which we can draw for Luke's use at Lk. 22:61 is that this continuity between the exalted Lord and the earthly Jesus is being drawn. It appears that the perspective of the situation in the early community to whom Luke is writing has come into the foreground. The function of the whole account of the denial seems to be parenetic. It teaches the early community that even the closest followers of Jesus can deny him. But it also teaches the way back into fellowship through knowledge of the presence of the Lord; remembrance of his word (cf. Ac. 11:16; 20:35; Lk. 22:61); and repentance. The fact that it is "the Lord" who looks on Peter, then, has significance mainly for Jesus' relationship with Peter. The divine nature of the one holding that title only has significance in increasing the seriousness of the denial and the depth of the compassion. However,

---

<sup>1</sup> Rese, Alttestamentliche Motive, p. 205; Such a purpose does not create an anachronism; cf. C. F. D. Moule, "The Christology of Acts," Studies in Luke Acts, ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn (Nashville, 1966), p. 160.

<sup>2</sup> Voss, p. 57.

<sup>3</sup> Flender, p. 53.

this stands in the background. Peter's broken relationship with his Lord is to the fore.

One other OT idea in this section is the vocabulary combination ἐκλαυσεν πικρῶς.<sup>1</sup> In the LXX twice this phrase renders a combination of cognates of בָּכָה and בְּדַמְדָּם (Is. 22:4; 33:7). The adverb does not identify the motivation for the weeping (e.g. remorse) but only shows its intensity.<sup>2</sup> This is the only occurrence of the adverb in Luke's writings and may be due to his non-Markan source.

#### Old Testament Style

This passage is rich in LXX style. Though the general syntax shows a little more semitic character than in previous sections, it is again individual grammatical constructions which add the LXX flavor to the narrative.

The use of δέ and καί as coordinating conjunctions is pretty equal (δέ -8X; καί -6X to connect main clauses; 6X in other uses). The occurrence of parataxis is somewhat more frequent in vv. 60b-62 which have Mark as their source than in the rest of the narrative (cf. vv. 54, 58, 59, 60a). Word order does not show much evidence of LXX style imitation (subject-verb-object: 10X; verb-subject-object: 4X; cf. two post-positive constructions, vv. 54, 59).<sup>3</sup> There is no thoroughgoing LXX style imitation in syntax here.

Two constructions involving prepositional phrases may reflect LXX

---

<sup>1</sup>v. 62 is not present in 1071 and the Old Latin. Though the verse could be seen as a secondary harmonization with Mt. (Schneider, p. 54), it is more likely that it is original and has been accidentally omitted from several mss. To take it as secondary means that we must assume that it was added without variation in all other witnesses (cf. admittedly ὁ Πέτρος is added in several witnesses; cf. Metzger, Commentary, p. 178). Also note the homoeoteleuton which may have caused the omission τῷ καὶ... πικρῶς καὶ.

<sup>2</sup>TDNT, VI, p. 124, n. 12.

<sup>3</sup>cf. Schneider (p. 51), who assuming Luke's dependence on Mark notes that Luke makes the semitic word order of Mk. 14:67/Lk. 22:56 simpler.

style: ἐν μέσῳ plus the genitive (v. 55); ἐξ αὐτῶν (v. 58). Occur-  
ring throughout Luke and all of Acts, ἐν μέσῳ plus the genitive does appear  
enough times to qualify as a characteristic of Luke's style (he inserts  
it at Lk. 8:7/Mk. 4:7; Lk. 21:21/Mk. 13:14; Lk. 22:55/Mk. 14:54; he removes  
it at Lk. 9:47/Mk. 9:36; cf. Ac. 1:15; 2:22; 17:22; 27:21).<sup>1</sup> The con-  
struction has been proposed as a characteristic of LXX style, but the  
evidence for that is quite thin.<sup>2</sup> The construction occurs only 6X in  
the LXX and three of them involve text variants which would change the  
genitive to dative (cf. 5 other occurrences of it with the dative; e.g.  
Gen. 2:9; Ezk. 5:2), or the ἐν to ἐξ. This construction is then  
hardly established as a LXXism and its occurrence in the NT should not  
necessarily be taken as an imitation of the LXX.<sup>3</sup>

In verse 58 we have an example of "a partitive expression standing  
independently of a noun as subject or object of a verb."<sup>4</sup> Though this  
usage may be correctly identified as an element of Luke's style (e.g.  
Lk. 11:49; 22:3, 58; Ac. 19:33; 21:8) and as a feature of the MT (e.g.  
Ex. 29:12; 2 Ch. 21:4; 1 Km. 14:45, the partitive use of יְנִי), it may  
not properly be called a feature of LXX style. The LXX regularly ren-  
ders the Hebrew construction with the preposition ἐν (e.g. Ex. 29:12;  
3 Km. 18:5). There are a few examples (e.g. Gen. 9:21; Lev. 3:1; Dt.  
17:15; cf. Ex. 32:28; 1 Km. 4:10) of the partitive genitive construction  
with ἐκ but these are rare and are often involved in other constructions,

<sup>1</sup> Contrast Schürmann, III-Jesu Abschiedsrede, p. 88.

<sup>2</sup> Swete (p. 308) erroneously claims that the LXX translates יְנִי as ἐν μέσῳ, ἀνὰ μέσον, διὰ μέσου; ἐν τῷ μέσῳ translates rather יְנִי or יְנִי; cf. Haenchen, p. 159; Wilcox (p. 58f.) erroneously reports W. K. L. Clarke and calls this a LXXism which occurs over 25X in the LXX; Contrast Schürmann (III-Jesu Abschiedsrede, p. 88), who is not convinced that it is a LXXism.

<sup>3</sup> cf. the secular Greek expression "at midnight," ἐν μέσῳ νυκτῶν, Xenophon, Cyr. V:3:52; cf. BDF, ¶ 264.

<sup>4</sup> Turner, Kilpatrick Festschrift, p. 10.

e.g. a finite verb plus ἐκ (Lev. 22:11; Dt. 28:31). We need not consider the construction in Luke, then, as an example of LXX style imitation.

Three constructions which concern verbs of speaking may indicate LXX style imitation (pleonastic λέγων, vv. 57, 59; εἶπεν δέ, v. 60; εἶτι λαλοῦντας, v. 60). We have already dealt with εἶτι λαλοῦντας as a LXX stylistic element when we considered the LXX style of Lk. 22:47-53.<sup>1</sup> Its use here is to show the close connection between the denial and the cock crowing. This points out the precise fulfilment which Jesus' prediction reached (22:33-34). Since this phrase occurs only rarely in Luke (8:49/Mk. 5:35; Lk. 22:47/Mk. 14:43; Lk. 22:60; Ac. 10:44), it is difficult to attribute its occurrence at Lk. 22:60 totally to Luke's style. We have a choice between seeing Mk. 14:43 as exercising an influence on the narrative at Lk. 22:60 or supposing that Luke is influenced by his non-Markan source. Since vv. 61f. appear to have their basis in Mark it is more probable that v. 60 beginning from *καὶ παρὰ χρόνον* is also based on Mk. 14:72 to which is added a reminiscence of Mk. 14:43. This phrase not only heightens the dramatic conjunction of denial and prophetic sign. It becomes important in itself as a LXX style feature for it is combined with other LXX stylistic elements in vv. 60-62: the parataxis; "the Lord"; "the word of the Lord"; ὡς. Again the semitic style of the book which records God's dealings with men is deemed appropriate to narrate God's dealings with men in Jesus' ministry.

Luke uses εἶπεν δὲ ὁ Πέτρος to introduce Peter's last denial. This Lukan stylistic element which is also a feature of LXX style,<sup>2</sup> may be intended by Luke to emphasize the seriousness of the denials at their climax. From the second half of verse 60 onwards Luke is already adopting a more thoroughly LXX style in terms of word order and parataxis.

<sup>1</sup>See above, p. 355.

<sup>2</sup>See above, p. 305.

It may be as we have suggested that this difference comes from his use of Mark. But it also may be because he has adopted the non-Markan source as basic and, since he is inserting Mark, uses greater freedom with it, remolding Mark according to LXX style. Further, we have noted a tendency in Luke to show a greater concentration of LXX style at transition points in his narrative: the beginnings and ends of perikopes (cf. Lk. 22:47, 53). With all these influences it is understandable that Luke could have adjusted his non-Markan source at this point to bring it into greater conformity with LXX style (contrast the way Peter's first and second denials are introduced, 22:57, 58, ὁ δὲ...ὁ δὲ).

A feature of Luke's style, which pervades his two works, is λέγων used pleonastically with a verb of speaking (73X Luke; 43X Acts; 16X in Luke λέγων introduces direct discourse). In the LXX this participle normally renders the infinitive construct ἰδὼν? (e.g. Gen. 18:12; 50:4; 2 Km. 3:35; Am. 3:1). The main uses to which Luke puts this participle involve his purposes in editing his sources. Besides reproducing his sources faithfully (e.g. Lk. 3:16/Mk. 1:7; Lk. 7:16; 19:16/Mt. 25:20; Ac. 5:28; cf. Mk. 1:24/Lk. 4:33; Mk. 5:12/Lk. 8:32; the only instances where he removes the participle from Mark; cf. Mk. 8:28/Lk. 9:19; Mk. 10:26/Lk. 18:26, where λέγων is replaced by either a less pleonastic participle or a substantive participle), Luke inserts the construction where he wants to introduce a piece of conversation which comes abruptly in his source (9:35/Mk. 9:7; cf. Lk. 21:7/Mk. 13:3; Lk. 9:38/Mk. 9:17). When a verb of speaking occurs in a paratactical construction in his source, Luke often removes the parataxis by making the verb of speaking a pleonastic participle. He usually employs λέγων (e.g. Lk. 5:13/Mk. 1:41; Lk. 8:24/Mk. 4:38; Lk. 18:16/Mk. 10:14; Lk. 19:46/Mk. 11:17). In this way Luke can produce acceptable Greek and at the same time preserve all the words from his source. Another editorial practice in which Luke seeks to preserve elements from his source and at the same time write acceptable Greek is his custom of introducing a more accurately descrip-

tive verb of speaking while retaining the simple verb of speaking in the form of pleonastic λέγων (e.g. Lk. 5:30/Mk. 2:16; Lk. 8:54/Mk. 5:41; Lk. 20:14/Mk. 12:7).

Although λέγων with a verb of speaking is possible in secular Greek,<sup>1</sup> the great frequency with which the construction occurs in the LXX makes it easily a feature of LXX style.<sup>2</sup> Its occurrence in Luke may be seen as an imitation of LXX style. What is interesting about the use in the LXX is that though the great majority of the instances of λέγων are a rendering of the infinitive construct לְדַבֵּר, there are some examples of this pleonastic participle, which result from the same kind of editorial practice as Luke has. The LXX translation can remove parataxis through the use of λέγων (e.g. Gen. 1:28; Ex. 24:3; Job 3:2). The LXX translation can insert λέγων to introduce direct quotation (e.g. Gen. 19:37; Josh. 14:9).

Luke's use of pleonastic λέγων in our present passage has the purpose of introducing a direct quotation. Since it introduces the words of both Peter and his accusers (Lk. 22:57, 59), it does not appear to be a device for emphasizing the speech of one over against the other. Since it is a feature of Luke's style which he inserts very frequently, its significance at any given place is not readily discoverable. It is the one feature of Lukan and LXX style that we have so far discovered which pervades Luke's prose and gives a general OT coloring to his narrative. The most one can say for its significance is that it serves as a smooth introduction to many direct quotations. It indicates to the reader the beginning of the quotation and may also cause him to stop and note the words of direct discourse more carefully. The fact that this is a device which functions in the same way in the LXX merely shows the importance both writings place on the spoken word. As with other pleonas-

---

<sup>1</sup>Turner (Kilpatrick Festschrift, p. 17) cites Sophocles, Herodotus, and Demosthenes (λέγων εἶπεν οὕτω).

<sup>2</sup>Dalman, Words, pp. 36ff.



tic participles<sup>1</sup> λέγων helps Luke overcome parataxis, preserve all of the elements in his source, and at the same time write in LXX style.

Two other features of LXX style which we will note briefly are the use of ὥς as a declarative conjunction and the phrase τοῦ λόγου τοῦ κυρίου. The use of ὥς to translate the conjunction ἡ ὥστε in the LXX has meant that the range of meaning and use of ὥς has been extended to that of ἡ ὥστε.<sup>2</sup> In the case of ὥς εἶπεν αὐτῷ (22:61), the use is not simply declarative but is also, following the LXX, possibly exegetical (cf. Ps. 131(132):2; 1 Ch. 17:21).<sup>3</sup> Since this use does not vary in form from regular Greek usage (cf. e.g. Xenophon, An. 1:9:11), its employment here does not noticeably contribute to LXX style imitation in this passage. Luke takes over the construction in this instance from Mark.

In addition to the absolute use of ὁ κύριος to describe Jesus, the phrase τοῦ λόγου τοῦ κυρίου (Lk. 22:62)<sup>4</sup> has an OT background which connects Jesus with the Lord of the OT. The predominant use of the phrase ὁ λόγος κυρίου = יהוה' דבר in the OT is to describe a message which God has revealed to his servants the prophets (e.g. 2 Km. 12:9; 3 Km. 12:24; Hos. 1:1; Is. 1:10). In Luke the phrase ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου normally stands for the Christian message of salvation (e.g. Ac. 8:25; 15:35). But it can be employed to refer to a saying of Jesus (e.g. in the plural, Ac. 20:35; cf. 11:16). Since the word which Luke is referring to at

<sup>1</sup>Two other possible pleonastic participles in this narrative (v. 61, στραφεῖς and v. 62, ἐξελθὼν) do not quite qualify as such for their presence does advance the narrative and give it greater dramatic force.

<sup>2</sup>T. Muraoka, "The Use of ὥς in the Greek Bible," *NovT*, VII (1964-65), p. 62; See below for full discussion, p. 501.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 61.

<sup>4</sup>The text variant, τοῦ ρημάτων, though attested by ancient mss is restricted to mainly one text family, the Alexandrian-p<sup>69</sup>, 75; B; x; L; T. Since both phrases are used by Luke to refer to sayings of Jesus (Ac. 20:35; 11:16), the favorable extrinsic probabilities of the τοῦ λόγου reading with its wide geographical distribution (e.g. Caesarean-θ; f<sup>1</sup>; f<sup>13</sup>; Western-D; Byzantine-many mss) make it probable that τοῦ λόγου is original.

Lk. 22:61 is a word of prophecy by Jesus it is appropriate that he should call it Τοῦ λόγου τοῦ Κυρίου . . . . We notice immediately the difference, between the OT and NT usage. In the OT the word is not man's word, the word of a given prophet. It is rather the word of God, "the Lord," which has been given to the prophet. For this brief moment Luke looks at the incident from the post-resurrection perspective and sees the prophet Jesus and the Risen exalted Lord as identical. Luke, then, appropriately employs this phrase to describe not a word from the Lord (God the Father), but a word of the Lord (God the Son), which was prophesied and has now been fulfilled. It is probably this OT prophetic perspective rather than the practice of the early church in calling the sayings of Jesus, words of the Lord, which determines Luke's usage as he edits Mark here.

With a heavy concentration of OT style in vv. 60-62, as well as the use of LXX elements throughout the narrative, Luke portrays the denial of Peter as part of the progress of salvation history.