Benjamin R. Wilson

The Saving Cross of the Suffering Christ

Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft

Edited by
Carl R. Holladay, Matthias Konradt,
Hermann Lichtenberger, Judith Lieu,
Jens Schröter and Gregory E. Sterling

Volume 223

Benjamin R. Wilson

The Saving Cross of the Suffering Christ

The Death of Jesus in Lukan Soteriology

DE GRUYTER

ISBN 978-3-11-047582-1
e-ISBN (PDF) 978-3-11-047711-5
e-ISBN (EPUB) 978-3-11-047590-6
ISSN 0171-6441

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available on the Internet at http://dnb.dnb.de.

Printing and binding: CPI books GmbH, Leck
♾ Printed on acid-free paper
Printed in Germany

www.degruyter.com

Contents

Preface

This book is a revision of a doctoral dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Divinity at the University of Cambridge in 2014. In the course of its completion and publication, I have accrued a substantial debt of gratitude to the supervisors, colleagues, friends, family members, and supporters who in various ways have enabled the book's production.

My supervisor, Dr Simon Gathercole, has helped me at every turn. Dr Gathercole's attention to detail and precision in thinking are an inspiration, and I have learned a great deal from his patient reading, insightful feedback, and gentle direction. Likewise, Dr James Carleton Paget generously contributed considerable time and effort helping me to sort out my thoughts at various stages in this project, particularly during the second year of my research. His objective criticism was immensely useful, and his friendship enriched my time in Cambridge. My examiners, Dr Peter Head and Dr Grant Macaskill, offered much helpful criticism which has greatly aided in the revision of this work. I would also like to thank others who have given valuable advice on bits and pieces of this thesis, if only by mentioning their names: Professor Judith Lieu, Professor Steve Walton, Ben Pascut, Peter Malik, Chris Thomson, Colin Bullard, Sarah Dixon, and more generally, the NT Graduate Seminar at Cambridge.

The years spent in research for this project were a delight, largely on account of the broader relational context within which my research took place. St Andrews Street Baptist Church was a supportive and edifying church home for my wife and me during our time in Cambridge, and we could not have asked for a more gracious and kind community of friends than what we had over the years that this book was written. My parents kindly provided the necessary financial support for me to undertake this research project. I am truly grateful for their generous gift.

Finally, I am indebted to no one more than to my wife Rachael. She sacrificed much in order for me to pursue my dream, and her sense of humor kept me sane during the lonely times of my research. Thank you, Rachael, for your tireless encouragement. I would say that this book is dedicated to you, but then you would probably feel obliged to read it!

Citations and Abbreviations

Citations are in the form of *Author-Date*. Full references to the works cited can be found in the bibliography.

References to ancient literature generally follow the conventions established in P. H. Alexander *et al.* (eds.), *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical and early Christian Studies* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999).

Chapter 1 – Introduction and History of Research

I. Introduction

What is the place of the cross in the thought of the third evangelist? The question is not as straightforward as it may initially seem. On the one hand, references to the rejection and suffering of Jesus can be found from the early chapters of Luke's gospel to the closing chapters of the book of Acts. Luke's whole story of the life of Jesus unfolds in the shadow of the cross, and the body of the third gospel progresses as one long journey to Calvary. The passion narrative itself extends over the course of two lengthy chapters, so that Jesus' final hours occupy a prominence in Luke's narrative entirely out of proportion to the rest of Jesus' life. Moreover, the death of Jesus is one of the core components of the apostolic proclamation in Acts. Indeed, with only a few exceptions, the story of Jesus begins with the cross for Christian preachers in Acts. Whatever its function in Lukan thought, clearly the death of Jesus emerges as a pivotal event in the Lukan narratives.

On the other hand, many interpreters have found that the Lukan cross is most distinctive for what it lacks. Unlike the other synoptic evangelists, Luke's gospel does not contain Jesus' famous ransom saying that interprets his death as a redemptive event (cf. Mark 10:45; Matt 20:28). In addition, the dubious textual tradition behind the Lukan account of the last supper has convinced some interpreters that Luke did not originally preserve the soteriological interpretation of the cross found in Jesus' words over the cup (Luke 22:19b-20). When one turns to the book of Acts, the early Christian sermons appear to treat the death of Jesus as a mere historical fact. Even the preaching of Paul in Acts seems to lack the sort of soteriological interpretation of Jesus' death that is so conspicuous in Paul's own account of his gospel (cf. 1 Cor 15:3 – 5). The confluence of these assorted Lukan silences has led many interpreters to conclude that while the cross obviously occupies a central place in Luke's portrayal of the life of Jesus and the kerygma of the early apostolic mission, Jesus' death actually stands at the margin of Lukan thought, an event relegated to the sacred past with little abiding significance for the contemporary church.

The present work represents my own attempt to come to terms with the Lukan cross, and I hope to demonstrate that the death of Jesus functions in Lukan soteriology as an event of pivotal salvation-historical importance. More specifically, I wish to show that Luke conceives of the crucifixion as a cultic act of atonement that results in the establishment of a new covenant relationship between God and his people, a relationship marked by the eschatological for-

giveness of sins and experience of salvation. As such, for Luke the cross is central to Jesus' fulfillment of scriptural expectations for the messiah, and so in the course of establishing the centrality of the cross in Lukan soteriology, one cannot help but uncover the importance of the cross for Lukan christology as well. Luke presents to us a Christ who suffers upon a cross that saves. The death of Jesus therefore occupies a prominent position within the thought of the third evangelist.

Before embarking upon a new analysis, however, it is important to examine the long history of scholarship bearing upon the Lukan perspective toward the death of Jesus. The development of differing attitudes toward Luke's conception of the passion is an interesting topic in its own right, and by tracing out the history of the discussion, one gains a greater sense of the methodological and exegetical issues that lie at the heart of the present scholarly stalemate concerning the Lukan cross. Thus, the remainder of this introductory chapter offers an account of the range of explanations that have arisen in order to interpret Luke's unique treatment of the death of Jesus. Upon surveying the full spectrum of previous interpretive endeavors, I will then comment briefly upon what I perceive to be the distinguishing elements of my own approach to the topic.

II. History of Research

The literature devoted to the Lukan passion is expansive and fragmented, with no two authors agreeing in every detail. Nevertheless, some effort toward categorization must be made, and I will approach the discussion in terms of the soteriological function of Jesus' death within Lukan theology.[1]

I will start with those treatments which find on various grounds that the death of Jesus possesses no intrinsic soteriological significance for Luke. After surveying the historical development of this general interpretive outlook, I will discuss a number of comparative analyses which seek to show that the Lukan description of Jesus' death is based upon parallels within the literary traditions of Luke's day. These comparative analyses attempt to provide interpretive paradigms for understanding the Lukan passion without direct reference to the intrinsic soteriological significance of Jesus' death, so that they can be adapted to varying perspectives on the place of the cross in Lukan soteriology. As

1 As others have helpfully traced the broader discussion of Lukan soteriology in some detail (see Bovon [2002: 275 – 328]; Mittmann-Richert [2008: 10 – 50]), the present analysis will focus more narrowly upon the particular debate within scholarship regarding the soteriological interpretation of Jesus' death in Lukan thought.

such, they can be deemed mediating interpretations of the Lukan cross. Finally, I will examine the most common attempts that have been made to find an intrinsic soteriological significance in the death of Jesus in Luke-Acts.[2]

1. Minimalist Perspectives on the Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts

In his seminal work concerning the making of Luke-Acts, the American H. J. Cadbury observes that for Luke the cross seems to serve as a mere prelude to the resurrection, an unfortunate necessity that is overcome by the power of God in raising Jesus from the dead.[3] Writing a few years later, the Englishman J. Creed echoes this sentiment in his influential commentary on the third gospel, stating quite bluntly, "There is indeed no *theologia crucis* beyond the affirmation that the Christ must suffer, since so the prophetic scriptures had foretold."[4] Within German scholarship, this interpretive perspective is typically traced back to H. Conzelmann's statement, "There is no trace of any Passion mysticism, nor is any direct soteriological significance drawn from Jesus' suffering or death."[5] Subsequent generations have frequently followed the lead of these foundational interpreters, so that a common understanding of the Lukan cross has been that Jesus' death was merely a divine necessity with no soteriological significance in itself, a tragic historical event which had to take place in order to fulfill God's plan.

Commentators have typically been content to cite Cadbury, Creed, and Conzelmann as the founding advocates of a minimalist approach without inquiring as to how they arrived at their conclusions.[6] However, the seeds of this minimalist outlook, particularly within German scholarship, were actually planted quite

2 For purely heuristic purposes, treatments which find minimal intrinsic soteriological significance in the death of Jesus within Lukan thought will be labeled as "minimalist" approaches, whereas those treatments which do find an intrinsic soteriological significance in the death of Jesus in Luke-Acts will be labeled "maximalist" approaches. The labels are intended as nothing more than a shorthand way of referring to the basic interpretive conclusions of commentators with reference to the soterological function of Jesus' death. Such labels of course risk obscuring the significant elements of diversity and difference between various interpreters, yet I will employ the labels with the hope that they might provide a simple organizational framework as a point of entry into the complex discussions which have occupied scholarship on the death of Lukan Jesus.

3 Cadbury (1927: 280).

4 Creed (1930: lxxii).

5 Conzelmann (1960 [1954]: 201).

6 See, for instance, Brown (1969: 122); Giles (1985: 137).

early in the history of modern NT research. Indeed, the impetus for the restrained appraisal of the Lukan passion among interpreters of the 20th century can be traced all the way back to a number of trends within biblical criticism in the 19th century. A continuous tradition of interpretation therefore spans from the *Tendenzkritik* of F.C. Baur and the Tübingen School in the mid-19th century, through the Bultmann tradition of the mid-20th century, and into the modified soteriological minimalism of present-day interpreters.

Roots of the Minimalist Outlook

F.C. Baur and the Tübingen School

The move toward a minimalist assessment of the Lukan cross begins in earnest with F.C. Baur's influential hypothesis regarding the purpose and provenance of the book of Acts. Baur posits that the ostensibly historical portrayal of the early church in Acts is determinatively influenced by the author's desire to present an essential continuity and agreement between Pauline, Gentile Christianity and the Jewish Christianity of the original apostles. Indeed, this is the "chief tendency" of the book of Acts, the purpose which gives unity to the whole work.[7] While this conciliatory purpose is not necessarily incompatible with an accurate historical account of the ministry of the apostles, Baur finds that the author of Acts, who was a disciple of the Pauline school, has allowed his concern for the needs of the early second century church to affect his representation of Pauline theology.[8] Since Paulinism could only survive during the second century by modifying its opposition to Judaism, the author of Acts has attenuated Paul's original bifurcation of law and grace, faith and works. Consequently, in Baur's estimation, the Paul of Acts is made more Jewish than the Paul of the epistles, so that the Paul of Acts might be more acceptable to second century Jewish Christianity.

Baur writes generally of the conciliatory purpose of Acts, yet the systematic application of his hypothesis to the interpretation of Acts is performed by his students from the Tübingen school rather than by Baur himself. Schneckenburger, for example, affirms Baur's hypothesis through a sustained analysis of the purpose of Acts, comparing the Pauline and Petrine portions of Acts in order to dem-

7 Baur (1873 [1845]: 6). Though Baur most thoroughly develops his hypothesis concerning the purpose of Acts in this work, he also briefly mentions it in two earlier works: see Baur (1836: 113 – 114); idem (1838: 142). For Baur's influence on the study of Acts, see Gasque (1975: 26 – 54).

8 Baur (1873 [1845]: 12).

onstrate the work's conciliatory agenda.[9] Schneckenburger concludes that the theology of Paul's speeches in Acts is mirrored at every turn by the theology of the Petrine speeches.[10] In both sets of speeches, the resurrection is emphasized far more than the death of Christ.[11] Moreover, according to Schneckenburger, in Paul's speech at Pisidian Antioch, the author of Acts exchanges the Pauline concept of justification by faith alone for a synergistic understanding of justification in which the law and faith are viewed as complementary (Acts 13:38 – 39).[12]

In a similar manner, Zeller, in his 1854 commentary on Acts, contends that the soteriology of Paul in Acts does not resemble the soteriology expressed in the genuine Pauline epistles.[13] Paul's speech at Athens in Acts 17 replaces the genuine Pauline contrast of sin and redemption with the opposition of monotheism and polytheism, and faith in the messiah is only mentioned once in passing.[14] Indeed, in the Pauline speeches in Acts, Zeller discovers "*nichts von der allgemeinen Sündhaftigkeit und der Versöhnung durch das Blut Christi, vom Aufhören der Gesetzesreligion, vom alleinrechtfertigenden Glauben, von allen den Ideen, welche den Kern des paulinischen Christenthums ausmachen.*"[15] Acts 20:28 alone, with its curious reference to a church obtained by blood, preserves "*eine flüchtige Andeutung der Versöhnungslehre*" in a book otherwise purged of distinctively Pauline theology.[16] Thus, Zeller can only conclude that the author of Acts has deliberately transformed the apostle to the Gentiles into a spokesperson for Jewish Christianity, in keeping with the author's purpose in writing his conciliatory account.[17]

9 Schneckenburger was a student of Baur at Tübingen before becoming Professor of Theology at Bern.

10 Schneckenburger (1841: 130).

11 Schneckenburger (1841: 130).

12 Schneckenburger (1841: 131).

13 Zeller (1854: 298). Zeller studied under Baur at Tübingen and later became Baur's son-in-law. Prior to Schneckenburger's untimely death in 1848, Zeller and Schneckenburger were friends and colleagues at Bern (see Harris [1975: 55 – 77]). For Zeller and the Tübingen school, the genuine Pauline epistles were Romans, the Corinthian correspondence, and Galatians.

14 Zeller (1854: 298).

15 Zeller (1854: 328).

16 Zeller (1854: 327).

17 Zeller (1854: 328 – 329).

Overbeck

The leading Acts commentator of the next generation, F. Overbeck, rejects the Tübingen school's specific reconstruction of the purpose and provenance of Acts. According to Overbeck, any dispute between a law-free Pauline Christianity and a Torah-observant Jewish Christianity had long been resolved by the time of the production of Acts. Thus, the purpose of Acts could not be conciliatory in the sense that Baur had supposed. Rather, the purpose of Acts is historical, or perhaps genealogical. For Overbeck, Acts is the attempt of a dominant, second century Gentile Christianity to evaluate its past, particularly its origins and founder, Paul.[18] This Gentile Christianity had been strongly influenced by Jewish Christianity at an earlier stage in its development, but such concerns had ceased by the time of the production of Acts. The book belongs to the era of early Catholicism, and the apparent inaccuracies in Acts are a result of the author's historical distance from the object of his narration, not any conciliatory agenda (*contra* Baur).

Still, Overbeck affirms that the Tübingen school has rightly called attention to the differences between the theological perspective of Acts and its ancestral Pauline Christianity. Echoing Schneckenburger and Zeller, Overbeck confirms that Acts has not preserved a genuine Pauline soteriology. For instance, Paul's speech in Pisidian Antioch connects justification with the resurrection rather than the death of Christ. In fact, the book of Acts is silent about the special significance of Jesus' death.[19] Additionally, justification in Acts is redefined as simply the forgiveness of sins. Thus, the concept is wholly negative for the author of Acts (i.e., the removal of guilt), whereas justification for Paul also involves the positive reckoning of righteousness.[20] In addition, the law is given a role in justification in Acts that it never receives in genuine Pauline soteriology (Acts 13:38–39; cf. Gal 3:11; Heb 10:1f.).[21] In this manner, Overbeck affirms the basic Tübingen perspective toward the soteriology of Acts while providing his own reconstruction of the provenance of Luke's second volume.

German Scholarship at the Turn of the Century

At the turn of the century, the new generation of German scholarship endorses and expands upon Overbeck's historical understanding of Acts. For example, Jülicher places Acts early in the second century and suggests that the book pres-

18 De Wette and Overbeck (1870: xxxi). Overbeck's commentary is a substantial revision and expansion of De Wette's earlier work.

19 De Wette and Overbeck (1870: 204).

20 De Wette and Overbeck (1870: 204–205).

21 De Wette and Overbeck (1870: 205).

ents an idealized historical picture of the apostolic age.[22] Like Overbeck, Jülicher contends that any inaccuracies in the portrayal of Peter and Paul are due to ignorance rather than a particular motive in writing, and he finds that the organizational structures and ecclesiastical discussions portrayed in Acts represent the contemporary concerns of an early Catholic age.[23] Furthermore, Jülicher builds upon Overbeck's insight into the historical purpose of the Lukan corpus by suggesting that the theological perspective of Luke and Acts is also historical. Not only are Luke and Acts written in order to provide an edifying historical account of past events, but they are also written from a salvation-historical perspective. The two books describe two distinct periods in the history of salvation, with Acts presenting "the second period of the history of salvation and of the Gospel (as in the Gospel he had described the first and fundamental epoch), a period in which the Apostles, the fully authorised representatives of Jesus, stepped into the place of their acting and teaching master."[24] In this way, Overbeck's hypothesis regarding the historical purpose of Acts is expanded to postulate a particular salvation-historical framework which governs the structure of Luke-Acts as a unified corpus.[25] This notion of a salvation-historical agenda behind the configuration of Luke-Acts would prove formative in later assessments of the place of the cross in Lukan soteriology.

The Quest for the Historical Jesus and Minimalist Assessments of Luke's Gospel

At the same time that the seeds of a minimalist perspective are being sown in critical scholarship on the book of Acts, the roots of a minimalist perspective on Luke emerge within discussions regarding the historical Jesus and the synoptic gospels. Several features of these discussions are worth mentioning. First, the influence of Weiss and Schweitzer upon the quest for the historical Jesus brings about a renewed appreciation for the eschatological nature of Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God.[26] According to Weiss and Schweitzer, Jesus originally proclaimed an eschatological call to repentance in anticipation of the coming kingdom of God. Then, a shift toward a non-eschatological proclamation took

22 Jülicher (1904 [1894]: 434).
23 Jülicher (1904 [1894]: 434 – 438).
24 Jülicher (1904 [1894]: 438).
25 See also Weiss and Knopf (1937: 685 – 687). This work of J. Weiss was completed after the author's death by Knopf.
26 Weiss (1971 [1892]); Schweitzer (1925 [1901]). See also Schweitzer (1926 [1906]: 348 – 397).

place within the church on account of the delay of the parousia. Schweitzer argues that the shift from Jesus' eschatological message to the church's non-eschatological message took place immediately at the death of Christ.[27] Weiss, by contrast, suggests that the change in eschatological expectation occurred gradually within the first generation of believers following the crucifixion.[28] In their insistence that the church adapted the originally eschatological message of Jesus, both authors provide the conceptual framework by which later minimalist appraisals locate Luke-Acts securely in the second, non-eschatological stage of the growth of the church. This in turn is used to reinforce Jülicher's viewpoint regarding the salvation-historical perspective of the Lukan corpus, so that later interpreters come to characterize the description of the life and death of Jesus in Luke as a purely historical account of the sacred past with no abiding soteriological significance for the present.

Beyond creating the conceptual foundation for assigning Luke-Acts to a non-eschatological era in church history, gospels scholarship of the 19th and early 20th century also prepares the way for a minimalist reading of Luke-Acts in additional ways. First, the quest for the historical Jesus brings heightened attention to the Lukan omission of the ransom saying in Mark 10:45 (cf. Luke 22:27), as authors debate the extent to which Jesus conceived of his impending death in redemptive terms.[29] The form-critical analysis of the early 20th century then retains this interest in Luke's omission of Mark 10:45, as Luke's version of the pericope is taken to be the more original tradition.[30] Additionally, interpreters at the turn of the century frequently deny the authenticity of the longer version of the Lukan words of institution (Luke 22:19b-20),[31] and the longer text is taken at any rate to be a remnant of Pauline tradition in Luke's gospel.[32]

Attention to these Lukan particularities is made possible in part by an emerging consensus in favor of Markan priority.[33] Had the synoptic gospels been composed independently, then the unique elements of Luke's account would not elicit concern. Conversely, the establishment of Markan priority entails the obvious implication that Luke knew of the Markan tradition and chose to diverge from it at places which might speak to the soteriological significance of

27 Schweitzer (1925 [1901]: 242 – 243).
28 Weiss (1971 [1892]: 91).
29 See, for example, Schweitzer (1925 [1901]: 70 – 71, 74 – 76).
30 See Bousset (1970 [1913]: 39); Bultmann (1963 [1921]: 144).
31 Preference for the shorter version of the Lukan last supper in the late 19th and early 20th centuries traces back to the influence of Westcott and Hort (1881: 175 – 177).
32 Weiss (1971 [1892]: 88); Schweitzer (1925 [1901]: 70 – 72).
33 Influential in this regard were Weisse (1838); Weisse (1856); Holtzmann (1863).

Jesus' death. The acceptance of Markan priority therefore serves as an important pre-condition for much of the minimalist attention given to Lukan omissions and redactions.

Finally, the 19th and early 20th century pre-occupation with matters of historicity and source criticism in the gospels and Acts results in a method of exegesis that naturally lends itself to a minimalist reading of Luke's portrayal of the death of Christ. In NT scholarship at the turn of the century, the gospels and Acts are dissected one pericope at a time, and overarching motifs and themes which might develop cumulatively throughout the narrative are pushed to the margin of investigation. The dominant narrative is not to be found in the text itself but in the scholar's historical reconstruction of the life of Jesus or the ministry of the apostles.[34] A similarly atomistic method of interpretation is retained within form and redaction criticism, so that this mode of exegesis becomes a hallmark of the minimalist readings of the Lukan passion during the middle of the 20th century.

Dibelius, Bultmann, and German Minimalism in the Early to Mid-20th Century

Dibelius

The basic elements which would come to undergird a minimalist perspective toward the Lukan portrait of Jesus' death are furnished within critical scholarship of the late 19th and early 20th century, yet the scholarship of that era for the most part is not concerned with a unified analysis of the theme of the death of Christ within Luke-Acts. The concern is to uncover Jesus' own perspective on his death, not the perspective of the gospel authors or the communities out of which the gospels arose. Dibelius stands as a transitional figure in this regard. In his form-critical approach to the NT narratives, Dibelius begins to shift attention away from the historical figures depicted within the NT and toward the communities which produced the gospels and Acts. Individual passages are analyzed in order to uncover the communal setting in which the traditions about Jesus and the apostles were preserved and developed. Likewise, the biblical authors are recognized for their role in piecing together the various pericopes which comprise their works.

Dibelius devotes several pages of his form-critical analysis of the gospels to a discussion of the distinctive features of the passion story in Luke, finding that

34 On the historical development and philosophical underpinnings of this approach to biblical narrative, see Frei (1974).

the Lukan passion does not present Jesus' death in soteriological terms.[35] Instead, Luke has uniquely crafted his account of the passion in the form of a martyrdom story. The categorization of Jesus' death in Luke as a martyrdom has been popular since Dibelius, and the present work will return to this interpretive proposal in its discussion of mediating interpretations of the Lukan passion. Presently, the significance of Dibelius lies not in his interpretive conclusions but in his novel attention to the role of the author in constructing the passion account. Dibelius suggests that the Lukan passion narrative "rests upon a unified conception" and as such can only be traced back to the literary artistry of the author.[36] This new awareness of the author's role in constructing the passion account anticipates the way in which the next generation of German exegetes would seek to discern the theological perspective of the author through a redaction-critical approach to Luke's gospel.

Bultmann

A second transitional figure within German scholarship pertaining to the Lukan cross is Bultmann. A student of Weiss, Bultmann applies Weiss's general proposal concerning early Christian eschatology to the particular case of Luke-Acts. For Bultmann, Luke has exchanged the eschatological perspective of the earliest Christians for a salvation-historical approach that relegates the story of Jesus to sacred history, a sequence of past events that serves primarily as a model for the present life of the post-apostolic church. Bultmann writes, "While for Paul, Christ, being the 'end of the Law' (Rom. 10:4), is also the end of history, in the thought of Acts he becomes the beginning of a new history of salvation, the history of Christianity. Later on he will be regarded by universalistic thinking as the middle-point and turning-point of history."[37] Here Bultmann draws a sharp contrast between Paul and the perspective of Luke-Acts, and he contends that in Luke-Acts the relation of Christ to history has been reversed. No longer the eschatological figure who ushers in the age to come, Christ has become for Luke the founding figure who stands at the dawn of Christian history. As such, Christ belongs not to the present eschatological age, as he does for Paul, but to the sacred past, the beginning of the history of Christianity. This salvation-historical framework, already anticipated in the work of exegetes at the

35 Dibelius (1934 [1919]: 199 – 204).
36 Dibelius (1934 [1919]: 203).
37 Bultmann (1955: 2.117).

turn of the century, becomes foundational for Bultmann's heirs as they interpret the Lukan portrait of the cross.

German Minimalism in the Mid-20th Century

Building upon the work of their teacher, the students of Bultmann apply his salvation-historical framework to a sustained analysis of the Lukan corpus. Thus, Conzelmann inherits Bultmann's non-eschatological reading of Luke-Acts and argues that the framework of God's plan in salvation-history functions as the determinative force which directs the entire narrative of Luke-Acts. However, whereas Christ occupies the beginning of Christian history in Bultmann's understanding of Luke-Acts, Conzelmann contends that Luke actually places Christ in the middle of salvation history, between the era of Israel and the time of the church and the Spirit.[38] When this salvation-historical reading is then applied to the portrayal of the death of Jesus in Luke-Acts, the students of Bultmann repeatedly set the Lukan passion over against a Pauline theology of the cross and insist that Luke sees no positive redemptive value in Jesus' death. Thus, Käsemann finds that Luke has portrayed the death of Jesus merely as one event in the progression of salvation history. Since Christ now stands exalted by virtue of the resurrection from the vantage point of Luke's early Catholic church, the cross in the Lukan framework inevitably comes to be overshadowed by the resurrection.[39] The cross in Luke-Acts has "merely historical relevance," a sad distortion of the Pauline theology of the cross in Käsemann's estimation.[40]

Indeed, for Bornkamm, another heir of the Bultmann tradition, the striking difference between the theological import of the cross in Paul and the brevity of references to the cross in the speeches of Acts must be taken as one significant indication of the latter work's distance from the apostolic age. Whereas Paul recognizes the cross as the "decisive factor" in his self-understanding and conception of Christianity, "Acts no longer has anything of this, replacing it by the pic-

38 Hence the German title for Conzelmann's work, *Die Mitte der Zeit* (1960 [1954]: 150). Haenchen (1971: 95 – 96) then adopts Conzelmann's salvation-historical framework in his commentary on Acts.

39 Käsemann (1971: 55 – 56). Conzelmann (1966: 304) contests the attempt to locate Luke-Acts within the era of early Catholicism, but he affirms that the cross in Luke is conceived as a past event with no abiding soteriological relevance for the present age of the church. For a critique of the characterization of Lukan theology as early Catholic, see Schürmann (1968: 337 – 340).

40 Käsemann (1971: 55). Käsemann's placement of Paul's theology of the cross within early Christianity has been influential within subsequent German scholarship (see Wolter [2006: 66 – 69]).

ture of the triumphant witness."[41] Partially on account of this assessment, Bornkamm does not expect to discover a historically accurate reflection of the apostle Paul in the book of Acts. He concludes, "It will not do confidently to make Acts the basis of Paul's life and to assign to the letters merely the role of an occasional welcome supplement or illustration; nor may we uncritically fill in gaps in the letters from the copious material in Acts."[42] The comparison between the conception of the cross in Pauline soteriology and in the apostolic *kerygma* in Acts thus becomes one of the pieces of evidence supporting the claim that Paul's own thought cannot be reconciled with the picture of the apostle in Acts.[43]

Another disciple of Bultmann, H. Koester, uncovers a distortion of Pauline soteriology in the Lukan corpus in a slightly different way. In Koester's view, Acts presents the precise understanding of Jesus' death which Paul took pains to dispute with his Corinthian opponents, even though Acts is intended to venerate the memory of Paul as the consummate Christian missionary.[44] Whereas Paul in 2 Corinthians combats a 'divine man' christology in which Jesus is seen as the ultimate example of a man who has transcended the limits of human existence, the author of Luke-Acts has unwittingly adopted the triumphalist perspective of Paul's opponents on account of his historical distance from the events of the narrative. In fact, Luke has modeled his entire depiction of the story of Christ and the birth of the church upon this alternative, θεῖος ἀνήρ christology. Consequently, Luke emphasizes Jesus' divine qualities and powerful ministry throughout his account of the life of Jesus.[45] Therefore, he has no place for Paul's word of the cross. Within Luke's exultant aretalogy of Jesus, the crucifixion can be nothing more than "an appendix to the gospel."[46] In this way, Koester arrives at the same basic conclusion as the other students of Bultmann, albeit by a slightly different path.

---

41 Bornkamm (1971: xix).

42 Bornkamm (1971: xxi).

43 This can also be seen in Vielhauer (1966). Vielhauer relies heavily upon Dibelius and Overbeck in his comparison of the Paul of Acts and the Paul of the epistles.

44 Robinson and Koester (1971: 152 – 156, 191).

45 Koester's construal of Lukan christology is anticipated in Bultmann's own characterization of Luke's christology, according to which Luke emphasizes the miraculous and attributes divinity to the earthly Jesus through the use of the title κύριος. See Bultmann (1963 [1921]: 366 – 367). Koester's perspective may also reflect Conzelmann's divisions of the life of Jesus in Luke, in which the period of Jesus' ministry is seen as a time of divine activity free from the duress of the devil (Conzelmann [1960 (1954): 28, 199 – 200]).

46 Robinson and Koester (1971: 153).

Summary

In the minimalist interpretations of the Lukan passion within German scholarship of the mid-20th century, the influence of previous generations can be easily detected. The Tübingen school's contrast between the Paul of Acts and the Paul of the epistles is combined with Weiss' hypothesis regarding early Christian eschatology in order to confirm Jülicher's general understanding of Luke's salvation-historical perspective, so that Luke-Acts is seen as a non-eschatological history of Christian origins emerging from the era of early Catholicism. Within this treatment of salvation-history, the death of Jesus is seen as a past event with no intrinsic soteriological significance.

Minimalism in American and British Scholarship

In contrast to the developmental nature of the minimalism which gradually emerges within German scholarship in the mid-20th century, within English-speaking scholarship, a minimalist perspective receives its purest expression at its inception in the early 20th century. The minimalism of American and British scholarship tends to be less systematic than that of the Bultmann tradition, though it remains every bit as consistent in its insistence that Luke has avoided any redemptive interpretation of the cross.[47] Whereas the Bultmann tradition arrives at its minimalism through its appraisal of Luke's eschatological (e. g., Käsemann) or christological (e. g., Koester) framework, the path to English-speaking minimalism appears to follow a more purely exegetical course.

Cadbury

Thus, Cadbury arrives at his minimalist assessment of the Lukan Passion by noting the absence of the Markan ransom saying in Luke (Mark 10:45; cf. Luke 19:10), the textual uncertainty regarding the Lukan Last Supper (Luke 22:19–20), and the absence of an overtly redemptive interpretation of the death of Christ in the speeches in Acts.[48] Additionally, Cadbury is convinced that Luke's use of Isaiah 53 does not entail a redemptive understanding of Jesus' death, contending that Luke studiously avoids reference to those portions of Isaiah 53 which speak of the suffering of the Isaianic servant as an act of atonement. "It is noticeable," states Cadbury, "how out of the middle of a passage

47 However, Pervo's (2008: 23) understanding of the Lukan cross corresponds quite well with the Bultmann tradition, though he avoids the characterization of Lukan theology as "early Catholic."

48 Cadbury (1927: 280).

with a dozen 'vicarious' phrases (Is. liii. 4–12), Acts quotes vss. 7*bcd*, 8*abc*, which have none."[49]

As in the Bultmann tradition, Cadbury too compares Luke with Paul. "The cross of Jesus is for him no stumblingblock [*sic*] as it was to Paul the Jew, and it is no ground of hope and glorying, as it was to Paul the Christian."[50] Nonetheless, Cadbury still believes that the basic pattern of Luke's thought regarding Jesus' death and resurrection is essentially Pauline, even if it is underdeveloped. In Cadbury's view, Luke seems to link Christ's exaltation and the remission of sins in some vague way with the humiliation of Jesus in his death. At least in his manner of speech, then, Luke seems to have adopted the Pauline framework (cf. Phil 2:6–11). Certainly Luke does not appear to have grasped the intricacies of Paul's thought in this regard, but perhaps Luke was not particularly interested in this aspect of Pauline theology, or perhaps Luke's purposes as an author afforded him little opportunity to elaborate upon such concerns.[51] At any rate, Cadbury does not set the Paul of the epistles completely at odds with the portrait of the apostle in the book of Acts.

Creed

Creed echoes many of Cadbury's sentiments in his assessment of the Lukan Passion.[52] Creed, however, places Luke-Acts and the Pauline corpus in much sharper opposition than Cadbury: "Luke's interests and point of view were widely different from Paul's. The Pauline controversies about the Law and the peculiar Pauline theology in which they issued are not determining factors in St. Luke's presentation of the Gospel story. In Luke we are appreciably further from the Pauline spirit than in Mark. Most striking is the entire absence of a Pauline interpretation of the Cross."[53] Here, as in much of the Bultmann tradition, the Lukan portrayal of Jesus' death is taken as a key piece of evidence for a fundamental incongruity between Lukan and Pauline theology. In point of fact, it seems that for Creed this stands as the most important indication of the distance in thought between Paul and Luke-Acts.

---

49 Cadbury (1927: 280–281, n. 282).
50 Cadbury (1927: 280).
51 Cadbury (1927: 281).
52 Creed (1930: lxxi-lxxii). Much like Cadbury, Creed calls attention to the absence of the ransom saying and to Luke's abbreviated account of the last supper.
53 Creed (1930: lxxi-lxxii).

Exegetical Minimalism in Anglo-American Scholarship of the Mid-20th Century

The exegetically driven minimalism of Cadbury and Creed is then replicated time and again in subsequent English-speaking scholarship on Luke-Acts. Hooker, for instance, resembles Cadbury in finding no use of the redemptive themes of Isaiah 53 in Luke-Acts. Regarding Jesus' quotation of Isa 53:12 in Luke 22:37 ("and he was numbered with the transgressors"), Hooker suggests that Jesus does not identify himself with the Isaianic servant in this passage, that the concept of substitutionary suffering is in no way implied by the quotation, and that no "doctrinal significance" accompanies the verse.[54] Likewise, for Hooker the quotation from Isa 53:7–8 in Acts 8:32–33 merely underscores the divine necessity of the crucifixion; the passage does not explore the meaning of the passion event.[55] Luke cites Isaiah 53 merely as a proof-text. Any notion of atonement is absent.[56]

With similar restraint, numerous interpreters follow Cadbury and Creed in affirming that the speeches in Acts do not place any soteriological significance upon the death of Jesus. For Dodd, this absence of an atonement theology in the apostolic speeches indicates that Luke is recording a nascent stage of church history that preceded the development of Pauline soteriology.[57] For Moule, the absence of redemptive overtones in the speeches of Acts can instead be explained by the fact that the apostolic sermons are addressed to non-believers as opposed to believers.[58] Were Luke recording catechetical instruction to Christian audiences, the soteriological significance of the death of Christ would be present. Since he is preserving evangelistic sermons to non-Christian audiences, Luke does not include the redemptive interpretation of the crucifixion. On Moule's account, this is why Paul's counsel to the Ephesian elders (Acts 20:28) is the only place in Acts that might allude to the death of Jesus in redemptive terms.[59] Though Dodd and Moule therefore differ in their explanations for the lack of a soteriological interpretation of Jesus' death in the speeches in Acts,

54 Hooker (1959: 86, 149).

55 Hooker (1959: 113–114).

56 Similar assessments of Isaiah 53 in Luke-Acts can be found in Jones (1984: 148–159); De Jonge (1991: 48–50); Sellner (2007: 406–408); Jipp (2010: 257).

57 Dodd (1936: 25–28). See also Marshall (1971: 174–175).

58 Moule (1966: 171). Moule's proposal has recently been replicated within German scholarship by Wolter (2009: 23–31), who also calls attention to the non-Christian audience of the missionary sermons in order to explain the lack of a soteriological interpretation of Jesus' death in the speeches of Acts.

59 For additional examples of an English-speaking minimalist perspective on the speeches of Acts, see Brown (1969: 122); more recently, Talbert (1983: 99); Tyson (1986: 170).

they both accept the longstanding contrast between the Lukan cross and Pauline soteriology within both German and English-speaking scholarship.

Indeed, a comparison between German and English-speaking minimalism toward the Pauline speeches of Acts is revealing. Whereas German minimalism tends to identify the Pauline *theologia crucis* as the historical starting point for a decline into a non-eschatological understanding of the cross as a mere past event, English-speaking minimalists such as Dodd appear to conceive of the primitive, non-soteriological understanding of the cross as the primeval spring from which a later, more developed Pauline *theologia crucis* emerged. Consequently, both traditions envision an ideological transition between Luke-Acts and Paul, yet the movement proceeds in opposite directions for each. Pauline soteriology serves either as the pinnacle toward which early Christian conceptions of the cross ascend (e. g., Dodd) or else as the peak from which later interpretations of the cross have fallen (e. g., Käsemann). In both cases, the Lukan cross lies at the bottom of the hill, either as a sprouting seed not yet in bloom or as the withered vestige of a once-vibrant blossom.

The Modified Minimalism of Contemporary Interpreters

A minimalist appraisal of the Lukan passion has remained influential within both German and English-speaking scholarship up to the present day, with many contemporary interpreters readily acknowledging that Jesus' death has no intrinsic soteriological significance within Lukan thought. However, many minimalist interpreters of the late 20th century and today have at the same time sought to defend Luke from the charge that he has no theology of the cross by arguing that although the death of Jesus is not objectively redemptive in itself, the cross nevertheless plays an integral part in God's plan of salvation through its subjective effect upon God's people. Either as a means to glory or as a model of faithful endurance in the midst of suffering, the crucifixion is related in an exemplary fashion to the experience of the salvation of the people of God in Luke-Acts. Just as Jesus attained glory through suffering, so too must disciples of Jesus emulate his example in order to experience glory with him.

Along these lines, Flender insists that Luke's cross is not soteriologically efficacious in itself, but it draws the Christian into the suffering of Christ as a precondition and model for genuine discipleship.[60] Jesus' death is an eschatological

60 Flender (1967: 158 – 159). Barrett (1979: 75) also calls attention to the relationship between discipleship and the cross in Luke-Acts, noting that for Luke the cross is a "way of life." The theme of discipleship is also emphasized in Matera (1986: 198 – 205).

event that puts an end to human striving, thereby preparing the believer for the reception of salvation. Similarly, Zehnle is willing to speak of a soteriological effect of the cross in so far as Jesus' life, death, and resurrection reveal the favor of God and thereby provide the motivation for repentance and faith in the name of Jesus.[61] Jesus' death is not a satisfaction, yet the cross does have an indirect influence upon the salvation of God's people to the extent that it brings about conformity to Jesus' pattern of obedience in life, death, and exaltation.[62] Glöckner likewise locates the soteriological significance of the cross in its subjective effect. Jesus' humiliating death reveals the vanity of self-exaltation, and Luke's depiction of the resurrection shows that God exalts those who humbly submit to his will.[63] Consequently, the humble nature of Jesus' death is seen as the grounds for his exaltation, and as such the cross inspires the believer to overcome the sin of self-exaltation and to share in a pattern of discipleship that is conformed to Christ's humility.

Each of these modifications of a minimalist perspective articulates the subjective effect of the cross differently, yet these authors all see the soteriological outcome of the death of Jesus arising from the ethical change it produces in the believer rather than from any objective efficacy in the event itself. Many contemporary interpreters affirm this ethical turn in the interpretation of Luke's passion story, such that this modified minimalist perspective remains one of the more common viewpoints regarding the significance of Jesus' death within Lukan soteriology.[64]

---

61 Zehnle (1969: 436).

62 In a slightly different manner, Bovon (2006: 296) argues that Luke has deliberately downplayed the intrinsic soteriological significance of the cross in order to promote repentance within the Christian community. Whereas Zehnle believes that Luke simply does not perceive any intrinsic soteriological significance in the cross, for Bovon the scarcity of references to the redemptive effect of Jesus' death results from Luke's ethical interests, even though Luke is not opposed to a more objectively soteriological interpretation of Jesus' death.

63 Glöckner (1975: 195 – 198). Glöckner's construal of Lukan soteriology is then replicated in Kodell (1979: 226 – 229); Scheffler (1993: 150 – 158).

64 See, for example, Franklin (1975: 65 – 67); Büchele (1978: 193 – 196); Untergaßmair (1980: 208 – 213); Karris (1985: 115); Karris (1986: 67); Doble (1996: 232 – 237); Pokorný (1998: 149 – 151); Böttrich (2005: 431 – 436); Székely (2008: 167 – 170). For an extensive overview and critique of this approach to the Lukan passion, see Mittmann-Richert (2008: 22 – 36). Also, the trend toward a modified minimalism within Lukan scholarship is mirrored within scholarship on the historical Jesus, where increasingly Jesus is seen to have understood his impending suffering not as an intrinsically soteriological event but as an exemplary demonstration of faithful endurance. See McKnight (2006: 71 – 74).

Evaluation of the Minimalist Outlook

An historical overview of minimalist interpretations of the Lukan cross uncovers a continuous strand of thought that can be traced back to the Tübingen school in the mid-19th century. A minimalist approach is therefore supported by a long tradition of interpretation within both German and English-speaking scholarship, and many of the foremost figures within the study of Luke-Acts have espoused this fundamental orientation toward the Lukan passion. Nevertheless, minimalist perspectives are not above critique.

The minimalism of most of the Bultmann tradition, for instance, rests upon a questionable proposal regarding eschatological expectations and salvation-history in Luke-Acts.[65] While Luke-Acts may not emphasize the expectation of an imminent parousia, the eschatological expectations of the early Christian community are not entirely abandoned within the Lukan corpus.[66] Luke's gospel reflects the expectation of an imminent day of the Lord at several points (Luke 3:9, 17; 10:9 – 12; 13:6 – 9; 18:7 – 8; 21:32), and the speeches of Acts similarly reveal an eschatological appeal for repentance (Acts 2:17 – 21, 38 – 40; 13:40 – 41, 46 – 47; 17:30 – 31). *Pace* Bultmann, Luke-Acts does not portray Jesus' life and death as merely a past event within a non-eschatological account of salvation history.[67] Rather, the book of Acts demonstrates the abiding significance of the life of Jesus for the present, eschatological experience of the church.[68] As Soards writes, "Far from producing a theology of history, Luke writes Acts in such a manner that time spirals, moving ahead only as it reaches back and brings into the present the crucial reality of God's work in Jesus Christ."[69] Therefore, the Bultmann tradition, with its suggestion that for Luke the death of Jesus is merely a past event with no enduring soteriological significance, has arrived at its minimalism only by virtue of an eschatological framework that can no longer be maintained.

---

65 Koester's minimalism does not rest upon Bultmann's tenuous salvation-historical paradigm. However, the θεῖος ἀνήρ construct upon which Koester's minimalism depends can no longer be accepted as a viable paradigm for synoptic christology, since a fixed, miracle-working θεῖος ἀνήρ tradition upon which the evangelists could have based their accounts never existed in the first century. In addition, the characterization of the synoptic Jesus as a Hellenistic miracle-worker is quite questionable in itself, apart from any consideration of the viability of a θεῖος ἀνήρ theme within Hellenistic literary tradition. For a thorough critique of the θεῖος ἀνήρ christological hypothesis, see Holladay (1977); Blackburn (1991).

66 Gasque (1975: 295).

67 For a detailed critique of the salvation-historical framework of the Bultmann tradition, see Robinson (1962: 29 – 40, 61 – 69); Fitzmyer (1981: 171 – 192).

68 Richard (1990: 132 – 133); Gerber (2008: 232 – 233).

69 Soards (1994: 189). See also Rowe (2009: 123).

The exegetical minimalism found within English-speaking scholarship is also subject to certain criticisms. In particular, the diversity of minimalist viewpoints within American and British scholarship of the mid-20th century is unified in its circumspect exegetical methodology. The concern for the historical reference of the text frequently leads to an inductive approach in which each individual pericope is assessed in terms of what it may reveal about the origins of the early Christian movement.[70] The speeches of Acts are culled in order to arrive at a primitive kerygma, or Jesus' quotation of Isaiah 53 is evaluated in terms of what it might reflect about Jesus' own self-consciousness. Such inquiries are concerned not with the ideological perspective reflected by the narratives of the gospels and Acts, but with the isolated historical events which those narratives purport to describe. Therefore, each NT passage is examined in isolation from the next in order to consider the historical events depicted in each passage. In this way, the minimalist appraisal of the Lukan cross within English-speaking scholarship is connected at least in part to an atomistic exegetical methodology rooted in modern critical discussions of Christian origins. While a certain exegetical caution is surely commendable, one might wonder whether minimalist modes of exegesis have allowed for an adequate consideration of the thematic development of the death of Christ throughout the narrative of Luke-Acts.

Additionally, the minimalism of English-speaking scholarship depends quite heavily upon inferences drawn from a small number of Lukan omissions and silences.[71] For example, the Lukan omission of Mark 10:45 (cf. Luke 22:27) is one of the foremost reasons cited by many minimalist interpreters for concluding that the cross has no intrinsic soteriological significance in Luke-Acts. However, aside from this single ransom saying (Mark 10:45; Matt 20:28), the other synoptic gospels do not contain any more explicit references to the soteriological significance of Jesus' death than Luke, and Luke may avoid the traditional ransom saying for any number of linguistic, literary, or ideological reasons.[72] In a similar manner, a comparison of Acts with the Pauline corpus causes many minimalist interpreters to be troubled by the apparent silence in the speeches of Acts concerning the redemptive effect of Jesus' death.[73] However, the brevity of references to Jesus' death in the speeches of Acts may simply result from the fact that the

70 A notable exception to this atomistic approach would be the work of Tyson (1986: 170), who takes a literary approach to the death of Christ in Luke-Acts and yet arrives at a similar soteriological conclusion to many minimalist interpreters.

71 This criticism is also mentioned by Sellner, who characterizes Luke's attitude toward the atonement as "*unpolemischen Marginalisierung.*" See Sellner (2007: 411–412, 476–480).

72 Marshall (1971: 170–171).

73 Brown (1994: 33).

crucifixion has already been depicted in detail in Luke's gospel, and retrospective references to past events within a narrative are typically compact.[74] Furthermore, the Christ-hymn of Phil 2:6 – 11 shares a pattern of humiliation and exaltation that is quite similar to the speeches in Acts, and thus the opposition between Luke and Paul at this point may be exaggerated.[75] Hence, minimalist interpreters tend to employ arguments from silence in order to reach their conclusion regarding Lukan soteriology, when often the disputed elements of the Lukan cross can just as easily be explained on other grounds.

Finally, some minimalist interpreters seem at times to presume an absolute dichotomy between christology and soteriology. Jesus' suffering is understood as a divine necessity within his christological vocation, yet this divine necessity is apparently unrelated to Jesus' ministry as God's anointed agent of salvation. This bifurcation can be seen quite clearly in a figure such as Creed, who strongly affirms the christological necessity of Jesus' suffering and yet finds no place for the death of Jesus in Luke's understanding of salvation. Lukan christology, however, ought not to be separated so absolutely from Lukan soteriology. Jesus is proclaimed at his birth as "the savior, Christ the Lord" (Luke 2:11), and when Simeon receives "the Lord's Christ" into his arms (Luke 2:26), he rejoices that his eyes have seen "your salvation" (Luke 2:30).[76] Thus, from the very outset of Luke's gospel, Jesus' christological identity is inextricably linked to his messianic ministry of salvation.[77] Christology and soteriology are surely distinct, yet they are also related,[78] and the minimalist perspective sometimes rests upon a misleadingly strict dichotomy between Jesus' christological identity and his soteriological ministry.

To the extent that the modified minimalism of contemporary interpreters essentially accepts the exegetical conclusions of mid-20th century interpreters as its starting point for expounding the subjective soteriological significance of the Lukan cross, the modified minimalism falls subject to the criticisms above. In addition, the recent ethical turn in the interpretation of Jesus' death in Luke-Acts may be at odds with the Lukan emphasis upon human obstinacy.[79] Ac-

74 Genette (1986: 54); Anderson (1994: 144).

75 Buckwalter (1996: 234 – 236).

76 The indissoluble connection between salvation and the person of Jesus is then demonstrated throughout the Christian mission in Acts, where salvation is inseparable from the name of Jesus and his christological identity as κύριος πάντων (cf. Acts 4:12; 10:36). See Rowe (2009: 123 – 124).

77 See Mittmann-Richert (2008: 89).

78 See Keck (1986: 363).

79 Mittmann-Richert (2008: 16 – 18, 267 – 275).

cording to modified minimalist interpretations, the death of Christ has a parenetic function, prompting a free response of repentance and faith by virtue of its exemplary character. In Luke-Acts, however, the narrative repeatedly stresses the stubbornness and unrepentant disposition of God's people. Stephen's speech in Acts 7, for example, chronicles Israel's repeated response of stubbornness to the redemptive activity of God,[80] and the paradigmatic function of Jesus' initial rejection at Nazareth serves to foreshadow the persistently negative response to Jesus' ministry throughout Luke (Luke 4:16 – 30).[81] Therefore, the notion that individuals are to come to repentance and faith as a result of observing the favor of God in the crucifixion of Jesus may not be entirely reconcilable with the Lukan perspective toward God's dealings with humanity in the history of Israel or in the ministry of Jesus.

On the other hand, even if the modified minimalist emphasis on the parenetic function of the death of Jesus is found to be legitimate, this would not logically necessitate a rejection of any objective soteriological dimensions to the Lukan cross. In other words, one might theoretically affirm that the Lukan cross is an impetus for repentance and faith in Luke-Acts without denying that the death of Jesus has an intrinsic soteriological function within Lukan theology. Aspects of the modified minimalist perspective, then, may be entirely in keeping with a more optimistic appraisal of the place of the cross within Lukan soteriology.

Particular facets of a minimalist approach will be critiqued more thoroughly as they arise over the course of the present work. For now, the questionable assumptions and methodological shortcomings inherent to the minimalist outlook can account for why some interpreters remain unconvinced that the cross lies at the margins of Lukan soteriology.

2. Competing Paradigms for Understanding the Lukan Passion

In addition to the persistent strand of minimalism which can be found in modern critical scholarship pertaining to the death of Jesus in Luke-Acts, the history of research also reveals an array of proposals regarding the motifs and themes which govern Luke's unique narration of the passion event. Beginning with Dibelius' identification of a martyrdom theme in the Lukan passion, it has been common for interpreters to suggest that Luke's story of the cross is patterned

80 See Johnson (1999: 55 – 56).
81 Buckwalter (1996: 251 – 252); Rusam (2007: 101).

upon a model available to the author within the literary traditions of his era. Accordingly, a number of analyses have been comparative in nature, as exegetes have sought the background to the Lukan understanding of the cross in either Greco-Roman or Jewish parallels. In a sense, the comparative treatments of our topic can be considered mediating interpretations, in so far as they do not inherently demand any particular understanding of the soteriological significance of Jesus' death. Several different paradigms have been proposed as the key to understanding the description of Jesus' death in Luke-Acts.

The Suffering Righteous One

Intrigued by the distinctively Lukan aspects of Jesus' death scene (Luke 23:46 – 47; cf. Mark 15:34 – 39; Matt 27:46 – 54), Doble and Karris suggest that Luke adopts the model of suffering and vindication found in the Wisdom of Solomon in order to portray Christ as the suffering "Righteous One" (δίκαιος) who is vindicated through the resurrection.

Doble's argument for Luke's dependence upon the Wisdom model unfolds in three cumulative stages. First, Doble claims that Luke consistently uses the phrase δοξ- τὸν θεόν to signal the fulfillment of God's salvific program in the actions of Jesus.[82] Since the centurion's declaration in Luke 23:47 is preceded by this descriptive phrase, the reader is expected to notice that a significant aspect of the scriptural plan of salvation has been accomplished. Second, Doble examines the centurion's declaration that Jesus was δίκαιος, arguing that δίκαιος in Luke should be understood in a religious rather than forensic sense.[83] The centurion is not merely claiming that Jesus was innocent; he is declaring that Jesus was righteous, based upon the model of the suffering δίκαιος in the Psalms and Wisdom. Third, Doble analyzes Jesus' final words from the cross in Luke 23:46 – "Father, into your hands I commit my spirit" – discovering a Wisdom background to this quotation of Ps 31:6 (cf. Wis 3:1).[84] Having found three mutually supportive echoes of Wisdom in Luke 23:46 – 47, Doble then uncovers further echoes of Wisdom throughout the portrayal of Jesus' entrapment, trial, and death in Luke-Acts. Thus, Wisdom's δίκαιος-model becomes the key to under-

82 Doble (1996: 26 – 46). Aside from Luke 23:47, the phrase also appears in Luke 2:13 – 14, 20; 5:25 – 26; 7:16; 13:13; 17:15 – 16a; 18:43; Acts 3:13; 4:21; 11:18; 13:48; and 21:20. Doble's handling of these passages builds upon suggestions made in Glöckner (1975: 188); Karris (1986: 66).

83 Doble (1996: 126). See also Glöckner (1975: 188 – 190); Karris (1986: 68 – 70); Matera (1986: 187).

84 Doble (1996: 173). See also Bons (1994: 96 – 101).

standing Luke's coherent *theologia crucis*, as Jesus' shameful death and subsequent vindication through the resurrection are presented as the fulfillment of God's scriptural plan for salvation.[85]

The Suffering Martyr

One of the most common mediating proposals contends that the Lukan passion is modeled upon well-known martyrdom accounts within either Greco-Roman or Jewish literature.[86] Beck, for example, finds the following parallels between the Lukan passion and Jewish martyrdom literature: supernatural conflict,[87] an emphasis upon the innocence of the one who suffers,[88] reference to the attitude of bystanders,[89] the conduct of the person dying,[90] and the call to follow the example of the martyr.[91] While not denying parallels between the Lukan passion and the martyrdom literature of Judaism, Sterling adds that substantial elements of the traditions regarding the death of Socrates can be found in Luke's handling of the death of Christ. Jesus' calmness and the declaration of his innocence by

85 In describing the cross as a part of God's salvation program, Doble does not wish to argue for an intrinsic soteriological function for the cross. For Doble, Luke's cross is "no ransom and effects no forgiveness" (1996, 237). Rather, the death of Jesus for sinners becomes Jesus' solidarity in suffering with the righteous. For a critical appraisal of Doble's work, see Green (1998: 140–142). For a critique of Doble's construal of Lukan soteriology, see Mittmann-Richert (2008: 30–33). Hagene also emphasizes the importance of the book of Wisdom for Luke, suggesting that the proper paradigm for understanding Lukan soteriology is the wisdom tradition of post-exilic Judaism. Hagene, however, is more broadly concerned with Lukan soteriology than with the Lukan cross. Indeed, in Hagene's estimation, the cross is not "salvifically relevant" for Luke, though it does function in an exemplary manner as the starting point for repentance and the transcendence of ἄγνοια (Hagene (2003: 17–19, 259)).

86 Martyrdom interpretations of the Lukan passion are expounded in Dibelius (1934 [1919]: 199–204); Brown (1969: 122–125); Pilgrim (1971: 362); Beck (1981: 28–47); Talbert (1983: 99–110); Kloppenborg (1992: 106–120); Sterling (2001: 383–402).

87 Dan 3:25; 3 Macc 5.6f.; 6:18; *Mart. Isa.* 5:6f.; cf. Luke 22:41–44, 53; 23:44.

88 Dan 6:4f.; 3 Macc 3:1–10. Jesus' innocence is affirmed repeatedly by Pilate (Lk 23:4, 14, 22), Herod (23:8–11, 15), the thief on the cross (23:41), and the centurion at the cross (23:47).

89 2 Macc 6:18–7:41; 3 Macc 5:24; cf. Luke 22:63–65; 23:11, 35–39, 48.

90 The martyrs are depicted as expressing reverence for God and willfully subjecting themselves to their divinely ordained fate (4 Macc 17:11–16; *Mart. Isa.* 5:13; cf. Luke 22:42). However, van Henten (2005: 166) argues that Jesus' passivity is actually a point of divergence between the canonical passion narratives and Jewish martyrdom tradition, since the latter frequently depicts an aggressive attitude on the part of the martyr.

91 Beck (1981: 30–33).

the centurion have their antecedent in the example of Socrates, who was unjustly condemned and faced death with tranquillity.[92]

For those convinced of the prominence of the martyrdom theme in Luke's passion story, the theme underscores the exemplary value of the cross.[93] Christ is a model of faithfulness for those in Luke's audience who might presently be suffering.[94] In addition, Jesus' death as a martyr legitimates his message, since he is willing to die in order to remain faithful to what he has proclaimed.[95] For many interpreters, therefore, the characterization of Jesus' death as a martyrdom functions as a significant element of the narrative's rhetorical appeal.[96]

The Suffering Servant

A third common mediating interpretation of Luke's description of the death of Jesus is that Luke has presented Jesus as the suffering servant of the Lord from Isa 52:13 – 53:12. References to the Isaianic servant are clearly present in Luke-Acts (Luke 22:37; Acts 8:32 – 33), yet scholarship is divided concerning the extent to which Luke intends for his readers to recognize Jesus' death as a fulfillment of the whole of Isa 52:13 – 53:12.

Authors who conclude that the fourth servant song has significantly influenced the Lukan account of Jesus' death point to several features of Luke-Acts in support of their conclusion. First, multiple passages suggest that Jesus is to

---

92 Luke 23:47; cf. Xenophon, *Apol.* 28; Plato, *Phaed.* 118a. See Sterling (2001: 398 – 399). Likewise note Kloppenborg (1992: 108 – 115). Scaer (2005: 55 – 78, 131 – 133) similarly calls attention to parallels between the Lukan passion and the death of Socrates, though he prefers to characterize this descriptive theme as part of a broader "noble death" tradition rather than a martyrdom *per se*.

93 See Beck (1981: 34 – 35); Scaer (2005: 134). Though he challenges the extent to which Jesus' death is portrayed as a martyrdom in the canonical passion narratives, van Henten (1997: 210 – 243) also expounds the exemplary emphasis of martyrdom accounts within Jewish literature.

94 Along the lines of the modified minimalist perspective, George (1973: 208 – 209) finds that the characterization of Jesus as a martyr entails a certain soteriological significance for the cross in an exemplary sense. This is conceived in ethical terms, and George rejects any suggestion that the death of a martyr entails an intrinsic soteriological significance.

95 Talbert (1983: 103 – 106). According to Talbert, the legitimating function of a voluntary death is a common feature of Greco-Roman, Jewish, and early Christian martyrdom tradition (cf. Tertullian, *Apology* 50; Plato, *Apology* 39a-b; 4 Macc 7:15).

96 For a balanced consideration of the similarities and differences between the gospel passion narratives and Jewish martyrdom tradition, see van Henten (2005: 155 – 167). Additional critiques of the martyrdom interpretation of the Lukan passion include Seccombe (1981: 257); Karris (1986: 71 – 73); Green (1990: 21 – 22).

be recognized as the Isaianic servant throughout the entirety of his ministry.[97] Second, the direct quotation of Isa 53:12 – "and he was numbered with his transgressors" – at the outset of the passion narrative (Luke 22:37) indicates to the reader that Jesus' arrest, trial, and death can be understood as a fulfillment of the Isaianic prophecy.[98] Indeed, Jesus explicitly states that the passage from Isaiah refers to him and has reached its fulfillment. Third, the centurion's declaration that Jesus was δίκαιος, spoken at the climax of the passion narrative (Luke 23:47), may be an allusion to the suffering servant (cf. Isa 53:11).[99] Fourth, in Acts 8:32–33, the death of Jesus is described with a quotation from Isa 53:7–8, indicating once more that Jesus is to be identified with the Isaianic servant.[100] Fifth, Jesus is repeatedly described as God's servant (παῖς) and as the "Righteous One" (δίκαιος) in the book of Acts, which may be drawn from the fourth servant song.[101] Additionally, authors have found further allusions to the Isaianic servant in the passion predictions,[102] Jesus' words of institution,[103] the disciples' lack of understanding prior to the resurrection,[104] the designation of Jesus as the "chosen one of God" in Luke 23:35,[105] and other elements of the passion narrative.[106]

Just as scholarship is divided regarding the scope of Luke's usage of the Isaianic servant theme, interpreters have also failed to reach a consensus concerning the soteriological implications of the suffering servant theme in Luke-Acts. Many interpreters believe that Luke's use of Isaiah 53 is central to his presentation of the death of Jesus as an act of atonement. Indeed, Ulrike Mittmann-

97 Buckwalter (1996: 251–252); O'Toole (2000: 338–340); Kimbell (2014: 100–114). Note, for instance, Lk 2:29–32; 4:18–19; Acts 13:47; 26:23; cf. Isa 42:1, 6–7; 49:9; 60:1–3.

98 France (1971: 115–116); Larkin (1977: 330–331); Green (1990: 22–23); Mallen (2008: 118–125).

99 Franklin (1975: 62); Green (1990: 20); Moessner (1990: 181); Mittmann-Richert (2008: 96).

100 For a sustained argument regarding the importance of the Isaianic quotation in Acts 8:32–33 within the narrative framework of Acts, see Genz (2015). See also O'Toole (2000: 329–330); Kimbell (2014: 127–131).

101 Παῖς appears in Acts 3:13, 26; 4:27, 30 (cf. Isa 49:6; 52:13), and δίκαιος is used as a title for Jesus in Acts 3:14; 7:52; and 22:14 (cf. Isa 53:11). See, for example, Stuhlmacher (2004: 156).

102 Lk 18:31–33; cf. Isa 50:6. See Seccombe (1981: 256); Brawley (1995: 51); O'Toole (2000: 334–335).

103 Stuhlmacher (2004: 152); Mittmann-Richert (2008: 121–135).

104 Seccombe (1981: 256).

105 Green (1990: 21); Mittmann-Richert (2008: 103–104).

106 For instance, the Isaianic servant songs have been identified as the background to the crucifixion among criminals and Jesus' promise of paradise to the penitent thief (Bultmann [1963 (1921): 281]; Moessner [1990: 181]). Mittmann-Richert (2008: 89–110) and Kimbell (2014: 120–123) also find numerous other possible echoes of the Isaianic servant songs.

Richert and Rouven Genz find that Isaiah 53 is central to Luke's conception of Jesus' christological identity and pervasive throughout the narrative framework of Luke and Acts, such that the death of Jesus is understood above all to be the atoning death of the suffering Isaianic servant.[107] Conversely, other authors deny that Luke's application of Isaiah 53 to the death of Jesus entails any soteriological implications.[108] Still other interpreters appear to acknowledge some vague soteriological significance in Luke's usage of the Isaianic servant theme, yet they seem reticent to describe the salvific effect of Jesus' death in terms of an act of atonement.[109] In this way, both the scope and the significance of Luke's use of Isaiah 53 remain a point of contention.

The Suffering Davidic Messiah of the Psalms

A fourth approach to the Lukan passion emphasizes the extent to which Jesus has been portrayed as the Davidic messiah of the Psalms. Jipp, for example, uncovers allusions and echoes to several Davidic Psalms in the Lukan crucifixion scene.[110] Furthermore, Weren identifies Ps 2:1–2 as the background for the account of Jesus' trials and for the use of the christological titles employed

107 In her work on Luke's Gospel, Mittmann-Richert begins with Luke's passion narrative to show that the crucifixion scene is presented as the death of the Isaianic servant (2008: 89–110). From there, she seeks to show how the theme of the Isaianic suffering servant is central to the rest of Luke's gospel. Genz, a student of Mittmann-Richert, extends the analysis into Acts, beginning with the explicit quotation of Isa 53:7–8 in Acts 8:32–33 and then seeking to show how the pericope with the eunuch is a pivotal passage within the broader narrative framework of Acts (2015). Both interpreters rely rather heavily upon compounding intertextual connections, moving quickly from the text of Luke-Acts to Isaianic passages, which are then taken to reverberate with each other and with other texts from the Hebrew Scriptures. Interpreters who are more circumspect in their approach to intertextual allusions will likely object to such an approach, yet Mittmann-Richert and Genz do present an imaginative reading of Lukan christology which seeks to situate the Lukan portrait of Jesus within the broader narrative of Israel's history read through an Isaianic lens.

108 Franklin (1975: 61–65); Glöckner (1975: 171–174); Martin (1976: 377–378); O'Toole (2000: 336, 342).

109 Green (1990: 24–27); Bovon (2006: 295).

110 Jipp (2010: 260–264). The dividing of garments in Lk 23:34 functions as an allusion to Ps 22:18. In the mockery of Jesus, the usage of ἐκμυκτηρίζω can be traced back to Ps 22:7–8 (Lk 23:35), and the ridicule of Jesus in terms of his royalty may be drawn from Ps 2:1–2 and Ps 89:19–20 (Lk 23:35). In addition, the offering of sour wine alludes to Ps 69:21 (Lk 23:36), and the distance of Jesus' companions at his death resembles a similar scenario in Ps 38:11 (Lk 23:48). For Jipp, the declaration of the centurion alludes to Ps 31:18, identifying Jesus as the "righteous, royal sufferer of the Psalms" (263). Hence, Jipp uncovers a tapestry of interwoven allusions to the Davidic Psalms in the passion narrative.

throughout the passion narrative.[111] Rusam, in his analysis of the Lukan passion, seeks to demonstrate an extensive usage of Psalm 22 in such places as Jesus' prayer from the cross (Luke 23:34; cf. Ps 22:19), the declaration of the centurion (Luke 23:47; cf. Ps 22:32), and Jesus' encounter with his disciples after the resurrection (Luke 24:39 f.; cf. Ps 22:17).[112] Even the replacement of Ps 22:2 in Jesus' final words upon the cross can be tied back to Luke's engagement with the 22nd Psalm: Since the speeches of Acts explicitly state that Jesus was not abandoned to Hades (ἐγκαταλείπω – Acts 2:27; cf. Ps 22:2), Luke must avoid the notion of abandonment in Jesus' dying declaration (Luke 23:46; cf. Ps 31:6).[113] Hence, many interpreters are convinced that the Davidic Psalms serve as the most prominent background to the Lukan description of Jesus' death.

Additional Mediating Proposals

In addition to the mediating interpretations surveyed above, a number of alternative proposals have also been suggested. For instance, Neyrey calls attention to the ways in which Jesus may be presented as the second Adam in the Lukan passion narrative.[114] In contrast to the disobedience of the first Adam, Jesus as the second Adam remains faithfully obedient to the Father unto death.[115] Alternatively, Moessner attempts to demonstrate that the depiction of Jesus as the prophet-like-Moses (Deut 18:15) determinatively affects the way in which Jesus' suffering and death is described in Luke-Acts.[116] For Moessner, this motif is soteriologically significant, as Jesus brings a new exodus for his people through his death.[117] However, other proponents of the prophet-like-Moses motif do not follow Moessner in connecting the new exodus with Jesus' death.[118] Brawley reads the Lukan passion narrative in light of the concept of carnivalesque, finding that Luke has portrayed Jesus' trial, suffering, and death as a

111 Weren (1989: 200 – 202).
112 Rusam (2007: 86 – 99).
113 Rusam (2007: 94).
114 Neyrey (1985: 165 – 184).
115 For Neyrey, the Adamic resonances entail an affirmation of the objective soteriological efficacy of the cross. However, Karris (1985: 102 – 103) also affirms the importance of Adamic christology in the Lukan passion narrative, yet Karris' understanding of Lukan soteriology corresponds to the modified minimalism discussed above.
116 Moessner (1982); idem (1989: 176 – 182, 322 – 324).
117 In Moessner's estimation, Lk 22:19 – 20 and Peter's speech in Acts 3:13 – 26 closely link the death of the Deuteronomic prophet with the forgiveness of sins, so that the cross is understood as an atonement for sins (1982: 338 – 339; idem 1989: 179).
118 See, for example, Buckwalter (1996: 256); Johnson (1999: 54 – 63).

resistance against the mockery of Jesus' messianic identity.[119] Lastly, Ahn offers a political reading of the passion narrative, setting aside soteriological concerns in favor of a counter-hegemonic reading from an East Asian perspective.[120] The author contends that Luke's account reveals an ambivalence toward Roman rule. These various alternative readings illustrate the diversity of proposed explanations that have arisen in order to account for the background to Luke's depiction of Jesus' death.

Evaluation

The assorted mediating interpretations of the death of Jesus in Luke-Acts are not mutually exclusive, though preference for one model does limit the extent to which an interpreter will find evidence for the presence of other themes in the Lukan passion.[121] For example, Luke 23:47, in which the centurion declares Jesus to be δίκαιος, has become a key passage for several of the mediating proposals surveyed above. Yet each of these interpretive paradigms reads the centurion's declaration against a different background text. Is Luke dependent at this point upon the Psalms and Wisdom, Socratic tradition, or the servant songs of Isaiah? The ubiquitous presence of δίκαιος in the background literature to the NT makes it difficult to discern Luke's intended usage, and the way in which one reads this verse depends largely upon one's previous conclusions regarding the themes at work in the passion narrative. Though helpful to a degree, then, the comparative approaches to the Lukan passion have yielded a fragmented array of possible sources to Luke's thought, and no single interpretive paradigm has been able to account for all of the relevant data in Luke's two volume work. Each new mediating proposal draws attention to a particular facet of the Lukan cross, yet the integration of these comparative analyses into a cohesive reading of Luke's overall description of the death of Jesus has proven to be elusive.

119 Brawley (1995: 43 – 59). Brawley defines "carnivalesque" in such broad terms that virtually any account of a crucifixion would fit under its umbrella. The usefulness of the category is therefore questionable. For a critique of Brawley's interpretation, see Rusam (2007: 97).

120 Ahn (2006).

121 For a reading of the Lukan passion that combines elements from several of the preceding proposals, see Senior (1990: 161 – 173).

3. Evidence Used in Maximalist Appraisals of the Lukan Cross

Minimalist readings of the Lukan passion deny any intrinsic soteriological meaning in the Lukan cross beyond the affirmation of its divine necessity. Alongside the popular minimalist outlook, a number of comparative analyses have offered assorted models for understanding Luke's depiction of Jesus' death without direct reference to the significance of the cross within Lukan soteriology. We turn now to the most common ways in which some scholars have argued that an intrinsic soteriological function is ascribed to Jesus' death in Luke-Acts. Aside from the aforementioned possibility that Luke's use of Isaiah 53 entails an understanding of the death of Christ as an act of atonement, interpreters have most often recognized an intrinsic soteriological significance for the cross in two controversial passages: Luke 22:15 – 20 and Acts 20:28.

Luke 22:15 – 20

The Lukan last supper has been the topic of much scholarly debate. First, the establishment of the text has been a point of contention, as the textual tradition attests to six possible readings for Luke 22:17 – 20.[122] The significant issue in this regard is whether Luke 22:19b-20 was actually a part of the original passage. External evidence favors the inclusion of these verses, but a case can also be made for the shorter reading.

Even among interpreters who include verses 19b-20, no consensus exists concerning either the meaning of these words of institution or their significance within Lukan soteriology. Several interpreters argue that the Lukan words of institution interpret the death of Christ as an atoning, covenant sacrifice. Typologically prefigured in the Passover sacrifice of Exodus 12 and the covenant sacrifice of Exodus 24, Jesus' death initiates the new covenant between God and his people by atoning for their sins.[123] Du Plessis, on the other hand, argues that the passage is concerned not with issues of atonement and individual salvation but with the foundation of the new covenant community, pointing to Genesis 15 rather than Exodus 24 as the background for Jesus' eucharistic words.[124] The

122 Metzger (1994: 148 – 150).

123 Kimbell (2014: 30 – 36); Mittmann-Richert (2008: 69, 125). See also Routledge (2002: 217 – 221). Carpinelli similarly affirms that Jesus describes his death as an expiatory sacrifice for sins, highlighting the centrality of cultic conceptions for Lukan soteriology. However, Carpinelli adds the qualification that Luke does not conceive of this sacrifice in substitutionary terms. See Carpinelli (1999: 88).

124 Du Plessis (1994: 534).

death of Jesus is not a sacrifice for sins but a seal of the covenant. Finally, other authors are willing to grant that the concept of atonement is present in the passage, yet they are convinced that Luke is merely recording liturgical tradition without integrating its soteriological significance into his own theology.[125] Thus, even those interpreters who recognize verses 19b-20 as textually authentic present a variety of explanations with regard to the significance of the Lukan last supper.

Acts 20:28

The second passage which has most often been interpreted as assigning an intrinsic soteriological significance to the death of Jesus is Acts 20:28, where Paul exhorts the Ephesian elders to shepherd the church of God which he obtained either "through the blood of his own" or "through his own blood" (διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου). Here again a textual problem presents itself, as the manuscripts fairly evenly attest to ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ and the alternative ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ κυρίου.[126] Almost all interpreters favor θεοῦ, since it seems to be the harder reading. If this reading is correct, then the language of the verse is certainly curious. Did God obtain the church through "his own blood" or, as Metzger tentatively suggests, through "the blood of his own"?[127] If the preferred translation is "his own blood," this manner of speaking about God is unparalleled in the NT. However, the grammar of the passage seems to point in this direction. If "the blood of his own" is the correct translation, then "his own" is functioning as a title for Christ, and the difficulty is resolved.[128] At any rate, most commentators acknowledge the presence of the idea of atonement in this verse.[129] But, as with the Lukan words of institution, many interpreters are convinced that Luke is simply recording traditional language that he has inherited. Acts 20:28 is not an expression of Lukan thought but a reflection either of Pauline catechetical instruction or of traditional early church phraseology.[130] In this way, the signifi-

125 Note, for example, Kodell (1979: 223).

126 Metzger (1994: 425 – 426).

127 Metzger (1994: 426).

128 Other interpreters suggest a textual emendation, adding "son" to the end of the verse (see Glöckner [1975: 182 – 183, n. 191]).

129 A minority of interpreters resist the prevailing opinion, contending that no conception of cultic atonement is present in Acts 20:28. See Zehnle (1969: 400); Glöckner (1975: 182 – 183); Sellner (2007: 475 – 476).

130 See, for instance, Moule (1966: 171); Pilgrim (1971: 380); Franklin (1975: 66); Kodell (1979: 223); Beck (1981: 37); Giles (1985: 137); Bovon (2006: 185).

cance of the verse within Lukan soteriology is frequently minimized or altogether negated.[131]

Soteriological Interpretations of the Death of Jesus elsewhere in Luke-Acts

Aside from the aforementioned passages, some interpreters have argued that several other points in Luke-Acts also attribute an intrinsic soteriological significance to the death of Jesus. Kimbell, for example, finds a constellation of episodes with atoning overtones throughout the passion narrative, from Jesus' prayer for the "cup" to pass from him, to the release of Barabbas, the salvation of the thief on the cross, the darkness at Jesus' death, and the torn veil in the temple.[132] In another unique proposal, Patella finds parallels between *2 En.* 67:1–3 and Luke 23:44–49, arguing that Enoch's departure served as the prototype for the crucifixion scene in Luke.[133] According to Patella, Luke adapts the diabolical force and ministering angel traditions of early Judaism, so that Jesus himself is the ministering angel who defeats the diabolical force through his death.[134] Additionally, some authors have suggested that a redemptive, substitutionary understanding of the cross may be implied by Acts 5:30; 10:39; and 13:28–29, which apparently allude to Deut 21:22–23 in referring to Jesus' death as being "hanged upon a tree."[135] Given the way in which Deut 21:22–23 is employed by other NT writers (Gal. 3:13; 1 Pet. 2:24), these passages in Acts may presuppose an interpretation of Jesus' death as an intrinsically soteriological event.[136]

---

131 For a reading of Acts 20:28 which stresses its importance for Lukan soteriology, see Genz (2015: 306–313).

132 Kimbell (2014: 59–95).

133 Patella (1999: 143–144).

134 Patella (1999: 160–161, 167–168). Patella draws the diabolical force and ministering angel traditions from *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, *1 and 2 Enoch, Jubilees,* and *The Martyrdom of Isaiah.*

135 Morris (1965: 142–143); Baker and Green (2000: 75–76); Hurtado (2003: 185–188); Peterson (2004: 65); Kimbell (2014: 155–159).

136 Differently, Park argues that in Acts the phrase, "hanged upon a tree," is drawn from the hanging of the Canaanite kings in Josh 8:29; 10:26–30, 38–39. According to Park, these kings were hanged as representatives of nations which had been designated as mandatory חרם. In a similar manner, Jesus is said to have been hanged as a representative of his nation, whose status as both mandatory and voluntary חרם has been established within the narrative. In this way, Park seeks to find the idea of atonement in the development of a חרם theme throughout Luke-Acts. See Park (2007: 151ff.).

Evaluation

Between the theme of the suffering servant, the words of institution, Paul's curious expression in Acts 20:28, and the various passages mentioned above, Lukan scholarship has explored many different avenues in search of an intrinsic soteriological significance for the death of Jesus. Ultimately, however, the persistent question of Luke's attitude toward a soteriological interpretation of the cross remains unanswered. The two passages most frequently cited in support of the notion of atonement remain controversial as to their significance for Lukan soteriology. Even if vestiges of an atonement theology can be found in Luke 22:15 – 20 or Acts 20:28, a number of interpreters are convinced that these expressions should not be taken as a reflection of Lukan theology, given the traditional character of the language in these passages. Furthermore, while some minimalists have tended to presume an artificial dichotomy between christology and soteriology, maximalists have sometimes been prone to the opposite error, collapsing the two concepts into one another without distinction. Thus, maximalists have often imported the atoning dimensions of Isaiah 53 into every Lukan allusion to the Isaianic servant, without considering whether a given Lukan usage of the Isaianic servant songs might be directed more toward a christological apologetic than toward an exposition of the saving significance of the cross. Christology and soteriology are surely related, yet they are also distinct, and too often the difference between the two has been ignored by some maximalist interpreters.

III. The Present Analysis

A survey of the history of scholarship on the Lukan cross reveals a steady strand of interpretation that finds no intrinsic soteriological significance in the death of Jesus. Many contemporary treatments of Lukan soteriology presuppose this minimalist outlook,[137] yet minimalist viewpoints are often rooted in a flawed exegetical methodology that inadequately accounts for the narrative development of Lukan thought and relies heavily upon inferences from a few Lukan omissions and silences to bolster its conclusions. Alongside minimalist perspectives, a diverse range of comparative proposals have sought to situate the Lukan cross against the background of various parallels in Greco-Roman and Jewish literature. These comparative analyses have helped to unveil many possible themes in the Lukan portrayal of Jesus' death. Nevertheless, they have struggled to

137 Wasserberg (1998), for example, presents an analysis of Lukan soteriology without any consideration of the import of the cross within Luke's soteriological framework.

yield a cohesive and compelling description of the theme of the death of Jesus throughout Luke-Acts. In addition, many interpreters have sought to demonstrate that various passages in Luke-Acts assign an intrinsic soteriological significance to Jesus' death, yet the passages in question remain a matter of vigorous dispute.

Given the long history of debate on this topic, it seems fitting at this point to state briefly what contribution any new work might hope to make to the discussion. It is hoped that the present work will be distinctive in two respects: First, while my approach to the discussion is neither rigorously nor exclusively framed according to the canons of contemporary literary criticism, the chapters which follow do reflect the conviction that many of the peculiarities within the Lukan depiction of the cross are best explained in terms of the narrative development of Lukan thought.[138] A minimalist outlook became firmly entrenched within scholarship well before the rising interest in the literary artistry of the gospels, and analysis of the Lukan cross has historically been dominated by background comparisons and the search for Luke's sources.[139] Such considerations are surely important, yet the present analysis will seek to balance out such ap-

138 NT scholarship has grappled for quite some time over the proper application of contemporary literary criticism to the study of the NT (see Petersen [1978]; McKnight [1988]; Moore [1989]; Powell [1990]). Narrative criticism, reader-response criticism, and the analysis of the New Testament use of the Old from the vantage point of intertextuality have all arisen out of a desire to attend to the literary dynamics of the NT texts by appropriating methods of interpretation from modern literary analysis. These literary approaches have all shared a common concern for the final form of the text itself, in distinction from alternative methodologies (e. g., source and form criticism) which in various ways have sought to peer behind the present form of the text to some aspect of its composition. Within NT studies, these literary approaches have also usually assumed the fundamental unity of the text under investigation, in that such approaches have typically accepted *a priori* that the task of interpretation is to understand the final form of the text as a single, coherent act of communication (see Kurz [1993: ix]). The present analysis will share these core concerns, concentrating upon the final form of the texts of Luke and Acts as unified narratives in which the interpretation of any one particular passage must take into account that passage's place within the progression of the narrative. C. Kavin Rowe's work on Lukan Christology (2006) and the ecclesiology of Acts (2009) is a helpful model in this regard, furnishing a sound example of a multifaceted exegetical approach that is sensitive to the literary dynamics of the text.

139 For differing perspectives on the issue of Luke's sources in the passion narrative, see Taylor (1971); Matera (1985); Soards (1987); Green (1988); Bovon (2003: 88 – 105). For Luke's sources for the kerygma in Acts, see Bauckham (1996). In my analysis of Luke's anticipatory references to Jesus' suffering and the passion narrative itself, I do employ redaction criticism at various points as a means of highlighting the distinctive character of Luke's narration vis-a-vis the other synoptic witnesses. Here I am assuming Markan priority, and my citation of Matthean parallels is intended only as a point of comparison without implying a particular viewpoint on the precise nature of the relationship between the first and third evangelist.

proaches by starting from the final form of the texts of Luke and Acts as unified narratives.[140]

This approach does not mitigate the importance of historically contextualized exegesis; it merely adopts a different starting point. For example, in my analysis of the passion narrative, rather than beginning from a comparative model derived from a source external to Luke-Acts, as has been customary in previous scholarship, I will begin from the framework established by the anticipatory references to Jesus' death throughout Luke's gospel and at the last supper. Indeed, the very decision to consider the anticipatory passion references on their own terms reflects a departure from the conventional scholarly preoccupation with the passion narrative proper. By moving from text to background rather than background to text, the scope of the analysis is broadened, so that I will not be confined only to those facets of the Lukan cross which might fit comfortably within a particular comparative paradigm. Instead, I will look more generally at the themes at work throughout the references to Jesus' death over the course of Luke's gospel and all the way through the book of Acts.[141] Hence, this work represents a wide-angle approach to the topic at hand, concentrating on the inter-relationship of the various parts that form the whole of Luke's portrayal of Jesus' death, in contrast to the general tendency within previous scholarship to focus narrowly on one particular passage or theme in the Lukan passion.

---

140 See also the comments upon method in Peterson (2004: 58 – 60). For the purposes of the present work, a few remarks are also necessary regarding the concept of the reader. The term 'reader' is not meant to signify an actual reader and his or her subjective responses to the text. Rather, the term is meant as a theoretical construct for the full actualization of the possibilities for meaning intrinsic to the text itself, when considered in light of its various contexts (historical, cultural, literary, theological, etc.) and implied authorial intent. Perry has called this a "maximal concretization of the text." Actual readers might misconstrue or overlook aspects of meaning in the text. Or, they might experience the intended effects of the text without being conscious of how those effects were accomplished. Therefore, when I use the term 'reader', the hypothetical reader in mind is one who fully experiences the effects of the text and who is aware of how those effects are accomplished, at least with reference to the theme of the death of Christ in Luke-Acts. See the discussion about real, implied, and ideal readers in Fowler (1995: 13 – 18); also Iser (1974: 274 – 275); Perry (1979: 40, 43).

141 Several voices in recent scholarship have questioned the extent to which Luke and Acts are meant to be read together as a unified literary production. The present work does not rely upon any particular construal of the literary unity of Luke-Acts aside from its authorial unity, though my analysis of the apostolic proclamation of the cross will conclude that the descriptions of the cross in Acts cohere with the interpretation of Jesus' death presented in Luke's gospel. For a helpful overview the recent debate, see Bird (2007: 425 – 448).

A second aspect of the present work also distinguishes its approach from many previous treatments of the same topic, arising in part from this work's provenance in the post-Sanders era of NT scholarship.[142] Early minimalist assessments of the Lukan cross were connected in no small measure to an understanding of Judaism which can no longer be maintained. Pauline theology was understood against the foil of allegedly legalistic Pharisaic Judaism and then made the benchmark for minimalist evaluations of Lukan thought. In chapter six, the present work will reconsider the relationship between the pattern of Lukan soteriology and the pattern of religion within early Judaism. When the apostolic kerygma is considered in light of what is now known about Jewish belief and practice in the first century, one arrives at a new understanding of the place of the death of Jesus in Lukan soteriology. Rather than mediating the comparison of Lukan soteriology and early Judaism through Protestant conceptions of Pauline theology, as has been done most frequently in previous discussions, it is hoped that this approach will allow for a more direct assessment of Lukan soteriology in relation to early Jewish practice and belief. In this way, the present work hopes to make a distinctive contribution to the time-honored discussion of the Lukan cross.[143]

The analysis that follows will be loosely structured according to the narrative progression of Luke and Acts. Thus, chapter two will consider the anticipatory references to the passion throughout the body of Luke's gospel. I will argue that the early anticipations of the suffering and death of Jesus reveal that Jesus' tragic destiny is an integral element of his christological mission and is therefore an event of pivotal salvation-historical significance. Moreover, I will suggest that the unique emphases of Luke's early passion references provide a plausible explanation for the Lukan omission of the synoptic ransom saying. In this way, chapter two will make two important contributions to the overall analysis, highlighting the importance of Luke's anticipatory passion references,

142 See the divisions of 20th century NT scholarship proposed in Horbury (2006: 142).

143 One final note on method: In terms of presentation, I have focused primarily on positively expounding my own exegesis of the texts at hand in the main body of this work. When writing on a controversial topic, the temptation exists to spend as much time summarizing and critiquing alternative perspectives as actually setting forth one's own position, and a paralysis of analysis can all too easily set in. For the most part, I have chosen rather to say what I would like to say about the matters at hand. I have tried to provide a fair and charitable characterization of alternative viewpoints when they are discussed and to refer readers to the appropriate sources when they are not. Readers skilled at mirror-reading and familiar with the literature on the issues under discussion will recognize that my exposition is crafted with various dialog partners in mind. My intention in this mode of presentation is not to be dismissive, but rather to preserve the continuity and pace of my own argumentation, recognizing that others can articulate their own positions best for themselves.

which are frequently neglected within scholarship on the Lukan cross, while also addressing the most common objection to an optimistic appraisal of the death of Jesus in Lukan theology.

Chapter three, then, will examine the interpretation of Jesus' death offered at the last supper. The burden of this chapter will be threefold: First, the chapter will begin by establishing the text of Luke's institution narrative, arguing for the originality of the longer version of the text which includes the eucharistic blessing. Next, the analysis will turn to the interpretation of Jesus' death that the passage provides, as I will seek to demonstrate that the words of institution characterize the death of Jesus as an act of cultic atonement that accomplishes salvation and results in the establishment of a new covenant between God and his people. Finally, I will argue that the eucharistic interpretation of Jesus' death is not merely a vestige of tradition inherited unknowingly from Luke's sources, but rather the Lukan words of institution have been given a unique shape and significance within Luke's narrative.

Chapter four will evaluate the extent to which the soteriological interpretation of Jesus' death established at the last supper finds expression within the remainder of the passion narrative. Some aspects of the passion narrative are addressed primarily to christological rather than soteriological concerns, yet I will attempt to show that Luke's story of the death of Jesus does contain an impressive series of events that highlight the soteriological significance of the suffering of Jesus. When considered together, the assorted soteriological aspects of the passion narrative are a striking testimony to Luke's interest in the soteriological dimensions of the cross.

In chapter five, I will investigate the various references to the death of Jesus in the apostolic proclamation following the resurrection. The chapter will demonstrate how the retrospective references to the cross in Luke 24 and throughout Acts reinforce the interpretation of the cross presented in the third gospel, highlighting the significance of the cross within Lukan christology while also reminding Luke's audience of the soteriological efficacy of Jesus' suffering.

Finally, chapter six will consider the place of the cross within the broader pattern of Lukan soteriology reflected in the apostolic kerygma. The task here will be to move from the sustained textual analysis of previous chapters to a contextualized reflection upon the function of the cross within the broader contours of Lukan thought. In this chapter, the proclamation of Jesus' death and resurrection, followed by the call to repentance and the offer of forgiveness, will be evaluated against the pattern of religion within early Judaism. I hope to demonstrate that the consistent connection between Jesus' death and the concepts of repentance and forgiveness is not coincidental within the apostolic proclamation, but rather this connection corresponds to the link between acts of atonement and

the forgiveness of sins within early Judaism. Accordingly, one might reasonably suppose that the atoning significance of the death of Jesus is central to the pattern of Lukan soteriology. If such a conclusion can be sustained, then the study of the Lukan cross will have come full circle, for the continuity between Jewish religion and Lukan soteriology will serve to confirm rather than to challenge the significance of the saving death of Jesus in Lukan thought, *contra* the 19th century minimalists of the Tübingen school.

Chapter 2 – The Passion before the Passion: Anticipatory Allusions to Jesus' Fate of Rejection, Suffering, and Death

I. Introduction

As the introduction to this work has shown, the death of Jesus has long been a topic of discussion within Lukan scholarship. Surprisingly, however, very little focused attention has been given to the anticipatory references to Jesus' fate of suffering which occur from an early stage in Luke's narrative.[1] This is regrettable, for although these anticipations of the rejection, suffering, and death of Jesus draw heavily upon the material of Luke's sources, they also adapt that content in such a way as to reveal a distinctively Lukan framework for the interpretation of Jesus' death. The particularity of Luke's redaction is further augmented by Lukan special material, such that the specific emphases of the Lukan anticipations of Jesus' ultimate fate are to a significant extent unique to Luke (see appendix 1). Accordingly, the pre-passion allusions to Jesus' fate of suffering contribute considerably to the overall portrait of the Lukan cross, shaping the expectations of Luke's audience by furnishing a unique conceptual context for Luke's telling of the passion story.

In this chapter, I will argue that the anticipatory passion references in Luke's gospel emphasize the centrality of Jesus' tragic destiny within his christological mission (section I). For Jesus to accomplish his christological vocation in accordance with scriptural expectations, he must experience a fate of suffering. This can be seen in the way in which Luke speaks about the divine necessity of the cross. Whereas previous considerations of the concept of divine necessity have helpfully called attention to Luke's terminology of divine providence[2] and the ty-

1 Analyses of the Lukan passion often make selective reference to various elements in Luke's gospel which are taken to foreshadow particular events in the passion narrative. However, few interpreters have considered the numerous proleptic references to the death of Jesus in their own right. Büchele's (1978) redaction-critical analysis is a salutary exception, devoting a lengthy chapter to those references to the death of Jesus which precede the passion narrative. Additionally, Mittmann-Richert (2008), in her analysis of the death of Jesus in Luke, includes a sustained discussion of both Simeon's oracle and the Nazareth pericope in Lk 4:16 – 30. For the most part, however, the pre-passion anticipations of Jesus' death have been incorporated into considerations of the Lukan cross only in a piecemeal fashion, with little consideration of the context which such anticipatory allusions establish for the passion narrative proper.

2 See Cosgrove (1984); Nave (2002: 13 – 18); Sellner (2007: 413 – 423).

pological correspondence between Jesus' suffering and the fate of Israel's prophets of old,[3] I will instead focus upon Luke's christological interest in highlighting the necessity of Jesus' suffering. A fate of rejection is consistently marked as a constituent element of Jesus' christological vocation within the numerous anticipatory passion references throughout Luke's gospel. For Luke, if Jesus is to fulfill his divinely appointed mission, then he must suffer a scripturally ordained fate. The characterization of Jesus as God's anointed agent of eschatological salvation entails the necessity of his tragic destiny. In so far as Jesus' christological vocation is inherently soteriological, Luke's early references to Jesus' tragic destiny imply a certain soteriological purpose for that event within the divine plan of salvation, even if they do not specify precisely how the cross functions soteriologically. In fact, the early anticipations of the passion in Luke intimate that Jesus' suffering will serve as a turning point in God's salvation-historical plan. Thus, the chapter will begin with a consideration of the divine necessity of the cross within Jesus' christological mission in Luke's anticipatory passion references.

Once the chapter has established the centrality of Jesus' tragic destiny within his christological vocation, I will turn to a peculiar feature of Luke's anticipatory passion references that is developed alongside the theme of divine necessity: the ignorance of the disciples concerning Jesus' fate of suffering (section II). Luke uniquely stresses that it is only after the resurrection that the disciples are able to discern how Jesus' fate of rejection and suffering can be reconciled with his christological vocation. Hence, pre-passion references to Jesus' tragic demise are consistently followed with indications that an understanding of the passion has been concealed from the disciples (section II.1). The precise nature of the lack of understanding is left vague throughout the anticipatory passion references, yet the narrator emphasizes an abiding dissonance between Jesus and his disciples on the topic of Jesus' suffering and death. While this misunderstanding is actively addressed prior to the passion in Mark and Matthew, in Luke the fog of the disciples' ignorance only dissipates in light of the instruction of the risen Lord after the resurrection (section II.2). Indeed, through the events in Luke 24, the disciples come to understand the place of Jesus' tragic destiny within his christological vocation, and the dissonance between Jesus and the disciples is thereby resolved.

I will develop the theme of the disciples' ignorance in order to propose an explanation for Luke's omission of the synoptic ransom saying (section II.3).

3 Cf. Lk 4:25 – 27; 13:31 – 35. From the Lukan perspective, the prophetic vocation involves a particular, divinely determined course of life which must necessarily end in rejection. No prophet can perish outside Jerusalem, that city which stones the prophets and kills those sent to her (Lk 13:34 – 35; cf. Matt 23:37 – 39). See Glöckner (1975: 164); Ruzer (2008: 176 – 180).

I will suggest that Luke may omit the ransom saying because it would be out of place within his epistemological framework for the disciples. The ransom saying uniquely appeals to the soteriological effect of Jesus' suffering in order to explain the place of Jesus' tragic destiny within his christological mission. This is the precise matter that is concealed from the understanding of the Lukan disciples until after the resurrection, and therefore I suggest that perhaps Luke has omitted the ransom saying on account of his concern for the epistemologically transformative effect of the resurrection appearances.

In this manner, the present chapter will seek to highlight the contribution of Luke's anticipatory passion references to his overall presentation of the death of Jesus, while also accounting for the most common protest against finding an intrinsic soteriological function for the Lukan cross.

II. The Divine Necessity of the Death of Jesus within his Christological Vocation

1. Simeon's Oracle (Luke 2:29 – 35)

From quite early in the third gospel, the tragic destiny of Jesus is set forth as a divine necessity, a scripturally determined fate which Jesus must experience as an integral part of his mission as God's anointed agent of salvation. Christological vocation and a fate of rejection are brought together for the first time in the encounter between Simeon and the infant Jesus at the presentation of Jesus in the temple in Luke 2. Upon receiving "the Lord's Christ" into his arms, Simeon declares the salvation (τὸ σωτήριον) which will be accomplished for both Gentiles and Jews through the child (2:29 – 32). This exultation in the arrival of the messiah is then accompanied by the first anticipatory allusion to Jesus' fate of rejection in Luke's gospel, as Simeon adds that Jesus is appointed for the "falling and rising of many in Israel" and "for a sign to be opposed" (σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμενον – 2:34).[4] The description of Jesus as a σημεῖον is later echoed

4 The meaning of "falling and rising" in Simeon's oracle has been a source of considerable debate. Several interpreters suggest that this phrase refers to two separate groups, one which falls and one which rises, so that the phrase signifies that Jesus will be a source of division within Israel (see, for example, Vaughan [1975: 24]; Brown [1977: 461]; Tyson [1992: 50]). Others contend that the statement refers to a sequence of falling and then rising experienced by Israel as a whole (cf. Amos 5:2; Mic 7:8; Prov 24:16; Isa 51:17 – 23; *Jub* 1:9 – 17; *2 Bar* 83:5; Rom 11:25 – 26). See Tiede (1988: 28 – 32); Koet (1992: 1559 – 1564); Radl (1999: 310 – 311); Dillon (2007: 202 – 203).

in Jesus' statement about the σημεῖον of Jonah in Luke 11:29 – 32, where Jesus contrasts the reception of the preaching of Jonah and wisdom of Solomon with the present generation's rejection of one greater than either Jonah or Solomon. Likewise, the verb ἀντιλέγω later appears with special reference to the Jewish rejection of the Christian message in Acts 13:45; 28:19, 22.[5] Thus, within Luke-Acts, the designation of Jesus as a σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμενον anticipates the rejection which he will face from his own people.

Simeon's thought is likely derived from an Isaianic context, where a Davidic messiah figure is presented as a divinely appointed sign whose appearance will signal the eschatological ingathering of both Jew and Gentile (Isa 7:14; 11:10 – 12; cf. Luke 2:31 – 32; Isa 42:6; 49:6).[6] According to Simeon's oracle, this sign will be opposed, and Simeon's prediction is enacted vividly in the contradiction and opposition with which Jesus is met by many of his own people in Luke (Isa 8:14 – 15; cf. Luke 13:34 – 35; 20:17 – 18). As the rest of Luke-Acts will show, only through this opposition will the σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμενον become σωτήριον for all people, both Jew and Gentile alike, for it is the rejection of the Christian message by many in the Jewish synagogues that results in the expansion of the Christian mission to the Gentiles (Luke 2:30 – 32; cf. Luke 4:25 – 27; Acts 13:45 – 47; 28:28).[7] In this way, the very first Lukan allusion to Jesus' fate of rejection links his role in the divine plan of salvation-history to the opposition that he must experience.

2. Rejection at Nazareth (Luke 4:16 – 30)

The Nazareth pericope in Luke 4 then reinforces this connection between Jesus' fulfillment of salvation-historical expectations in scripture and his fate of rejection. The placement of the pericope at the outset of Jesus' ministry underscores the paradigmatic function of this initial experience of rejection, and once again Jesus' christological vocation features prominently within the passage. At the Nazareth synagogue, Jesus reads a passage from Isaiah in which a Spirit-anointed figure ushers in a new era in the divine plan of salvation, and Jesus declares that the passage is fulfilled in him (4:18 – 21). Though Jesus' message is initially

5 Koet (1992: 1563 – 1564); Tyson (1992: 51).

6 Brown (1977: 461); Soards (1990: 404); Mittmann-Richert (2008: 308 – 309).

7 Indeed, the inclusion of the Gentiles in Simeon's oracle stands in marked contrast to the Israel-centric thrust of the narrative up to this point (cf. Lk 1:17, 33, 54, 68; 2:10 – 11, 25, 39). See Koet (1992: 1553); also Radl (1999: 303 – 306).

received positively (4:22–23),[8] the reception of the crowds turns to rejection after Jesus cites the examples of Elijah and Elisha to indict the Nazarenes as heirs to the unbelief of apostate Israel (4:24–29).[9] Just as recalcitrant Israel failed to respond appropriately to the ministries of Elijah and Elisha, so too will the divinely commissioned ministry of Jesus be met with an unfitting response from his own people.[10] Thus, Jesus' tragic destiny has been typologically prefigured in the experiences of Elijah and Elisha, prophets of old whom God's people resisted.

Moreover, the specific examples of Elijah and Elisha intimate that the blessings of Jesus' ministry will be made universally accessible precisely through his experience of rejection. Just as Elijah and Elisha ministered to non-Israelites in the midst of the rejection of their message within Israel (1 Kgs 17:12–16; 2 Kgs 5:1–19), so too the benefits of Jesus' ministry will eventually reach beyond the horizons of Israel following the rejection which Jesus will experience among his own people.[11] Indeed, this pattern of expansion finds expression throughout the book of Acts.[12] Hence, Jesus is presented at Nazareth as a divinely anointed figure who will face rejection by his people, yet that very rejection will serve as the means by which the blessings of his ministry will be made accessible beyond the confines of Israel. In a similar manner to the episode with Simeon, then, the Nazareth pericope anticipates that the experience of rejection will be a central element in the fulfillment of Jesus' scripturally foretold mission.

---

8 Certainly the identification of Jesus as Joseph's son reflects an inadequate understanding of Jesus' true identity (cf. Lk 1:31, 35; 3:21f.). Nonetheless, the crowd's amazement and their question about Jesus' lineage are not to be interpreted negatively. Elsewhere in Luke-Acts, neither μαρτυρέω nor θαυμάζω carry intrinsically negative connotations, and Joseph is characterized positively within the narrative as belonging to the noble line of David (cf. Lk 1:27; 2:4). Hence, the initial reaction of the people to Jesus can be understood as a simple expression of amazement or as an attempt by the townspeople to claim Jesus as one of their own. See Vanhoye (1992: 1538–1540); Tannehill (1972: 53–54); Hill (1971: 163). For more negative readings, see Mittmann-Richert (2008: 256–261); Dupont (1960: 143).

9 See Baawobr (2007: 38–39).

10 Some interpreters have found that the negative response of the Nazarenes is to be attributed to their alleged Jewish exclusivism (Siker [1992: 85–86]; Tannehill [1972: 61–62]; Hill [1971: 170]). Alternatively, the response of the Nazarenes could be understood simply as an expression of personal offense on account of Jesus' pointed indictment of their unbelief (Poirier [2007: 361–363]). Sanders (1975: 98–100) seeks a middle ground: The rejection of a prophet arises from the nation's offense at the prophet's criticism, but Jesus' critique of the Nazarenes is directed specifically toward their exclusivist attitude. Both personal offense and Jewish exclusivism may therefore be in view.

11 Tannehill (1986: 71).

12 See Dupont (1960: 143–144); Crockett (1969: 177–183); Neirynck (1999: 388–391).

Therefore, by the time Jesus begins recruiting disciples in Luke's gospel, the narrator has already demonstrated to the audience that this figure anointed by the Spirit (Luke 4:18), whom the heavenly hosts have already confirmed as son of God, savior, and Christ (Luke 1:32, 35; 2:11), must fulfill his role in the divine plan in part by experiencing a course of rejection at the hands of his own people. By virtue of these early overtures of a tragic destiny for Jesus, Luke's readers occupy a privileged epistemological position in comparison to the disciples concerning Jesus' christological vocation, his fate of rejection, and the relation between the two from the Lukan perspective.

3. First Passion Prediction (Luke 9:21–22)

Following the early anticipatory allusions to Jesus' eventual demise, subsequent pre-passion references to the rejection, suffering, and death of Jesus continue to corroborate the Lukan conviction that the passion is an indispensable component of Jesus' christological vocation. Accordingly, the first passion prediction is directly connected to Peter's confession that Jesus is the Christ of God (Luke 9:20–22), so that Jesus' prediction about the suffering of the Son of Man appears as an explanation of what it means for him to be the Christ. In fact, the Lukan redaction of the scene strengthens the link between Peter's confession and Jesus' passion prediction.[13]

Table 1 – Synoptic Comparison of 1st Passion Prediction

Mark 8:30–31	Matthew 16:20–21	Luke 9:21–22
καὶ ἐπετίμησεν αὐτοῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ λέγωσιν περὶ αὐτοῦ. [31] Καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν αὐτοὺς ὅτι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῶν γραμματέων καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι καὶ μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστῆναι.	τότε διεστείλατο τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἵνα μηδενὶ εἴπωσιν ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ χριστός. [21] Ἀπὸ τότε ἤρξατο ὁ Ἰησοῦς δεικνύειν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ὅτι δεῖ αὐτὸν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἀπελθεῖν καὶ πολλὰ παθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ἀρχιερέων καὶ γραμματέων καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθῆναι.	ὁ δὲ ἐπιτιμήσας αὐτοῖς παρήγγειλεν μηδενὶ λέγειν τοῦτο [22] εἰπὼν ὅτι δεῖ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πολλὰ παθεῖν καὶ ἀποδοκιμασθῆναι ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων καὶ ἀρχιερέων καὶ γραμματέων καὶ ἀποκτανθῆναι καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθῆναι.

13 Hagene (2003: 228–229); Büchele (1978: 125–126).

In Luke, Peter confesses that Jesus is the Christ, and Jesus responds by warning the disciples not to tell anyone "this thing" (i.e., Jesus' identity as the Christ – 9:20 – 21). The subsequent passion prediction is then connected directly to Jesus' warning via a participial phrase, bringing about a shift from indirect to direct speech (εἰπὼν ὅτι – 9:22; cf. Luke 19:41 – 42; Acts 19:21). The syntax of this sequence gives the impression that the passion prediction functions in some sense as part of the content of Jesus' prohibition to the disciples, perhaps serving as an explanation for why the disciples must not disclose Jesus' christological identity: The disciples must not tell anyone that Jesus is the "Christ of God" (cf. 9:20 – 21), for the "Son of Man" must endure a fate of rejection and death (9:22). In this way, the initial passion prediction in Luke is closely connected grammatically with Jesus' preceding command against speaking of his christological identity, likely serving as the basis of Jesus' warning.[14] This syntactical sequence surely hints at a relationship between Jesus' christological identity and his tragic destiny, even if the nature of that relationship is not precisely expounded.

In Matthew, the sequential connection between Peter's confession and Jesus' passion prediction is broken. A lengthy blessing comes between Peter's confession and Jesus' warning to silence about his identity as the Christ (Matt 16:17–20). The passion prediction is then introduced with the temporal designation ἀπὸ τότε and presented through indirect speech (Matt 16:21). Hence, Jesus' prediction is cast as a transitional summary of what Jesus began to teach subsequent to the christological discussion of the preceding verses (cf. Matt 4:17; 26:16). Additionally, the "Son of Man" title is not employed in the Matthean passion prediction. Therefore, the link between Jesus' christological identity and his anticipated fate of suffering is less direct, since the prediction is introduced by a transitional temporal marker, conveyed through indirect speech, and lacking the christological "Son of Man" title.

In Mark, the command to silence vaguely concerns the person of Jesus (περὶ αὐτοῦ – Mark 8:30), a more general prohibition than the command against speaking of Jesus' christological identity. Also, Mark introduces the passion prediction as a separate teaching that commenced subsequent to Jesus' rebuke of the disciples (Καὶ ἤρξατο διδάσκειν – Mark 8:31), so that a clear grammatical transition introduces the passion prediction as the beginning of a new interaction between Jesus and his interlocutors (cf. Mark 4:1; 6:2, 34).[15] Thus, the con-

14 Tannehill (1986: 220); Nolland (1989: 2.459).
15 Bovon (2002: 362).

nection between Peter's christological confession and Jesus' prediction of suffering is not as direct as in the Lukan redaction.

Consequently, with regard to Luke's redaction of this sequence of verses, Büchele concludes, "*Aus dem Messiasgeheimnis bei Mk/Mt ist bei Lukas ein Leidensgeheimnis geworden.*"[16] Büchele may somewhat overstate the difference between Luke and the other synoptic evangelists at this point, yet Luke does reflect a special concern to link together Jesus' christological identity and his fate of suffering in the immediate context of the initial passion prediction.

4. Second Passion Prediction (Luke 9:44 – 45)

Peter's confession and Jesus' prediction are then followed shortly by the transfiguration scene, which serves as divine confirmation of Jesus' christological identity (Luke 9:28 – 36). After the voice from the cloud has confirmed Jesus' divine sonship at the transfiguration, Jesus descends from the mountain and casts a demon out of a young boy (Luke 9:37 – 42). This act of healing functions as a demonstration of divine power, and everyone responds to the deed with amazement (Luke 9:43). It is at this point that Jesus turns to his disciples and reiterates the somber assurance that the Son of Man is going to be betrayed into the hands of men (Luke 9:44). Thus, the picture of Jesus as a popular miracle worker is balanced with the solemn disclosure that suffering will be the ultimate destiny for this man.[17] Within a context preoccupied with the nature of Jesus' christological identity, this second passion prediction serves as a corrective against any delusion that Jesus' identity as God's chosen son might preclude the tragic destiny which he will endure. Indeed, the Lukan redaction of the second passion prediction omits any reference to the vindication of the Son of Man, so that the prophecy focuses solely upon the experience of rejection (cf. Mark 9:31 – 32; Matt 17:22 – 23).[18] As such, much like the first passion prediction, the second passion prediction closely connects Jesus' christological identity with his fate of suffering in a way unique to Luke, with the omission of any reference to the resurrection result-

16 Büchele (1978: 126). The turn of phrase can actually be traced back to Conzelmann (1960 [1954]: 56, 64 – 65, 197 – 198).

17 Büchele (1978: 130). The context of the second passion prediction is different in Mark and Matthew, where the healing of the child is followed by a private inquiry by the disciples (cf. Mark 9:28 – 30; Matt 17:19 – 20). Luke's account uniquely juxtaposes Jesus' present popularity and his future fate of suffering.

18 O'Toole (1987: 79).

ing in a heightened focus upon the necessity of rejection for Jesus' christological vocation.

5. An Impending Baptism (Luke 12:49–50)

The next anticipatory reference to Jesus' tragic destiny is found in Jesus' statement regarding a baptism with which he must be baptized (Luke 12:50; cf. Mark 10:38–39). The baptism logion parallels the preceding "I have come" declaration in Luke 12:49 and is also followed by another statement that speaks to Jesus' purpose in "coming" (12:51):

Table 2 – Luke 12:49–51

Luke 12:49	Luke 12:50	Luke 12:51
Πῦρ ἦλθον βαλεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν, καὶ τί θέλω εἰ ἤδη ἀνήφθη.	βάπτισμα δὲ ἔχω βαπτισθῆναι, καὶ πῶς συνέχομαι ἕως ὅτου τελεσθῇ.	δοκεῖτε ὅτι εἰρήνην παρεγενόμην δοῦναι ἐν τῇ γῇ; οὐχί, λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ἢ διαμερισμόν.

In Luke 12:49, Jesus opines that he has come to cast fire upon the earth. This imagery has sometimes been understood with reference to the Pentecost event in Acts 2:3 (cf. Luke 3:16).[19] However, the surrounding context, with its reference to a distressful baptism (12:50) and the division of families (12:51–53), suggests that the more negative connotation of fire as a symbol of discriminating judgment is likely in view (Luke 3: 16–17; cf. Deut 32:22; Amos 5:6; 7:4; Isa 30:33; Jer 5:14; 17:4; Ezek 38:22).[20] The fire has not yet been kindled (ἀνήφθη), and likewise the baptism that Jesus must undergo has not yet been accomplished (τελεσθῇ). Hence, verses 49 and 50 follow a parallel pattern in which a forthcoming event is mentioned, followed by an expression of Jesus' desire for the event to come to fruition.

The close parallelism of verses 49 and 50 may suggest that the two events anticipated in these verses are closely coordinated and refer to the same ordeal: Jesus declares that he has come to bring a judgment upon the earth, and he will enter into this judgment himself through the tragic fate he will endure.[21] Such an interpretation requires that the baptism refers quite specifically to Jesus' death,

19 Robinson (1962: 161); Wolter (2008: 469).
20 Delling (1957: 106); Marshall (1978: 546–547); Fitzmyer (1985: 996).
21 Delling (1957: 108–110); Kimbell (2014: 153–154).

which may find support both (1) in the distress that Jesus feels toward the impending baptism and (2) in the passive use of τελέω, which is exclusively related to Jesus' fate of suffering in Luke-Acts (Luke 18:34; 22:37; Acts 13:29).[22] If such a maximalist reading is pursued, then this passage would intimate that Jesus' fate of suffering will entail the bearing of divine judgment, so that the passage alludes to a soteriological purpose in Jesus' tragic destiny.[23] However, the precise significance of the baptism imagery is not entirely clear, as it may refer not only to Jesus' death but also to his resurrection and exaltation.[24] At any rate, Jesus' words at least establish (1) that he must experience a pre-determined fate, (2) that he is burdened for the experience to be completed (συνέχω), and (3) that this impending experience is an essential facet of his earthly vocation, given the proximity of the "I have come" statements that surround the baptism logion.

6. Third Passion Prediction (Luke 18:31–34)

Likewise, the third major passion prediction insists that the experience of rejection and suffering is a scriptural necessity for Jesus as God's anointed agent (Luke 18:31–34). Before outlining the course of suffering which he will endure, Jesus states, "Everything that is written about the Son of Man by the prophets will be fulfilled" (Luke 18:31). This statement is unique to Luke among the synoptic evangelists, and it serves to highlight the divine necessity of the cross as an essential aspect of Jesus' christological vocation.

22 Nolland (1989: 2.709).

23 Moo (1983: 121) connects the reference to baptism in Lk 12:50 with Jesus' actual baptism, finding that the heavenly voice's allusion to Isa 42:1 in Lk 3:21–22 provides a basis for seeing Jesus in Lk 12:50 as taking upon himself the role of the Isaianic suffering servant. For a more moderate assessment, see Fitzmyer (1985: 997); McKnight (2006: 126–128).

24 Robinson (1962: 160–161) argues that the baptismal imagery includes the whole of Jesus' ministry. However, the temporal marker in the verse most naturally looks forward to a future occurrence, especially in light of the parallelism with verse 49, which anticipates an event that has not yet occurred.

Table 3 – Synoptic Comparison of 3rd Passion Prediction

Mark 10:32	Matthew 20:18	Luke 18:31–32a
ἰδοὺ ἀναβαίνομεν εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδοθήσεται…	ἰδοὺ ἀναβαίνομεν εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα, καὶ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδοθήσεται…	ἰδοὺ ἀναβαίνομεν εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ, **καὶ τελεσθήσεται πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα διὰ τῶν προφητῶν τῷ υἱῷ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου**· [32] παραδοθήσεται…

The verb τελέω will next appear with reference to a particular τοῦτο τὸ γεγραμμένον, *viz.* Isa 53:12b (Luke 22:37), which may provide an indication of the conceptual source for Jesus' conviction regarding the necessity of the Son of Man's suffering. Also, the subsequent explanation that the Son of Man will be spit upon and flogged (ἐμπτύω, μαστιγόω – Luke 18:32–33) may further reinforce the impression of an Isaianic background, since similar language appears in the third servant song (cf. Isa 50:6).[25]

Still, at this point in the narrative, the Lukan reference to scriptural fulfillment is enigmatic, for the course of suffering predicted in Luke 18:32–33 is nowhere envisioned specifically for the Son of Man in the OT. Indeed, when the appellation "Son of Man" is used within a prophetic context with reference to an eschatological figure, the Son of Man appears not as a humble sufferer but as an exalted ruler (Dan 7:13–14; cf. *1 En.* 46:2–4; 62:5–9; 69:27–29).[26] Perhaps, then, the reference to "all that the prophets have written" should be interpreted rather broadly as referring to the belief that a special figure possessing a unique identity and role within the divine plan of salvation will be subject to a fate of suffering prior to his vindication. This general expectation finds expression in

25 Moo (1983: 88–89); Fitzmyer (1985: 1210). Note, however, that whereas Luke presents the verbal forms, the two terms appear as nouns in Isa 50:6 LXX.

26 Many locate the background to the synoptic passion predictions in Daniel 7 by equating the Son of Man with the "saints of the most high" who suffer in Dan 7:25. A well-stated defense of this perspective can be found in McKnight (2006: 231–236). However, this view remains problematic, since suffering is never attributed directly to the Son of Man in Daniel 7 (see France [1971: 128–130]). If one must choose between a Danielic and Isaianic background, the Isaianic suffering servant seems to provide a more natural conceptual background to the passion predictions. However, the binary opposition between the two backgrounds may be somewhat artificial in view of the influence of Isa 52:13–53:12 upon the book of Daniel. See Beauchamp (1989: 346); also Schaberg (1985: 212).

various ways at several points in the OT and coheres with Luke's sustained interest in the centrality of suffering to Jesus' christological identity.[27]

The similar phraseology of the initial passion prediction in Luke 9:22, where a comparable course of suffering is closely connected to Peter's confession that Jesus is the Christ, may help confirm that here the usage of "Son of Man" is meant as a reference not so much to a particular passage of scripture as to a more general messianic expectation drawn from the OT.[28] Also, the same terminology for suffering applied to the "Son of Man" prior to the passion is applied to the "Christ" afterward (πάσχω – Luke 9:22; 17:25; cf. Luke 24:26, 46),[29] and the comprehensive language of Jesus' statement in Luke 18:32 (πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα) may lend credence to the proposed interpretation.

7. Luke 13:31–35 and 17:25

Finally, two other passages unique to Luke may also resonate with undertones of christological fulfillment in relation to the passion. First, Luke 13:31–35 refers repeatedly to a period of three days, at the end of which Jesus' mission will reach its goal, which is characterized in terms of Jesus' death.[30] By placing the death of Jesus at the culmination of a figurative period of time, these verses evoke the sense that Jesus' fate stands as an event which brings one era in history to a close.[31] Conversely, in Luke 17:25, the destiny of Jesus seems to stand at the entrance to a new period in time, as Jesus specifies that he must first face rejection by this generation before the days of the Son of Man can be experienced.[32] The

27 In addition to the possible Danielic and Isaianic backgrounds for the expectation of a suffering figure who features prominently in God's salvific plan, this same general anticipation is present in the characterization of the suffering righteous of the Psalms (Psalm 22, 118) as well as in the description of the messianic figure in Zechariah 9–14.

28 *Contra* Fitzmyer (1981: 780), the usage of "Son of Man" in Lk 9:22 is not intended as a corrective to Peter's "Christ" confession. See Tannehill (1986: 220–221).

29 Jesus does not use the Christ title publically in Luke prior to Easter. *Contra* Mainville (2005: 200–201), this need not imply that for Luke Jesus is only the messiah following the resurrection. Rather, the evangelists' restraint in their usage of the Christ title likely reflects their care in differentiating between the speech patterns of the earthly Jesus and the subsequent teachings of the risen Lord and the early church. See Lemcio (1991: 76).

30 See Marshall (1978: 571–572).

31 For Brunson, the salvation-historical significance of this passage is mediated through the quotation of Ps 118:26 in Lk 13:35, which then finds its fulfillment in Jesus' entry into Jerusalem in Lk 19:28–40 (see Brunson [2003: 115–119]).

32 On the verbal parallels with Lk 9:22, see Nolland (1989: 2.859).

preceding references to the "day(s)" of the Son of Man (cf. Luke 17:22, 24), the terminology of divine necessity (δεῖ), the reference to "this generation" (τῆς γενεᾶς ταύτης), and the designation of a sequential progression through the use of πρῶτος – all of these features in the text give the impression that Jesus' rejection will entail a special historical significance. Though allusive, Luke 13:31–35 and 17:25 reinforce the impression that Jesus' death will constitute a seminal moment in salvation history, bringing one age to a close while initiating a new age in the divine scheme. As such, these passages can be added to the litany of anticipatory passion references which intimate that Jesus' rejection is central to his christological mission.

8. Summary

Throughout his gospel Luke insists that the rejection and suffering of Jesus is a central feature of his christological mission and is therefore a divine necessity. The figure identified at his birth as the savior and messiah must fulfill his role in the divine plan of salvation at least in part through the experience of rejection and suffering. Simeon's oracle and the paradigmatic rejection at Nazareth establish this expectation quite early within the narrative, and the centrality of suffering within the christological perspective of the third evangelist is underscored by the way in which subsequent anticipations of Jesus' death are either closely connected to overt christological affirmations or demonstrations (Luke 9:18–22, 44) or else accompanied by the reminder that the tragic destiny of Jesus has been determined by scripture (Luke 18:31; 22:37). As the risen Lord later affirms, for Luke, "the Christ must suffer" in accordance with the fate assigned to him in the scriptures (Luke 24:26, 46). Only through his obedient endurance of rejection and suffering can Jesus fulfill his christological vocation in the divine plan of salvation.

Significantly, many of the passages that situate the suffering of Jesus at a turning point of salvation-history refer only to Jesus' tragic fate without reference to the resurrection. Luke 2:34; 4:25–29; 13:33; and 17:25 – all statements unique to Luke's gospel – simply underscore the rejection which Jesus must face, and Luke's version of the second passion prediction even removes the reference to the resurrection found in the corresponding passages in Mark and Matthew (Luke 9:44–45). Conversely, the first and third passion predictions (9:22; 18:31–34), which are both drawn from the synoptic tradition, include predictions of the resurrection of the Son of Man. Thus, it is precisely the uniquely Lukan elements of the anticipatory passion references that isolate the rejection of Jesus from the resurrection as a distinct event of fulfillment in the salvation-historical

plan.[33] In contrast to the frequent suggestion that for Luke the death of Jesus retains a salvation-historical significance only to the extent that it makes possible the resurrection, the distinctively Lukan dimensions of the pre-passion passion texts indicate that the suffering of Jesus itself occupies a unique position within the Lukan understanding of God's plan of salvation, functioning as a pivotal moment which sets into motion a crucial transition in salvation-historical epochs.[34]

III. The Ignorance of the Disciples and Omission of the Ransom Saying

Aside from closely linking Jesus' christological vocation with his fate of rejection and death, Luke's anticipatory passion references are also unique in their emphasis upon the ignorance of the disciples. As noted above, the disciples are absent for the encounter between Jesus and Simeon and the rejection of Jesus at Nazareth. Both of these episodes establish for Luke's audience the centrality of the experience of rejection to Jesus' salvation-historical task. Once the disciples are present in Luke's gospel, anticipatory allusions to the rejection, suffering, or death of Jesus are consistently accompanied by indications that the disciples are ignorant regarding Jesus' tragic fate, as the matter has been divinely concealed from the disciples. These indications of the disciples' ignorance are vague yet emphatic. They do not specify the precise nature of what is concealed from the disciples' understanding, yet they do insist upon an abiding dissonance between Jesus and his disciples concerning his fate of suffering. This dissonance between Jesus and the disciples is finally resolved in Luke 24, where the appearances of the risen Lord lead to an epistemological awakening for the disciples, and they come to understand the place of the passion within Jesus' christological vocation. The second part of this chapter will consider the theme of the disciples'

33 Sellner (2007: 428 – 433) differentiates sharply between statements about Jesus' rejection and explicit references to his death. However, such an absolute distinction is somewhat artificial, since Jesus' death is surely the culmination of his rejection, and the forward-looking orientation of Jesus' early rejection unambiguously foreshadows the suffering and death which Jesus ultimately experiences. Therefore, while one can differentiate between rejection and death, the distinction is unhelpful when cited in order to minimize the extent to which Luke underscores the necessity of the cross.

34 For the view which finds an abiding salvation-historical significance in Jesus' death only with reference to its connection with the resurrection as the truly meaningful salvation event, see Flender (1967: 157 – 158); Zehnle (1969: 436); Franklin (1975: 67); Kodell (1979: 229); Scheffler (1993: 152 – 154).

ignorance with regard to the passion and appeal to this theme in order to propose an explanation for Luke's omission of the synoptic ransom saying.

1. The Disciples' Ignorance Prior to the Resurrection Appearances

The ignorance of the disciples regarding the passion can be seen in the Lukan treatment of the second passion prediction and the third passion prediction in the body of the gospel narrative. Moreover, the dissonance between Jesus and the disciples with regard to Jesus' fate of suffering even persists after the last supper at the outset of the passion narrative. The present chapter will consider each of these three passages in turn.

The Second Passion Prediction

Table 4 – Synoptic Comparison of 2nd Passion Prediction

Mark 9:31 – 32	Matthew 17:22b-23	Luke 9:44 – 45
ἐδίδασκεν γὰρ τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἔλεγεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοται εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτόν, καὶ ἀποκτανθεὶς μετὰ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀναστήσεται. [32] οἱ δὲ ἠγνόουν τὸ ῥῆμα, καὶ ἐφοβοῦντο αὐτὸν ἐπερωτῆσαι.	μέλλει ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου παραδίδοσθαι εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων, [23] καὶ ἀποκτενοῦσιν αὐτόν, καὶ τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἐγερθήσεται. καὶ ἐλυπήθησαν σφόδρα.	θέσθε ὑμεῖς εἰς τὰ ὦτα ὑμῶν τοὺς λόγους τούτους· ὁ γὰρ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μέλλει παραδίδοσθαι εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων. [45] οἱ δὲ ἠγνόουν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο **καὶ ἦν παρακεκαλυμμένον ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν ἵνα μὴ αἴσθωνται αὐτό**, καὶ ἐφοβοῦντο ἐρωτῆσαι αὐτὸν περὶ τοῦ ῥήματος τούτου.

Luke's presentation of the second passion prediction is distinctive in at least two respects. First, as mentioned above, the Lukan version drastically shortens the prediction, removing explicit reference to the death and resurrection of the Son of Man. Second, Luke lays special emphasis upon the notion that the disciples could not understand Jesus' prediction. The disciples are afraid to ask Jesus about what he has said, and at any rate the matter has been concealed from them (Luke 9:45).

While this element of ignorance on the part of the disciples is also present in Mark (Mark 9:32), Luke's description is far more emphatic.[35] Mark acknowledges the lack of understanding and notes the fear of the disciples, yet the notion of concealment is absent from Mark's account.[36] Also, for Mark the ignorance of the disciples is not limited to the rejection of Jesus, since the second passion prediction in Mark includes the entire sequence of death and resurrection. Indeed, in contrast to Luke, Mark's disciples seem to be confused primarily about the resurrection, for at the end of the nearby transfiguration scene, the narrator has noted that the disciples were bewildered by Jesus' statement about raising from the dead (Mark 9:9–10), another detail which Luke has omitted from his account.[37]

Matthew, for his part, transforms ignorance to grief in the second passion prediction, so that the Matthean disciples are presented as understanding what has just been said (Matt 17:22–23). The Matthean redaction is in keeping with how the disciples are portrayed as understanding other facets of Jesus' instruction within the surrounding context of Matthew.[38]

---

35 Marshall (1978: 392–393).

36 Note additionally that Luke has omitted Jesus' teaching on prayer and fasting from the surrounding context (cf. Mark 9:21–24, 28–29), so that the focus is placed entirely on the disciples' failure (Johnson [1991: 160]).

37 By contrast, in Luke the disciples at the transfiguration scene are burdened with sleep precisely when Jesus is discussing his ἔξοδος at Jerusalem (Lk 9:31–32). Though ἔξοδος may refer to more than solely Jesus' death, the passion surely is at least a part of the ἔξοδος, so that with Luke the transfiguration scene also illustrates the disconnect between Jesus and the disciples with regard to his tragic destiny. The disciples perceive Jesus' glory (9:32), yet they do not grasp the nature of his messianic vocation. In Mark, the reference to an ἔξοδος is absent, and the issue of confusion shifts to the matter of the resurrection (Mark 9:9–10). See Holmås (2011: 98).

38 In fact, at several points within the sequence between the first passion prediction and the second, Matthew has omitted negative elements in the portrayal of the disciples, on the one hand, and he has added details which render the disciples in a positive light, on the other. Matthew omits the negative interpretation of Peter's suggestion to build tents at the transfiguration (Matt 17:4; cf. Mark 9:5–6; Lk 9:33). Likewise, Matthew is unique in presenting Jesus as comforting the disciples in their terror of the heavenly voice (Matt 17:7; cf. Mark 9:8–9; Lk 9:35–36). Also, when Jesus responds to the disciples' inquiry regarding the coming of Elijah, Matthew notes that the disciples understood that Jesus was referring to John the Baptist (Matt 17:13; cf. Mark 9:13). Certainly Matthew preserves the failure of the disciples to heal the young boy. However, this failure is addressed through instruction unique to Matthew (Matt 17:19–20; cf. Mark 9:29; Lk 9:40–41). Thus, the negative aspects of Matthew's depiction of the disciples in this scene are all found in Mark, but the positive dimensions of his presentation are distinctive to the first evangelist.

Hence, the Lukan redaction of this sequence of scenes has placed a unique emphasis upon the ignorance of the disciples with regard to the passion.[39] In Matthew, this ignorance is unmentioned, and in Mark the notion of misunderstanding is related at least as much to the possibility of a resurrection as to the tragic fate which Jesus will endure.

The Third Passion Prediction

Luke then highlights the disciples' lack of understanding again following the third passion prediction in Luke 18:34, a verse unique to Luke (cf. Mark 10:32–34; Matt 20:17–19):

> καὶ αὐτοὶ οὐδὲν τούτων συνῆκαν καὶ ἦν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο κεκρυμμένον ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν καὶ οὐκ ἐγίνωσκον τὰ λεγόμενα.

The statement of the narrator essentially reiterates what had been expressed following the second passion prediction, this time employing three independent clauses to underscore both the ignorance of the disciples and the notion of concealment (cf. Luke 9:45).[40] For Luke, the lengthy period of teaching between the second and third passion predictions has done nothing to change the epistemological state of the disciples with regard to the passion. They remain just as ignorant about "this matter" at the end of the journey to Jerusalem as they did at the beginning, despite the concentrated instruction which has characterized the intervening time period.[41] Once again, this ignorance of the disciples is divinely imposed, so that it is not simply an issue of slow apprehension. Rather, the disciples will remain incapable of understanding the fate of their teacher until the matter is no longer hidden.

For Mark and Matthew, the final passion prediction is also met with a lack of understanding on the part of the disciples (Mark 10:33–34; Matt 20:18–19). However, rather than explicitly mentioning the disciples' failure to grasp the meaning of Jesus' prediction, both Mark and Matthew demonstrate the ignorance of the disciples through a dispute which immediately follows the third passion prediction. Ten of the disciples become indignant toward James and John when they learn that Jesus has been approached about seating these two men at his side in his glory (Mark 10:37) or kingdom (Matt 20:21). The contention among the twelve stands in marked contrast to the solemn prediction uttered by Jesus, re-

39 See also Hagene (2003: 229–230).

40 Note also the emphatic forward placement of οὐδὲν τούτων.

41 For the importance of instruction during this section of Luke, see Matera (1993: 67–76).

vealing a dissonance between the triumphalist mindset of the disciples and the stark reality that Jesus' kingdom and glory must be preceded by an ordeal of rejection, suffering, and death. Jesus' interchange with James and John underscores the disconnect – they express a willingness to drink his cup and undergo his baptism, yet in light of the surrounding context, it is clear that they have little awareness of what this must entail (Mark 10:38 – 39; Matt 20:22 – 23).

The dispute among the disciples in turn allows Jesus to address their lack of understanding directly through an explanation which clarifies the implications of what has just been stated in the third passion prediction (Mark 10:42 – 45; Matt 20:25 – 28).[42] Here, Jesus contrasts the self-aggrandizement and heavy-handed authority of worldly leaders with the humble service that is the true mark of greatness within the community of disciples. Among the disciples, whoever wishes to be great shall be a servant, and whoever wishes to be first will be a slave (Mark 10:43 – 44; Matt 20:26 – 27). Jesus then grounds this axiom in his own example, as his instruction to the disciples crescendos in the well-known ransom saying:

Table 5 – The Synoptic Ransom Saying

Mark 10:45	Matthew 20:28
καὶ γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.	ὥσπερ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.

The usage of the title "Son of Man" connects the saying directly with the closely preceding passion prediction (Mark 10:33; Matt 20:18), such that Jesus' ransom saying serves as an exposition of the soteriological purpose which lies behind the recent proclamation that the Son of Man will shortly be subject to a fate of rejection, suffering, and death prior to his resurrection. A clear connection is thereby established between Jesus' fate of suffering, its soteriological effect, and its centrality to Jesus' christological vocation. Jesus must suffer, because his suffering will serve "as a ransom for many," and therefore it lies at the heart of Jesus' special role in the divine plan. Thus, for Mark and Matthew, Jesus directly addresses the disciples' lack of understanding with regard to his fate of suffering, and this takes place well before the beginning of the sequence

42 For the didactic function of this pericope in relation to the third passion prediction in Mark, see Dowd and Malbon (2006: 277 – 278). In Mark all three passion predictions occur within a lengthy section devoted to the nature of discipleship and the slowness of the disciples to understand the character of Jesus' messiahship (Mark 8:22 – 10:52).

of events leading to his death. By the time Jesus enters Jerusalem, his disciples have been clearly informed of the soteriological purpose which lies behind his tragic destiny, and this soteriological interpretation of Jesus' fate is employed in order to expound the pivotal importance of suffering within Jesus' mission. The matter has not been divinely concealed, and the misunderstanding of the disciples has been addressed in a straightforward manner through Jesus' teaching.[43]

Luke, by contrast, simply calls attention to the concealment of the meaning of the passion prediction from the disciples and proceeds without further comment to the healing of a blind man on the way to Jericho.[44] Through the omission of the synoptic ransom saying, Luke withholds a straightforward soteriological exposition of the passion predictions from the disciples. While the disciples hear Jesus speak of the necessity of his tragic destiny, they are not able to understand what Jesus is saying. The effect of Luke's redaction is that the disciples remain unenlightened in their ignorance regarding the passion as the lengthy period of instruction in the journey section of Luke's gospel draws to a close.

The Last Supper

I will be arguing in the next chapter that a soteriological interpretation of the death of Jesus is set out in the eucharistic words at the outset of the passion narrative. For the purposes of the present chapter, I would like simply to note that even after the words of institution, the narrator provides clear indications of an abiding dissonance between the disciples and their teacher as Jesus' death approaches. Hence, following the eucharistic words, Luke presents a significantly shortened version of what may be a parallel to the synoptic dispute over rank among the disciples (Luke 22:24–27):

Table 6 – Synoptic Comparison for Jesus' Response to the Dispute among the Disciples

Luke 22:24–27	Mark 10:42–45	Matthew 20:25–28
Εγένετο δὲ καὶ φιλονεικία ἐν αὐτοῖς, τὸ τίς αὐτῶν δοκεῖ	καὶ προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς λέγει αὐτοῖς· οἴδατε	ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς προσκαλεσάμενος αὐτοὺς εἶπεν· οἴδατε ὅτι οἱ

43 This is not to deny that the ransom saying itself requires interpretation, and one might plausibly find that the specific meaning of the saying has been adapted within the particular contexts of Mark and Matthew. Nevertheless, the narrative function of the saying in each gospel is the same, for in both instances the saying serves as a remedy to the ignorance of the disciples with regard to the final passion prediction.

44 George (1973: 207).

Table 6 – Synoptic Comparison for Jesus' Response to the Dispute among the Disciples *(Continued)*

Luke 22:24 – 27	Mark 10:42 – 45	Matthew 20:25 – 28
εἶναι μείζων. [25] ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν ἐθνῶν κυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ ἐξουσιάζοντες αὐτῶν εὐεργέται καλοῦνται. [26] ὑμεῖς δὲ οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλ᾽ ὁ μείζων ἐν ὑμῖν γινέσθω ὡς ὁ νεώτερος καὶ ὁ ἡγούμενος ὡς ὁ διακονῶν. [27] τίς γὰρ μείζων, ὁ ἀνακείμενος ἢ ὁ διακονῶν; οὐχὶ ὁ ἀνακείμενος; ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν εἰμι ὡς ὁ διακονῶν.	ὅτι οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν τῶν ἐθνῶν κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι αὐτῶν κατεξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν. [43] οὐχ οὕτως δέ ἐστιν ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀλλ᾽ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ μέγας γενέσθαι ἐν ὑμῖν ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος, [44] καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος ἔσται πάντων δοῦλος· [45] καὶ γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.	ἄρχοντες τῶν ἐθνῶν κατακυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ μεγάλοι κατεξουσιάζουσιν αὐτῶν. [26] οὐχ οὕτως ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν, ἀλλ᾽ ὃς ἐὰν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν μέγας γενέσθαι ἔσται ὑμῶν διάκονος, [27] καὶ ὃς ἂν θέλῃ ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι πρῶτος ἔσται ὑμῶν δοῦλος· [28] ὥσπερ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθεν διακονηθῆναι ἀλλὰ διακονῆσαι καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.

The Lukan version of this pericope differs markedly from its possible synoptic counterparts, so that the majority of interpreters are probably correct in concluding that the Lukan passage comes from a non-Markan source.[45] Still, within its context at the table, the Lukan pericope does serve to underscore a dissonance between Jesus and the disciples in a manner similar to the comparable disputes in the other synoptic gospels.[46] The Lukan disciples do not ponder the eucharistic words. Instead, Jesus' prediction of betrayal prompts rivalry among the inner circle (Luke 22:21 – 23).[47] From a solemn warning to the least of the disciples, a

45 See Marshall (1971: 170); Green (1988: 45 – 46); Bovon (2003: 94). While the pericope occurs at precisely the same point in Mark and Matthew, the Lukan counterpart is placed much later in the narrative, between two passages which are not drawn from Markan tradition (Lk 22:15 – 20; 22:28 – 30). Furthermore, the dispute arises in Mark and Matthew as a result of pretentious requests on behalf of James and John (Mark 10:35 – 41; Matt 20:20 – 24), but Luke's pericope does not contain any corresponding introductory dialogue. In addition, lexical parallels between Lk 22:24 – 27 and Mark 10:42 – 45 are surprisingly scarce, whereas the Matthean version of this pericope follows Mark quite closely. Finally, Jesus' climactic statement in Luke, "But I am among you as one who serves" (Lk 22:27), shares only the verb διακονέω with the ransom saying that stands at the climax of the corresponding passages in Mark and Matthew. Also, in Luke, the first person singular pronoun appears instead of the "Son of Man" title that is present in Mark and Matthew, against the Lukan tendency to preserve the title when working from a Markan *Vorlage* (cf. Lk 5:24; 6:5; 9:22, 26, 44; 21:27; 22:22, 69).

46 Glöckner (1975: 180); Kurz (1985: 257, 268); Mittmann-Richert (2008: 165 – 167).

47 See Nielsen (2000: 128).

debate arises as to who is the greatest (Luke 22:24). Jesus responds to the disciples through instruction which refers back to the eucharistic meal,[48] teaching the disciples to conform to his own example of self-giving service.

Nonetheless, the dissonance between Jesus and his disciples persists even after Jesus' teaching. The Lukan disciples are subsequently characterized as lawless aggressors who pre-emptively resort to physical violence in defense of Jesus (Luke 22:35 – 38, 49 – 51),[49] and they succumb to grief and sleep while Jesus prays alone at the Mount of Olives (Luke 22:45 – 46).[50] In the passion narrative which follows, Jesus is betrayed by the least of the disciples (22:47 – 53), denied and abandoned by the greatest (22:54 – 62), and then he suffers his fate of mockery, rejection, condemnation, and crucifixion alone.

Unlike in the case of the passion predictions, the narrator in the passion narrative does not explicitly state that the disciples have failed to understand Jesus' statements regarding his tragic destiny. Rather, the behavior of the disciples is sufficient to show the dissonance between Jesus and the disciples, as they controvert Jesus' prior instruction regarding faithful discipleship at the very moment that Jesus obediently submits to the fate for which he is destined. When they ought to be denying themselves and following Jesus, even the greatest of the disciples denies Jesus and runs away by himself (Luke 22:57 – 62; cf. Luke 9:23; 14:27). Given the ignorance of the disciples with regard to the passion throughout the body of Luke's gospel, it is scarcely surprising that in the passion narrative they prove unfaithful as Jesus' suffering takes place. The failure and distance of the disciples in the Lukan passion narrative thus reinforces the impression that the tragic destiny of Jesus remains a mystery to his closest followers.

Summary

In Luke the messianic secret has indeed been transformed into a passion secret, and this in more ways than one. First, the initial passion prediction and its accompanying command to silence are uttered in secret to the disciples (Luke 9:18; cf. 9:23), which contrasts with the apparently open setting of the initial passion

48 Given the close proximity of the words of institution, some interpret Lk 22:27 to be a kind of Lukan counterpart to Mark 10:45 (see Roloff [1972: 58 – 60]; more tentatively Schlosser [1982: 68 – 70]). However, Lk 22:27 is more ambiguous than the ransom saying, as it does not refer explicitly to Jesus' purpose in "coming", and at the very most it refers to Jesus' death only indirectly through an assumed connection to the symbolism behind Jesus' table actions.

49 Minear (1964: 130 – 133).

50 This lapse among the disciples is especially glaring in view of prior exhortations to watchful prayer (cf. Lk 11:1 – 4; 21:36). See Neyrey (1985: 65 – 67); Holmås (2011: 151 – 152).

prediction in Mark and Matthew (cf. Mark 8:27–31; Matt 16:13, 21–22).[51] Second, the content of Jesus' command to secrecy in Luke is connected specifically to Jesus' fate of suffering, whereas in the other synoptic gospels it relates more generally to his messianic identity.[52] Most importantly, third, the messianic secret is transformed into a passion secret in the most literal sense, as the passion emerges as a mystery inscrutable even for Jesus' closest followers within the story-world of Luke's gospel. Hence, the disciples are not present for important portents of rejection, such as Simeon's oracle and the Nazareth pericope. And when the disciples are present for Jesus' passion predictions, the narrator consistently indicates that the disciples have failed to grasp Jesus' instruction. Even in the upper room, the teaching of Jesus regarding his death appears to fall upon deaf ears, as the subsequent narrative reveals a gaping dissonance between the disciples and their teacher.

2. The Resolution of the Disciples' Ignorance in Luke 24

The dissonance between Jesus and the disciples regarding the passion is finally resolved in the resurrection appearances in Luke 24. Through transformational encounters with the resurrected Jesus, the eyes and minds of Jesus' followers are opened, so that they come to understand that which had been incomprehensible prior to the resurrection. Luke emphasizes this epistemological transformation both in his account of Jesus' appearance to the men on the road to Emmaus (Luke 24:13–35), and in his description of Jesus' final instruction to the disciples (Luke 24:44–49).

The Men on the Road to Emmaus

In the story of the men travelling to Emmaus, the ability of the men to recognize the risen Jesus is suggestively coordinated with a growing understanding of the place of Jesus' suffering within his messianic vocation. Hence, at the beginning of the passage, Cleopas and his friend do not recognize Jesus (Luke 24:16), and their account of recent events reveals that they cannot reconcile Jesus' tragic end with their hopes that Jesus would be the one who was going to redeem Israel (Luke 24:20–21). They are despondent, convinced that the violent death of

51 Guillaume (1979: 36); Hagene (2003: 229).
52 Büchele (1978: 126).

Jesus had put an end to the hope that he could possibly redeem the nation.[53] Of course Luke's audience knows that the redemption of Israel actually finds its expression in the crucified and risen Jesus, a figure identified from the outset of the gospel as the Christ of God (2:11, 26), the savior (2:11) who fulfills the salvific hopes (2:30) of those who are awaiting the redemption of Jerusalem (2:26, 31–32, 38) precisely through his fate of rejection (2:34). Accordingly, Jesus' response to the two men on the road centers upon the scriptural necessity of suffering for the messiah (Luke 24:26–27), as Jesus directly corrects the mistaken perspective that the men possess toward the relationship between his fate of suffering and the vocation of the Christ. Moreover, it is precisely through the breaking of bread – an event described with language strongly evocative of the last supper scene – that the concealment of Jesus from the men is resolved (24:30–31).[54]

In this manner, the dramatic epistemological transformation of the men on the road to Emmaus appears to relate specifically to the relationship between the suffering endured by Jesus and his fulfillment of scriptural expectations for God's anointed agent of salvation. The progression of the men from not recognizing Jesus to recognizing Jesus functions symbolically to underscore the new understanding that arises over the course of the encounter between the men and Jesus, as the men come to see the way in which Jesus' christological vocation entails a fate of suffering.

Jesus' Final Instruction to the Disciples

Similarly, in Luke 24:44–45, the instruction of the risen Lord enables an epistemological transformation for the disciples with regard to scriptural expectations for the messiah.

> Εἶπεν δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς· οὗτοι οἱ λόγοι μου οὓς ἐλάλησα πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔτι ὢν σὺν ὑμῖν, ὅτι δεῖ πληρωθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωϋσέως καὶ τοῖς προφήταις καὶ ψαλμοῖς περὶ ἐμοῦ. [45] τότε διήνοιξεν αὐτῶν τὸν νοῦν τοῦ συνιέναι τὰς γραφάς.

---

53 The men speak of their hope for Israel's redemption in the past tense (ἠλπίζομεν).

54 The language of taking, blessing, and breaking the bread in Lk 24:30 closely resembles the eucharistic ritual performed in Lk 22:19. Indeed, the lexical parallels are substantial, though in 22:19 a different word for the act of thanksgiving/blessing is used (εὐχαριστέω vs. εὐλογέω). See Decock (2002: 42–46); Kimbell (2014: 40–41). Alongside the eucharistic echoes, the language is also evocative of the feeding miracle in Lk 9:16. See Dillon (1978: 105–107); Moessner (1990: 182); Schwemer (2001: 111); Wolter (2008: 785).

In verse 44, Jesus declares the scriptural necessity of his experience, explicitly recalling his passion predictions.[55] The phrase πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα and the reference to the prophets correspond to the introduction to third passion prediction in Luke 18:31, whereas the usage of δεῖ as well as the phrase περὶ ἐμοῦ correspond to the fulfillment formulae which enclose Jesus' quotation of Isa 53:12 in Luke 22:37. Thus, Jesus' declaration clearly calls to mind his anticipations of a fate of suffering.

Moreover, the intratextual connections between Jesus' declaration in Luke 24 and his previous predictions of the passion allow the readers to perceive a contrast in the narrator's remark in Luke 24:45. Whereas the passion predictions were previously met with a response of misunderstanding on the part of the disciples (Luke 9:44–45; 18:34), in the present instance Jesus' declaration of his scripturally ordained fate is accompanied by an epistemological transformation. Jesus opens the disciples' minds, so that they can understand the scriptures and presumably recognize how the scriptures are fulfilled through Jesus' experience (συνίημι – Luke 24:45; cf. 18:31, 34). What has previously been divinely concealed from the disciples is now made comprehensible. As we have seen, the ignorance of the disciples regarding the scriptures up to this point in the narrative has been narrowly focused upon the incomprehensibility of the passion (Luke 9:44; 18:34).[56] Therefore, when the risen Lord refers to his fulfillment of πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα in language evocative of the passion predictions and then opens the minds of the disciples to understand the scriptures, one can quite readily suppose that the epistemological conversion of the disciples likewise relates specifically to a new understanding of the passion.

This is further reinforced by the particular language with which the shift in understanding is described. The use of διανοίγω links the opening of the minds of the disciples to the opening of the eyes of the men at Emmaus (cf. Luke 24:31–32), where the recognition of Jesus is experienced after Jesus has "opened" (διανοίγω) the scriptures about his suffering to the men and then shared a meal pregnant with eucharistic undertones with them (Luke 24:25–32).[57] Only in light of the risen Lord's instruction can the disciples understand how the rejection and death of Jesus relates to his fulfillment of scriptural expectations for the "one who would redeem Israel" (cf. 24:21).

By withholding an understanding of the relationship between the death of Jesus and his christological vocation from Jesus' closest followers prior to the

55 Meynet (1988: 949).

56 Indeed, Luke's general redactional tendency is to present the disciples in a more positive light than the synoptic tradition.

57 Hagene (2003: 161).

resurrection, Luke is able to present the post-resurrection experience of the disciples with the risen Jesus as an epistemologically transformative event in which their eyes are opened and they come to recognize that which the readers of Luke's gospel have long since understood: The tragic destiny of Jesus functions as an indispensable fulfillment of scriptural expectations for the role of the messiah in the divine plan for salvation history.[58] Hence, Luke's account of the resurrection appearances is characterized by a dramatic irony that depends upon the privileged epistemological position of Luke's audience in comparison to Jesus' followers.[59]

3. Luke's Omission of the Ransom Saying

The place of the resurrection appearances within Luke's epistemological framework may offer a plausible explanation for the Lukan omission of the synoptic ransom saying. Before the post-resurrection appearances, the disciples in Luke cannot understand how one who suffers could possibly fulfill the scripturally anticipated role for the Christ in the divine plan of salvation. They cannot understand the function of Jesus' fate within his christological vocation, a matter which in Mark and Matthew is addressed in a unique manner through the soteriological appeal of the ransom saying. The ignorance of the disciples with regard to the passion in Luke must concern precisely this christological issue, though the nature of their ignorance is never spelled out explicitly at those places where general references are made to their lack of understanding (Luke 9:45; 18:34).

Obviously the bare fact of the passion is not what is concealed from the Lukan disciples, since they are told repeatedly that Jesus must suffer. Rather, the theme of concealment and ignorance must specifically concern the function of the passion within Jesus' scripturally ordained role in God's salvation-historical plan for the Christ, since this is precisely what is emphasized in the post-resurrection appearances throughout Luke 24: Contrary to the conviction of Jesus' despondent disciples, suffering is an indispensable facet of the scriptural plan for the Christ to bring redemption and the forgiveness of sins to God's people (24:21, 26 – 27, 44 – 47). Prior to the post-resurrection appearances, the Lukan dis-

58 On the epistemological transformation of the Emmaus disciples, see Schwemer (2001: 102 – 103).

59 See Frein (1993: 342 – 345); also Dillon (1978: 140).

ciples are blind to this element of Jesus' christological vocation, and their eyes are only opened through transformative encounters with the risen Lord.

Within such an epistemological framework, where the appearances of the risen Lord prove decisive for effecting a change in the understanding of the disciples with regard to the passion, the synoptic ransom saying, which functions in Mark and Matthew as an attempted remedy to the ignorance of the disciples on exactly this point, would be out of place. As commentary on the nearby passion prediction, Jesus' ransom saying provides a unique exposition of the role of Jesus' suffering within his christological vocation, appealing directly to the soteriological significance of Jesus' fate as the key to explaining in what sense it is necessary for the Christ to suffer. This is precisely what the Lukan disciples are not allowed to grasp before their encounters with the risen Lord.[60] Hence, the Lukan omission of the synoptic ransom saying may well relate to Luke's disciplined portrayal of the resurrection appearances as the crucial turning point in the understanding of the disciples regarding the passion.[61]

Of course the disciples in Mark and Matthew apparently do not understand the significance of the passion any better than Luke's disciples. However, only Luke relates their lack of understanding to the theme of divine concealment and its post-resurrection reversal. Mark and Matthew provide no indication that the meaning was concealed from the disciples, nor do their resurrection accounts allude to any reversal of the disciples' ignorance regarding the passion. The point, then, is not whether the disciples in Mark and Matthew *actually understand* Jesus' rejection, but rather whether they at least theoretically *could have understood*. The notion of divine concealment and its reversal is present

60 Thus, in Lk 24:19–21, the disciples explain the "things concerning Jesus" (τὰ περὶ Ἰησοῦ) in terms of his mighty words and deeds, and they express confusion over his violent death. Conversely, in Lk 24:26–27, Jesus explains the "things concerning himself" (τὰ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ) in terms of the scriptural expectation for a suffering messiah. Hence, Jesus' teaching addresses what the Emmaus disciples lack, *viz.* an understanding of the place of suffering within the divine plan for the messiah.

61 I am not suggesting that Luke 24 contains an equivalent to the ransom saying. I am simply appealing to the epistemological transformation in Luke 24 in order to account for the omission of the ransom saying earlier in Luke's gospel. Several considerations likely account for why the ransom saying is not reproduced in Luke 24 or the book of Acts: First, the saying is crafted as a response to the disciples' conflict over greatness, and outside of that setting, the ransom saying would need to be significantly altered to fit a new context. Second, as a declaration regarding Jesus' purpose in "coming", the ransom saying is ill-suited for a post-resurrection context (cf. Lk 4:43; 5:32; 12:49, 51; 19:10). Third, the usage of "Son of Man" in the ransom saying is also more at home in the context of Jesus' earthly ministry. Indeed, in Lk 24:26 and 46, the "Christ" title is found in contexts where Jesus previously employed the "Son of Man" title (cf. Lk 9:22; 18:31).

only in Luke, and this, I suggest, is what would be at tension with the ransom saying.

One final matter remains to be addressed: As we shall see in the next chapter, the words of institution at the last supper do expound a soteriological interpretation of Jesus' impending death for the disciples. In one sense, this might pose a difficulty to the proposed explanation for the Lukan omission of the ransom saying, since Luke's disciples have in fact been exposed to the soteriological significance of Jesus' death prior to the resurrection. However, a few considerations must be kept in mind at this point.

First, the purpose of the words of institution differs significantly from the purpose of the ransom saying in their respective contexts. As we have seen, the ransom saying is presented in Mark and Matthew as instruction that aims to correct the misunderstanding of the disciples by explaining Jesus' final passion prediction (Mark 10:32–34; Matt 20:17–19). Responding to a conflict over greatness between the disciples that arises immediately after the third passion prediction, the ransom saying appeals to the soteriological purpose of Jesus' impending destiny in order to show how humble suffering lies at the heart of Jesus' fulfillment of his mission. By contrast, the words of institution are not presented as a corrective explanation of prior instruction that the disciples have failed to understand. In fact, conflict among the disciples immediately follows rather than precedes the Lukan institution narrative, showing that the disciples still have not grasped their teacher's instruction (Luke 22:24–27), and Luke refrains from introducing the ransom saying at this point in order to address the disciples' dissension. Thus, the ransom saying is uniquely situated as a direct response to the dissonance between Jesus and the disciples regarding the place of Jesus' suffering within his christological mission, and as such the ransom saying presents a unique problem to Luke's epistemological framework for the disciples in a way that the last supper does not.

Moreover, the context of the ransom saying differs from that of the institution narrative in another important respect: The ransom saying occurs prior to Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, in the sections of Mark and Matthew that are focused primarily upon Jesus' instruction to the disciples. At this earlier stage of Jesus' ministry, the surprising character of Jesus' christological vocation is one of the leading themes of Jesus' instruction, as Jesus seeks to redefine the christological expectations of the disciples. Hence, all three synoptic gospels contain the repeated passion predictions in this stage of the narrative. Within the synoptic framework of Jesus' ministry, the entry into Jerusalem marks a significant shift. The period of training for the disciples draws to an end, and the narrative comes to focus upon the escalating conflict that culminates in the passion narrative, which begins in earnest with Jesus' meal in the upper room. It is here that

we find the words of institution in Luke's gospel, after Judas has already consented to betray Jesus (Luke 22:3 – 5), and the sequence of events leading to Jesus' death has already commenced.[62] The time of training for the disciples has passed, and the time of testing has begun (Luke 22:28 – 34, 39, 45 – 46, 53). This difference in context between the ransom saying and the words of institution underscores how the eucharistic words are situated outside that part of the synoptic framework that emphasizes Jesus' instruction to the disciples concerning the place of his suffering within his christological vocation.

IV. Conclusion

The pre-passion anticipations of the death of Jesus do not specify the precise nature of the soteriological effect of Jesus' death. However, the distinctively Lukan aspects of the anticipatory allusions to Jesus' fate of suffering do characterize the passion event as a divine necessity within Jesus' christological mission, a seminal moment in salvation-history that will bring one era of the divine plan to a close while inaugurating the dawn of another. Thus, the anticipatory allusions to Jesus' tragic destiny establish the general importance of the event within the divine plan of salvation, and it remains for the rest of Luke's work to reveal precisely how the cross functions in such a pivotal salvation-historical role. In this way, the present chapter prepares the way for a consideration of the more substantive descriptions of the death of Jesus in the passion narrative proper as well as the later references to the death of Jesus found at the end of Luke's gospel and throughout the book of Acts.

Too often the anticipatory passion references in Luke have been considered only with regard to what they lack, and the absence of the synoptic ransom saying has been taken as a reflection of Luke's lack of interest in the soteriological significance of the cross. I have instead proposed that the omission of the ransom saying is better explained by Luke's intense interest in the epistemological transformation of the disciples through the resurrection appearances. Like any attempt to account for a single redactional omission, this new proposal regarding the ransom saying is admittedly speculative. To some degree, it will stand or fall upon whether subsequent chapters succeed in demonstrating the intrinsic soteriological significance of the cross in Lukan thought. At the very least, the

62 The impression that the passion has already begun is reinforced by the present tense of the verbs and participles in the words of institution (Lk 22:19b-20) and Jesus' statement of fulfillment in Lk 22:37.

proposed explanation has the strength of accounting for the omission in terms of the most distinguishing features of Luke's anticipatory passion references, explaining what is absent in terms of what is most obviously present. The conventional minimalist explanation, on the other hand, is somewhat circular: Luke allegedly omits the ransom saying because he is uninterested in the notion of atonement, yet the omission of the ransom saying is typically cited as the strongest piece of evidence for Luke's lack of interest in atonement theology.

Chapter 3 – The Lukan Last Supper: Text and Interpretation

I. Introduction

The salvation-historical necessity of Jesus' fate of rejection is repeatedly highlighted in the anticipatory references to the passion, yet the precise soteriological meaning of Jesus' death is left undeveloped in the early parts of Luke's gospel. While Luke insists that Jesus' messianic vocation is closely bound up with his tragic destiny, readers are left to wonder how Jesus' death functions soteriologically within the divine plan of salvation. Jesus' words over the bread and the wine in the upper room in Luke 22:19b – 20 are addressed to exactly such concerns, offering a decisive soteriological interpretation of Jesus' impending crucifixion.

However, many interpreters have questioned whether Jesus' eucharistic words are actually original to Luke's gospel, as the Lukan institution narrative entails perhaps the most infamous text-critical dilemma in Luke-Acts. While the vast majority of manuscripts include the words of institution found in verses 19b – 20, Codex Bezae, along with a few Old Latin and Syriac witnesses, presents a shorter reading that lacks the explanation of the bread and the presentation and explanation of a second cup found in these verses.[1] The long and short readings of the Lukan institution narrative are set forth below, and as can be seen, the presence or absence of the longer reading is bound to exert a determinative influence on our understanding of Luke's attitude toward the cross.

Table 7 – Long and Short Readings of the Lukan Last Supper

Luke 22:17 – 20 – Long Reading	Luke 22:17 – 19a – Short Reading
καὶ δεξάμενος ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας εἶπεν· λάβετε τοῦτο καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς· [18] λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, [ὅτι] οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως οὗ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ. [19] καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων· τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν	καὶ δεξάμενος ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας εἶπεν· λάβετε τοῦτο καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς· [18] λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν, [ὅτι] οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως οὗ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ. [19] καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων· τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου

1 The manuscript evidence is set forth neatly in Metzger (1994: 148 – 149). Six different forms of the passage are attested in the manuscripts, though four of the variant readings are surely secondary to the longer and shorter readings.

Table 7 – Long and Short Readings of the Lukan Last Supper *(Continued)*

Luke 22:17–20 – Long Reading	Luke 22:17–19a – Short Reading
διδόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. [20] καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, λέγων· τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον.	

If Luke 22:19b-20 are original, then Luke's gospel contains a profound soteriological interpretation of the death of Jesus, pronounced by Jesus himself to his closest followers on the eve of his passion. If the words of institution were not originally present in Luke's gospel, then the Lukan last supper would lack the "for you" (ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν) statements over the bread and the wine, and any hint of a redemptive significance in the symbolism of the meal would come solely by virtue of its Passover context. Therefore, an exegetical analysis of the passage must be preceded by a consideration of the relative merits of the long and short forms of the text, and so the present chapter will seek to establish the text of Luke 22:15–20 before turning to its interpretation.

II. The Text of Luke 22:15–20

Although the external evidence would seem to favor the longer reading which includes Jesus' words over the bread and the wine, Westcott and Hort place verses 19b-20 in double brackets of uncertainty, noting that the passage belongs to a group of Western readings that they classify as "Western non-interpolations."[2] This somewhat tortuous moniker refers to a series of passages in which the Western text-type differs from other text-types by preserving shorter readings against the general tendency of the Western text to present longer readings in comparison to the other text-types. In such instances, Westcott and Hort argue that the reading must be determined by internal and transcriptional probabilities rather than by the weight of the manuscript evidence, since the uncharacteristically shortened Western text may reflect the original reading against the majority of witnesses.[3]

2 Westcott and Hort (1881: 175–177).

3 Westcott and Hort identify 27 possible Western non-interpolations and favor the Western text on the basis of internal grounds in nine instances, eight of which occur toward the end of Luke (Matt 27:49; Lk 22:19–20; 24:3, 6, 12, 36, 40, 51, 52). For a critique of Westcott and Hort's

Since the time of Westcott and Hort, many have followed the lead of these two influential interpreters and concluded on the basis of internal and transcriptional probabilities that the shorter rather than the longer reading is to be preferred. However, the external evidence ought not to be dismissed prematurely. Codex Bezae is the lone Greek manuscript attesting to the shorter reading. Aside from D, the shorter reading is also attested in several Old Latin manuscripts (it$^{a\ d\ ff2\ l\ l}$), and two other Old Latin manuscripts (it$^{b\ e}$) also lack the words of institution while adapting the order of verses 17 – 19. Likewise, one Syriac witness (syr^{c}) omits verse 20 and also places verses 17 – 18 after verse 19.[4] The other Old Syriac witnesses attest to some form of a longer reading, though with some variation.[5] On the whole, then, the Western witnesses do favor the shorter reading which omits the words of institution.

However, Western support for the shorter reading is not unanimous,[6] and the various witnesses to the shorter reading all likely trace back to a common origin:[7] D, it^{e}, and syr^{c} represent the three attested variations of the shorter reading.[8] However, each of these witnesses omits καί from v. 17b and τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ from v. 22, which strongly suggests a close connection between these three witnesses in this passage, since all other witnesses aside from syr^{s} contain these elements. Hence, the variations of the shorter reading are likely three shoots from a common stem.[9] As for the rest of the witnesses to the shorter reading, D and it^{d} are two sides of the same codex. The rest of the Old Latin witnesses to the shorter reading (it$^{a\ ff2\ l\ l}$) attest to the dissemination of the shorter text within the Latin tradition, but they all likely trace back to the same exemplar reflect-

proposal, see Jeremias (1966: 145); Snodgrass (1972: 374 – 378). Though he initially favored the shorter reading at Lk 22:15 – 20, Jeremias eventually became the foremost proponent of the longer reading.

4 However, syr^{c} does contain Jesus' words over the bread in verse 19 (τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν).

5 In syr^{p}, verses 17 – 18 are omitted while verses 19 – 20 are preserved, and syr^{s} adapts both the sequence and the language of verse 20 in such a way that it is unclear whether this witness should be taken as attestation for the shorter or the longer reading. See Schürmann (1951: 371 – 375). For a discussion of the various adaptations of the shorter form of the text, see Schürmann (1951: 366 – 381); Sellner (2007: 440 – 442).

6 A few Old Latin manuscripts which elsewhere attest to pre-Vulgate readings contain the words of institution (it$^{c\ q\ r1}$), and syr^{s}, an earlier form of the Syriac text than syr^{c}, attests to some form of a longer reading (see n. 5 above).

7 See Sellner (2007: 441).

8 See above paragraph.

9 In all likelihood, the adapted order in it^{e} and syr^{c} reflects a correction of the order of the cup and bread as it is found in the original shorter reading. By placing verse 19 before verses 17 – 18, these witnesses bring the sequence into conformity with the parallel institution accounts.

ed in D and it^{d}, given the close similarity between each of these witnesses in this passage. Hence, support for the shorter reading is early but limited, confined to one strand of the Western text-type.[10]

This contrasts markedly with the widespread early support for the longer reading that preserves the Lukan words of institution. All Greek witnesses aside from D attest in one way or another to the longer reading. This includes $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$, the earliest available Greek witness (c. 200 CE), as well as important witnesses such as ℵ A B C K L W X Δ Θ Π Ψ 063 f^{1} and f^{13}. Moreover, the longer reading is found in the Coptic (cop$^{sa\ bo}$), Armenian, and Georgian versions. In terms of both dating and genealogical diversity, the manuscript support for the longer reading is superior to that for the shorter reading. For the shorter reading to be original, one must suppose that every Greek manuscript except for D preserves a corrupted form of the text in which the words of institution were added to the passage.[11] Since $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ contains the longer reading, this corruption must have been introduced at a very early stage and then reproduced throughout the transmission of the text, with only Codex Bezae, a bilingual Greek and Latin manuscript,[12] surviving among the Greek witnesses as evidence of the uncorrupted reading.[13] Such a process of transmission is unlikely, and given the manuscript evidence for the

10 Following Westcott and Hort, Ehrman argues that since both the shorter and longer reading were likely available to scribes in the second century, the matter must be resolved purely by internal and transcriptional probabilities (1993: 198 – 199). This line of reasoning unduly downplays the narrow attestation for the shorter reading in the Western text-type in contrast to the wide and, at the very least, equally early attestation for the longer reading. The way in which Ehrman places the shorter reading on equal footing with the longer reading in the second century is also somewhat questionable, since it is difficult to reconstruct the earliest translation and transmission of the Old Latin text (see Petzer [1995: 120 – 123]). The exemplar upon which the witnesses to the shorter reading rely may well go back to the 2nd century, yet this is surely more speculative than the extant evidence of $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ in support of the longer reading.

11 Jeremias (1966: 144).

12 In fact, the *nomina sacra* in D indicate that the manuscript was produced by a Latin scribe, since the Latin text follows contemporary practice, whereas the Greek text preserves archaic convention (Parker [1992: 104]).

13 Several scholars view $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ as decisive in establishing the originality of the longer reading (Fitzmyer [1962: 177]; Aland [1967: 155 – 172]; Snodgrass [1972: 372 – 378]). However, this papyrus fragment closely agrees with Codex Vaticanus and thus likely belongs to the same Alexandrian text-type (Edwards [1976: 211]). Consequently, for possible Western non-interpolations, the attestation of an earlier form of the Alexandrian textual tradition does not necessarily prove that the short readings preserved in the Western tradition are secondary, since the Alexandrian text-type attests to the longer readings anyway. Rather, the evidence from $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ can only show that if the shorter reading in Lk 22:15 – 20 is original, then the longer reading must have been introduced by the time of $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$, since it is attested there. See Ehrman (1993: 224 – 225).

longer reading, only a very strong argument on other grounds would merit a preference for the shorter text.

1. Addressing Arguments in Support of the Short Form of the Text

Ideological Argument

Advocates of the short form of the text have most strongly set forth three basic arguments in support of their position. First, an ideological explanation posits that the longer form of the text is not in keeping with Luke's general avoidance of atonement theology.[14] Thus, the shorter text more closely conforms to Luke's theological perspective, and the longer reading likely arose within the context of second century chistological debates against docetism in order to demonstrate the true physicality of Jesus in his life and crucifixion, and thereby to prove the efficacy of the atonement.[15]

As the preceding history of research has shown, the notion of a Lukan aversion toward the concept of atonement is itself a contentious issue, and many interpreters would not be willing to concede that the longer reading of the Lukan institution narrative is out of place within Luke's soteriological perspective. However, even if a minimalist interpretation of the Lukan cross outside of Luke 22:15 – 20 is granted for the sake of argument, problems still arise with this ideological appeal for the short form of the text.

The evidence for widespread, ideologically driven interpolations into the text of the gospels is ambiguous. The general tendency of the earliest scribes may well have been to omit rather than to add,[16] and the need for a text to provide ideological support for an orthodox or heterodox position was typically addressed through creative methods of interpretation rather than through textual emendation.[17] Indeed, the attempt to add to the text to support a particular doctrinal position would be perilous within a polemical context, since one's interlocutors might recognize the interpolation and expose it as secondary to the original text.[18] While the transmission of the NT does reflect certain instances of emendations prompted by christological concerns, on the whole the process of the transmission of the text appears to have been relatively conservative in

14 Rese (1975: 27); Ehrman (1993: 199 – 204). Parker is also persuaded by Ehrman's proposal (1997: 156 – 157).

15 Ehrman (1993: 209); Matson (2001: 180 – 184).

16 Consider the critique of a preference for shorter readings in Royse (2008: 705 – 719).

17 Wisse (1989: 46 – 47).

18 Head (1993: 125).

this regard.[19] Scribes were not authors or editors, but copyists attempting to reproduce a given exemplar. As such, the ideological argument for the short form of the last supper assumes an unrealistic level of exegetical attentiveness and theological ingenuity on the part of scribes.[20]

In addition, the particular suggestion that the longer reading of Luke 22:19b-20 arose as an anti-docetic interpolation in the second century is suspect. The full humanity of Christ presented difficulties not just for heretics but also for orthodox readers of scripture.[21] Furthermore, even in its short form, the Lukan text would still demonstrate the true physicality of Jesus through its reference to Jesus' body in Luke 22:19a, so that it is unclear what unique anti-docetic contribution is made by the longer reading. Hence, the ideological argument for the short form of Luke 22:15 – 20 is not strong enough to overturn the clear manuscript evidence in support of the longer reading.[22]

---

19 Billings (2006: 53 – 56). Martin argues that the seven Western non-interpolations in Luke 24 preserve original readings and that the Alexandrian expansions in these passages all reflect an anti-separationist christological concern to prove that the post-resurrection Jesus was the same physical man as the Jesus who was crucified. See Martin (2005: 273 – 293). If Martin is correct, then there might be some evidence of widespread scribal emendation rooted in ideological concerns. However, the anti-separationist reasons behind this ideologically driven emendation of the text in Luke 24 are different from the alleged reasons behind the scribal interpolation in Lk 22:19b-20, so at most Martin's work would offer only indirect support for the ideological arguments in favor of the shorter reading in Luke 22.

20 See Schmid (2008: 3 – 9). Though advocates for the shorter reading, Westcott and Hort reject the notion of ideologically driven scribal emendations (1881: 282) and therefore favor the shorter reading primarily on the basis of other internal probabilities (1881: Appendix I, p. 63 – 64) – primarily the alleged similarity between the longer reading and other NT institution accounts (see below, p. 77, n. 41; also p. 92 – 93).

21 For example, Epiphanius in the fourth century states that orthodox scribes removed Lk 22:43 – 44, a passage that similarly demonstrates the true humanity of Jesus, on the basis of christological concerns (*Ancoratus* 31). See Head (1993: 107, 125).

22 For an additional critique of Ehrman's argument, see Schmid (1999: 579 – 580). Schmid points out that Ehrman's argument for the lack of an atonement theology in Luke depends upon his claim that Luke's placement of the temple veil *before* the death of Jesus reflects a Lukan avoidance of the notion of atonement. Yet, Codex Bezae, the lone Greek manuscript attesting to the short form of the text at Lk 22:15 – 20, places the tearing of the veil *after* the death of Jesus at Lk 23:45 – 47, in harmony with the other synoptic gospels. Thus, Ehrman's ideological argument makes the problem of the manuscript evidence even more acute, since by Ehrman's own criteria there is no extant Greek witness for Luke that does not contain the concept of atonement at one point or another.

Literary Argument

A second argument in support of the short form of the Lukan institution narrative involves a literary appeal to Lukan style and the surrounding context of the passage. From this perspective, the language of verses 19b-20 does not conform to Luke's vocabulary or grammatical style and therefore must be secondary.[23] Certainly much of the vocabulary of the longer reading is relatively rare within the Lukan corpus. However, the same criticism could apply to the immediately preceding verses, Luke 22:17 – 19a, and the language of the institution narratives in Matthew, Mark, and 1 Cor 11:24 – 26 is also stylistically foreign to each of those contexts.[24] Therefore, the distinctive style of the eucharistic blessing most likely reflects the liturgical nature of the institution narrative rather than the corruption of the text by a later scribe. As such, the non-Lukan style of 22:19b-20 cannot provide any real indication of the originality of the shorter or longer form of the Lukan institution narrative.[25]

In addition to the appeal to the non-Lukan style of verses 19b-20, the literary argument for the shorter reading suggests that the surrounding context of the Lukan institution narrative more naturally fits with the short form of the text. Hence, Vööbus calls attention to how the passage focuses on the presence of Jesus with his disciples in the Eucharist, arguing that the longer reading detracts from this focus by diverting attention to the sacrificial nature of Jesus' death.[26] Rese argues differently, contending that verses 21 and 27 presuppose that the meal is still taking place, whereas verse 20 explicitly mentions the end of the meal (μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι).[27] Additionally, both Rese and Ehrman argue in different ways that the strong adversative πλήν at the beginning of verse 21 fits more naturally with the shorter than with the longer reading. For Rese, the shorter reading establishes a contrast between those who share in the eschatological banquet (22:16, 18) and the betrayer who will be excluded from that blessing (22:21).[28] For Ehrman, πλήν is used as a structural marker in verses 21 and 22 in order to establish a parallelism between verses 15 – 18 and 19a-22.[29] This parallelism is preserved in the shorter reading but lost in the long form of the text.

---

23 Rese (1975: 30); Ehrman (1993: 199).

24 See the comparative analysis in Petzer (1991: 121 – 128).

25 Du Plessis (1994: 530).

26 Vööbus (1969: 457 – 462).

27 Rese (1975: 29).

28 Rese (1975: 29).

29 Ehrman (1993: 206). Conversely, Schürmann (1951: 386 – 387) contends that πλήν most naturally relates to the ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν statements of verses 19b-20, so that the adversative serves to exclude the traitor from those who receive the blessings pronounced by Jesus. Alternatively,

The very diversity of appeals to context reflects the way in which literary arguments for a particular textual variant can be highly subjective. No two advocates of the shorter reading agree as to the specific stylistic factors which support their conclusion, and some of the stylistic appeals are incompatible with one another.[30] Furthermore, for every argument supporting the shorter reading on the basis of contextual factors, an argument could be produced in favor of the longer reading. Hence, an initial glance at the development of 22:15 – 20 seems to reveal a structural parallelism in which comments about eating and drinking (22:15 – 18) or bread and cup (22:19 – 20) are followed by corresponding explanations of the symbolic actions. The statement about eating in verses 15 – 16 is paralleled by Jesus' word over the bread in verse 19, and the statement about drinking in verses 17 – 18 is paralleled by Jesus' word over the cup in verse 20. Thus, an alternating pattern of statement and explanation can be traced from verse 15 to the end of verse 20.[31] Also, the use of διατίθημι in 22:29 seems to connect naturally with the reference to the covenant in Jesus' blood in 22:20 (cf. Exod 24:8), a connection which is lost with the short form of the text.

Other contextual connections could be adduced in support of the longer reading,[32] yet this would only belabor the point that no single contextual factor is especially determinative for proving the originality of either the short or the long form of the text, a point which Ehrman seems willing to acknowledge.[33] In view of the strong manuscript support for the long form of the Lukan institution narrative, the literary arguments for the shorter reading are insufficient to overturn the probability of the longer reading on the basis of external evidence.

Transcriptional Probability

Perhaps the most significant argument supporting the short form of the Lukan institution narrative is the notion that it is easier to explain how the longer reading arose from the shorter text than to show how the short text arose from the long one. A foundational maxim of textual criticism is that a satisfactory reading

---

the contrast may lie in the juxtaposition of the selfish and disloyal traitor against Jesus, the self-giving one who serves at the table.

30 The proposals of Rese and Ehrman, for example, interpret the structure of the passage and the function of πλήν in two irreconcilable ways.

31 See Petzer (1984: 249 – 252); also Weren (1981: 14 – 15).

32 In particular, one might cite the stylistic and contextual parallels between Acts 20:28 and Lk 22:20 as evidence in favor of the reading that preserves a soteriological interpretation of Jesus' death (see below, p. 153).

33 Ehrman (1993: 204 – 205).

is one which accounts for all the others, so that the lack of a cogent explanation for the short reading if it is secondary is taken as the strongest evidence for its originality.[34]

While an explanation for the omission of verses 19b – 20 may not be as readily apparent as an explanation for their addition by a scribe, plausible accounts for the omission can be adduced. For instance, Billings has argued that the omission of verses 19b – 20 likely arose during a period of intense persecution during the second century. On account of their celebration of the Eucharist, Christians were accused of cannibalism, and the omission of Luke 22:19b – 20 served to prevent the text of Luke from being used as evidence corroborating this charge.[35] Epp has called attention to some weak points involving specific geographic details of Billings' proposal regarding Codex Bezae's provenance.[36] At a more general level, however, Billings' work furnishes a plausible sociological explanation for the omission of Luke 22:19b – 20.[37]

Alternatively, one might appeal more directly to the distinctive context into which Luke has placed the institution narrative: The sequence of Luke's narrative uniquely places the prediction of Judas' betrayal after the eucharistic blessing (Luke 22:21 – 23; cf. Mark 14:18 – 21; Matt 26:21 – 25), which thus implies that Judas was included in the ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν of the Lukan words of institution. This could furnish a plausible impetus for the omission of 22:19b-20, by which a scribe would have been able to remove any hint of blessing for Judas.[38]

Or perhaps one might favor the more straightforward explanation that the disputed verses were omitted to remove mention of a second cup, thereby bringing the passage into closer conformity with parallels elsewhere in the NT. This explanation contains the problem that the shorter reading still reverses the

34 Ehrman (1993: 207 – 209).

35 Billings (2006: 171 – 174). See also Billings (2006: 512 – 525).

36 Epp (2009: 413 – 415). Billings argues that a localized persecution in Lyon during the second century served as the impetus for the omission of Lk 22:19b-20 attested in D. This relies upon the assumption that Codex Bezae originated from Gaul, a presupposition that has fallen out of favor within recent text-critical scholarship. See Parker (1992: 261 – 262).

37 One might potentially object that if the omission of Lk 22:19b-20 arose on account of persecution, why do Mark and Matthew not attest to a corresponding omission? On the other hand, the shorter readings of the Old Latin and Syriac suggest that the omission reflected in D must date back to a fairly early stage of transmission, a time in which manuscripts of the gospels may have been transcribed individually rather than in collections.

38 Mittmann-Richert (2008: 118). That the inclusion of Judas in the Eucharistic blessing was likely a concern for some scribes may be reflected in the transmission of Luke 22:14, where many manuscripts preserve variants which avoid the implication that Judas was an apostle. For a discussion of the variants, see Parker (1997: 150).

bread-cup sequence and preserves the less familiar words over the cup in verse 17 rather than the more familiar words of verse 20 (cf. Mark 14:22–25; Matt 26:26–29; 1 Cor 11:24–25). However, $it^{b, e}$ and syr^{c}, key witnesses to the shorter reading, do in fact transpose verse 19 with verses 17–18 in order to bring the passage into greater conformity with the bread-cup sequence of parallel accounts. Thus, a harmonistic tendency is undeniably present within some of the witnesses to the short form of the text, and so the harmonistic explanation for the origin of the shorter reading ought not to be dismissed out of hand.

Though no single explanation for the secondary character of the shorter reading is without problems, the explanations for the scribal production of the longer reading are also susceptible to critique. Indeed, if the addition of verses 19b–20 reflects an anti-docetic concern to prove the physicality of Jesus and the efficacy of the atonement, then it is peculiar that the transmission history of Luke's gospel does not reflect a more widespread tendency to emend the text to address these same ideological concerns. Is it likely that a scribe who was willing to introduce a lengthy interpolation into the Lukan institution narrative for ideological purposes would have refrained from producing similar interpolations elsewhere in the third gospel? Just a few verses later, for instance, the scribe apparently refrained from adapting Luke 22:27 to conform to the explicit atonement theology found in the synoptic ransom saying (cf. Mark 10:45; Matt 20:28). One might doubt that a scribe so bold as to interpolate into the last supper scene would have felt constrained to a conservative preservation of the text at other points in the gospel. If, then, a scribe has added 22:19b–20 for ideological purposes, much more could have been done to bolster his anti-docetic polemic.

If, on the other hand, the purpose behind the addition of verses 19b-20 was to harmonize Luke's account with the other NT institution narratives,[39] the scribal redactor would surely have amended the text of 22:15–19a more thoroughly, either by removing the reference to a cup before the bread in order to conform to the sequence of all other NT institution accounts, or by transferring the eschatological statements to the end of the passage in order to conform to the synoptic parallels (cf. Mark 14:25; Matt 26:29), or at least by making minor adaptations to the language of verses 17–19a to bring the many unique elements of this institution account into closer conformity with parallel passages. Why has the scribe chosen simply to add to the text at this one point, and why has the redactor stopped with a single interpolation in the midst of a pericope containing many other elements which could be harmonized to NT parallels? If a scribe has added

39 See, for example, Parker (1997: 152–155).

22:19b-20 in order to harmonize the text with parallel accounts in the NT, much of the work of harmonization has been left undone.

These criticisms of some of the popular explanations for the scribal addition of Luke 22:19b – 20 do not conclusively demonstrate the originality of any particular variant in this passage. Nonetheless, they do show that every explanation of the variants in the institution narrative comes with its own set of problems, and any appeal to transcriptional probability contains a significant element of subjectivity.[40] The preference for that reading which best explains all others must therefore be coordinated with other important factors to determine the most likely reading. In the case of the Lukan institution narrative, ideological, literary, and transcriptional considerations do not present conclusive evidence for the short or long form of the text, yet the overwhelming external evidence in support of the longer reading suggests that in all probability Luke 22:19b – 20 was part of the original passage as it was penned by Luke.

2. Summary

The manuscript support for the longer reading of the Lukan last supper is ultimately more compelling than the strongest arguments which have been adduced in favor of the shorter reading of the text. The clear and consistent inclusion of Luke 22:19b – 20 among almost all the Greek manuscripts contrasts markedly with the scant and unstable transmission of various shorter readings within part of the Western tradition. If the longer reading is secondary, then we must suppose that (1) a copyist spontaneously noticed the abbreviated form of the Lukan last supper, (2) felt compelled to add substantially to the text at just this point, (3) proceeded to formulate a new version of the words of institution that would uniquely fit its Lukan context,[41] and (4) discretely introduced this

40 As Bovon (2012: 156) frankly states, "As one can see, the arguments cancel one another, and no solution is really convincing."

41 As we shall see shortly, multiple differences in wording and sequence exist between the Lukan words of institution and the Markan and Pauline versions of Jesus' words over the bread and cup (see below p. 92 – 93). This is significant with regard to the originality of the longer reading, for the disagreements between Luke 22:19b-20 and the other institution accounts are sufficient to demonstrate that the longer reading is not merely an interpolation borrowed from Pauline tradition. If a scribe has introduced the longer reading into the text, that scribe has taken care to adapt the language and sequence of the words of institution to fit its immediate context in Luke's gospel. Indeed, the transmission history of Luke 22:20 reflects the tendency of scribes to adapt the Lukan sequence to more closely conform to parallel traditions (see below, p. 92, n. 88). In this regard, some prominent advocates of the shorter reading unduly

emendation to the text with such success that it gained nearly universal acceptance throughout the history of transmission. While such a process of transmission is not impossible, it is unlikely, and the dubious internal evidence marshaled against the originality of the longer reading is insufficient to overturn the more likely conclusion that the Lukan last supper ought to include the words of institution found in Luke 22:19b – 20.

III. Interpretation of Luke 22:15 – 20

Having affirmed the originality of the longer form of the Lukan institution narrative, I will now consider its interpretation. The Lukan last supper is positioned within the final, climactic discourse of Jesus with his disciples prior to his arrest, trial, and crucifixion (Luke 22:14 – 38). Grand biblical themes of redemption and covenant, eschatological expectation and cultic offering converge in the space of a few verses, as Jesus illuminates his impending suffering and death through a series of symbolic acts and interpretations. As the last and most explicit pre-passion reference to the death of Jesus, the scene bears pivotal significance for any interpretation of the Lukan cross.

I will begin by surveying the diverse strands of biblical tradition at play within Luke 22:15 – 20. Then, I will consider the meaning which this passage attaches to the death of Jesus. Finally, the chapter will close by evaluating whether the institution narrative can be understood as a genuine expression of the Lukan perspective toward the death of Christ, given that Luke was to a certain extent constrained by tradition to include this episode on the eve of the passion.

1. Strands of Biblical Tradition in the Lukan Last Supper

Luke's institution narrative resounds with echoes of many of the key events and salvation-historical expectations recorded in the scriptures of Israel. Because of the way in which these strands of biblical tradition intermingle throughout the last supper scene, the present exposition will adopt a thematic rather than sequential approach, identifying and treating the major traditions which permeate Luke 22:15 – 20 in turn.

---

minimize the differences between the longer reading and the Pauline institution account, and this is a key factor in their preference for the shorter reading (see Westcott and Hort [1881: Appendix I, p. 63 – 64]; Parker [1997: 152 – 155]).

Passover

Scholarship has tirelessly debated whether the final meal of the historical Jesus with his disciples was actually a Passover *seder*,[42] yet within Luke's narrative there can be no doubt that the meal is to be understood with reference to the celebration of the Passover feast. The introduction to the meal in Luke 22:7 – 14 unambiguously establishes the Passover context of the passage. The meal takes place on the day of unleavened bread, on which it was necessary to slaughter τὸ πάσχα (Luke 22:7). Peter and John are sent to prepare τὸ πάσχα (22:8), which they dutifully make ready in accordance with Jesus' instructions (22:13). Moreover, Jesus' first statement at the table – ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν μεθ' ὑμῶν πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν (22:15) – explicitly identifies this final meal as a *seder*.

The wordplay in 22:15 between τὸ πάσχα and the verbal root πάσχω further intimates a connection between the passion and the Passover, and many have attempted to interpret the institution narrative against the background of the customary progression of the Passover feast during the first century.[43] Hence, the two cups in 22:17, 20 are understood in relation to the four cups of the *seder*, and the symbolic acts of Jesus are identified precisely with the steps of the *seder* ritual. Ultimately, the attempt to designate each activity and expression in the institution narrative with a corresponding act in the Passover ritual may be somewhat superfluous for the interpretation of the passage.[44] The scene itself contains little that is unique to the *seder* in comparison to other first century Jewish meals,[45] and the Passover undertones would seem to retain the same basic meaning regardless of whether each aspect of the scene corresponds with precision to a particular element of the Passover feast. The matter of importance for Luke is that the meal is a Passover, and as such the scene evokes the remembrance of God's saving act in the Exodus.

---

42 See, for example, the recent discussions in Klawans (2001: 24 – 33); McKnight (2006: 262 – 272).

43 Consider the detailed reconstructions of the Passover *seder* in Cohn-Sherbok (1981: 704 – 709); Routledge (2002: 203 – 221); McKnight (2006: 256). Reconstructions depend upon biblical material (e. g., Exod 12 – 13; 23:14 – 17; Num 9:1 – 14; 28:16 – 24; Deut 16), post-biblical Jewish sources (e. g., *Jubilees* 49; Philo, *Spec.* 2.145 – 175; Josephus, *A.J.* 3.248 – 251), and especially the more detailed rabbinic descriptions of the meal (e. g., *mPes* 10:1 – 7).

44 Nolland (1989: 3.1047).

45 Note the criticisms of Gese (1981: 123 – 124); Hofius (1989: 211 – 213); Theobald (2006: 158 – 159). The Passover context is helpful, however, in explaining the presence of two cups in the Lukan scene.

At a general level, then, the Passover context of the scene is critically informative. The Passover celebration serves to bracket the public ministry of Jesus.[46] As at the beginning of his appearance among his people (Luke 2:41–42), so at the end Jesus journeys to Jerusalem and celebrates the Passover, this time with his surrogate family, the apostles (Luke 22:14; cf. Luke 8:19–21). Within Jewish tradition, the Passover feast commemorated the liberation of Israel from bondage to Egypt, celebrating the Lord's redeeming activity on behalf of his people through an act of remembrance (Exod 12:13–14; Deut 16:3; *Jub.* 49:7; Philo *Spec.* 2.146; cf. Luke 22:19).[47] As such, participants experienced anew the past action of God as a present reality.[48] Furthermore, Passover naturally became associated with the eschatological deliverance of the people of God.[49] Thus, Jer 38:8 LXX anticipates that the eschatological ingathering and establishment of the new covenant will take place ἐν ἑορτῇ φασεκ,[50] and Josephus repeatedly attests to a connection between Passover and periods of political tumult in Jerusalem,[51] perhaps a reflection of the heightened anticipation of deliverance and undertones of liberation that accompanied the festival at the turn of the era.

This arch from the past, through the present, and into the future is reflected in the Passover liturgy, as the Hallel Psalms (Ps 113–118) were sung over the course of the meal.[52] These Psalms progress from the remembrance of God's act of deliverance in the Exodus (Ps 114:1 f.), through to an expression of praise and devotion in response to the Lord's mercy (Ps 115–117; esp. Ps 116:13; cf. Luke 22:20), and into the messianic overtures and expectations of eschatological salvation in Psalm 118 (see esp. Ps 118:22–23, 26; cf. Luke 19:38; 20:17–18).[53] The celebration of Passover therefore entailed a participatory identification with Israel's past experience of redemption and present expectation for future deliverance. Jesus evokes these same themes at the last supper, instituting a ritual of remembrance (Luke 22:19) while looking forward to the arrival of the eschatological kingdom of God (22:16, 18).

46 Theobald (2006: 136–137).

47 Kosmala (1960: 90).

48 Routledge (2002: 217).

49 Jeremias (1966: 58–60).

50 Theobald (2006: 163). This may account for the connection between Passover and new covenant in the NT institution narratives (see Hagene [2003: 289]).

51 Consider *A.J.* 17.213–218; 20.106; *War* 2.10–13, 223–227; 5.98–105.

52 *mPes* 10:5–7.

53 Mittmann-Richert (2008: 143–144). Rabbinic sources amply attest to the messianic interpretation of Psalm 116–118, though caution must be employed regarding the dating of such interpretive traditions. For a list of rabbinic references in which the Hallel Psalms receive an eschatological interpretation, see Jeremias (1966: 256–257); Cohn-Sherbok (1981: 706–707).

In this context, Jesus' presentation of the bread and wine function as symbolic acts through which he re-interprets the elements of the Passover meal with specific reference to his death.[54] The bread is now understood as a symbol of his body; the cup is taken metonymically as a symbol for its contents, Jesus' blood.[55] Accordingly, Jesus instructs his disciples to do this (i. e., to perform these ritual acts over the bread) "in my remembrance," an injunction which itself draws upon the vital importance of remembrance in the Passover feast (Luke 22:19; cf. *Jub.* 49:7 – 8). This feast ritual, which the Israelites were enjoined to perform in remembrance of God's past act of deliverance for his people (Exod 12:13 – 14; 13:3, 8 – 9; Deut 16:3), is now to be performed in remembrance of Jesus' self-giving act on behalf of his own.[56] In this manner, the feast of Passover and the event which it commemorates are interpreted by the Lukan Jesus as typological precursors to the last supper and the event which it symbolically enacts (i. e., Jesus' death), as numerous interpreters of Luke's institution narrative have affirmed.[57]

Moreover, this typological correspondence between Passover and passion, *seder* and supper, is distinctively focalized by Luke. The other synoptic evangelists lack the remembrance formula (cf. Mark 14:22; Matt 26:26), and Paul's institution narrative lacks explicit reference to the Passover context of the meal (1 Cor

54 Jesus' administration of the supper is to be understood against the background of the symbolic actions performed by the OT prophets (cf. Ezek 5; Jer 19:1 – 15). See Beck (1970: 193 – 195).

55 Lichtenberger (1996: 222 – 223). A minority of interpreters suggest that σῶμα in this passage cannot be limited to the crucifixion of Jesus' body but must refer instead to the entirety of his life. Such an interpretation misconstrues the nature of Jesus' symbolic activity. Just as the bread has been broken, so too will the body of Jesus be broken; just as the cup has been poured out, so too will be his blood. The reference is specifically to Jesus' death. For the minority position, see Büchele (1978: 168 – 169); Böttrich (2005: 424 – 425); Sellner (2007: 446 – 452).

56 The remembrance clause has been interpreted differently by Jeremias (1966: 248 – 250), who argues that the agent of remembrance is not the disciples but God, who is compelled to remember Jesus' sacrificial death through the performance of this ritual. Jeremias appeals to prayers for the remembrance of the messiah within early Judaism. This interpretation is problematic, for it requires ἐμήν to function similarly to an objective genitive, whereas the typical Lukan usage of possessive adjectives provides little warrant for such a reading (cf. Luke 5:33; 6:20, 30; 9:26; 15:31; 16:12; 22:42). Moreover, the notion of a prayer for God to remember his messiah would be out of place within the Lukan salvation-historical perspective, as the messiah has already come and now resides in a position of sovereign exaltation. See Kosmala (1960: 85 – 89); Carpinelli (1999: 75 – 78).

57 Interpreters who emphasize the importance of Passover typology for the interpretation of the institution narrative include Jeremias (1966: 223); Kosmala (1960: 90 – 91); Routledge (2002: 216); McKnight (2006: 278 – 280, 339); Theobald (2006: 136); Mittmann-Richert (2008: 144 – 145).

11:23–26). Only the Lukan Jesus interprets the elements of the Passover meal with reference to his own death and then explicitly enjoins the disciples to perform these ritual acts "in my remembrance." Though the typological relationship can be inferred in the case of the other synoptic evangelists, the connection between the Passover *seder* and last supper is made most explicit by Luke.

Covenant

Beyond the connection established between the Passover feast and the last supper in the institution narrative, Jesus also invokes the concept of covenant in his words over the cup, declaring, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood." The Passover context of the passage, along with the connection in Jesus' statement between covenant and blood, suggests an allusion to the establishment of the covenant at Sinai through the "blood of the covenant" that is sprinkled upon the people of Israel following their Exodus from Egypt (Exod 24:8). The Lukan link with the Sinai covenant is further strengthened by the surrounding reference to eating and drinking in the kingdom of God (Luke 22:16, 18, 30), for the initiation of the covenant at Sinai is celebrated by the elders of Israel eating and drinking in the presence of God (Exod 24:11), and this celebratory meal at Sinai serves as the basis for the expectation of an eschatological banquet (cf. Isa 25:6–8). Indeed, the meal context of the last supper itself corresponds to the way in which the ratification of the covenant at Sinai is celebrated through a meal by Moses and the elders as representatives of the people of God (cf. Luke 22:28–30). Hence, multiple aspects of the Lukan scene allude to the institution of the covenant at Sinai.[58]

However, whereas Mark and Matthew explicitly employ the precise language of Exod 24:8 (τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης – Mark 14:24; Matt 26:28), the version of the saying in Luke and Paul adapts the language so as to include a reference to the *new* covenant anticipated in Jer 31:31–34 (Luke 22:20; 1 Cor 11:25).[59] Because

58 Sellner (2007: 459–464) insists that the covenant here must be understood in terms of the Abrahamic rather than Mosaic covenant, since elsewhere in Luke-Acts (Lk 1:72; Acts 3:25) the notion of covenant is invoked with particular reference to Abraham. However, multiple references to the Abrahamic covenant elsewhere do not preclude the possibility of an engagement with Mosaic covenantal traditions in the institution narrative, and the verbal and conceptual correspondences between Exod 24:1–11 and the Lukan passage are sufficient to demonstrate that the covenant at Sinai is in view (see Nolland [1989: 3.1054]).

59 Though Matthew does not explicitly refer to a *new* covenant, he does refer to the forgiveness of sins (26:28), a central feature of the new covenant, so that the concept is likely in mind for Matthew as well.

Jer 31:31 – 34 itself refers back to the Sinai covenant and the experience of the Exodus, the appearance of allusions in the Lukan passage to both Exod 24:1 – 11 and Jer 31:31 – 34 is unsurprising. In Jer 31:31 – 34, Yahweh contrasts the new covenant with the covenant at Sinai that he established after delivering his people from slavery in Egypt. Though Israel's ancestors broke the covenant which had been established at Sinai, Yahweh nevertheless declares that he will still be Israel's God, and they will still be his people. Indeed, all the people will know Yahweh, from the small to the great, because Yahweh will be merciful toward their unrighteousness and no longer remember their sins. In this manner, the new covenant of Jer 31:31 – 34 transcends the covenant at Sinai and serves as the eschatological reconstitution of the people of God.[60]

In the Lukan last supper, Jesus declares the institution of this eschatological covenant in his blood, drawing together the promise of a reconstituted people of God with the imagery of the cultic blood ritual that initiated the covenant at Sinai. According to the word over the cup, then, the establishment of the new covenant is accomplished by the blood of Jesus (ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου), which must be taken as a reference to his death. Furthermore, Jesus speaks this interpretation over the cup to the twelve apostles, who in this scene appear to stand as representatives for a reconstituted people of God. Indeed, Jesus will shortly confer on them a kingdom and give to them the promise that they will eventually sit upon thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel (Luke 22:29 – 30). Therefore, Jesus' word over the cup recalls the establishment of the people of God as a nation through the covenant at Sinai, while simultaneously the mention of a *new* covenant by the blood of Jesus signals the eschatological reconstitution of God's people which will transcend the relationship between God and his people under the stipulations of the Sinai covenant.

Eschatological Banquet

The eschatological dimensions of the Passover feast and the new covenant accord well with another eschatological aspect of the Lukan institution narrative, *viz.* Jesus' repeated anticipation of the eschatological banquet. Jesus looks forward to eating the meal once again upon its fulfillment in the kingdom of God (Luke 22:16), and he likewise anticipates drinking from the fruit of the vine once more when the kingdom of God comes (Luke 22:18). As the scene progresses, Jesus again returns to this theme, assuring the disciples that in the future he will eat and drink with them at his table in his kingdom (Luke 22:30). In this way,

60 Theobald (2006: 173); Mittmann-Richert (2008: 126).

the discourse at the last supper places particular stress upon Jesus' expectation of an eschatological meal celebration with his disciples.[61]

The notion of joyful feasting in connection with the eschatological age is well-attested within the Hebrew Scriptures and early Judaism.[62] Prominent within this expectation of an eschatological banquet is a universal ingathering of the people of God from all the nations. Ps 107:2–9 anticipates that the redeemed will come with hungry souls from east and west and north and south and will be satisfied by the Lord (cf. Luke 13:29). Isa 49:10–13 similarly looks forward to the satisfaction of those who will come from afar in the ingathering accomplished through the mission of the Isaianic Servant (cf. Isa 49:6). In the context of the last supper, Isa 25:6–8 provides perhaps the most immediate conceptual parallel to the scene between Jesus and his disciples, particularly in the expectation of drinking wine at an eschatological feast. In this passage, a feast for all the nations gathered at Mount Zion will be held in celebration of the Lord's act of eschatological salvation, depicted as a decisive victory over death.

The passages above each entail an expectation of Gentile inclusion within the people of God at the eschatological ingathering, and similar notions of universality may be present in the Lukan institution narrative. Certainly the book of Acts will be concerned with the inclusion of the Gentiles and the proclamation of salvation to the ends of the earth. In light of the broader Lukan focus upon the eschatological inclusion of the Gentiles, Jesus' repeated anticipation of an eschatological banquet in the last supper narrative may serve to provide a dominical basis for the mission to the Gentiles and the inclusive table fellowship that such a mission entails in Acts.

Cultic Conceptions and the Suffering Servant

Whereas Jesus' anticipation of an eschatological banquet fits naturally with the eschatological dimensions of the Passover and new covenant themes in the passage, the cultic dimensions of the Passover celebration and the initiation

---

61 Two differing perspectives exist concerning the temporal fulfillment of this kingdom meal. Neyrey (1985: 14) argues that Jesus' expectation is fulfilled in the post-resurrection appearances of the risen Lord with his disciples. Others argue that the hope of an eschatological banquet remains a future expectation to be accomplished at the parousia. See Nielsen (2000: 82–89); Koenig (2000: 28–29)); Bovon (2012: 157). Acts 1:6 seems to indicate that the consummation of the kingdom remains a future event, such that the eschatological interpretation is to be preferred. Moreover, the post-resurrection meal scenes in Luke-Acts do not explicitly mention Jesus drinking (cf. Lk 24:30–32, 41–43), nor do they make explicit reference to the kingdom.

62 Note, for example, Ps 107:1–9; Isa 49:10–13; Joel 2:24; 3:18; Amos 9:13; *1 En.* 10:19; 62:14; *2 Bar.* 29:5 (McKnight [2006: 331]).

of the new covenant also accord rather well with the cultic undertones of Jesus' words over the bread and the cup. Over the bread, Jesus states, "This is my body *which is given for you*" (τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον). Over the cup, Jesus declares, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood *which is poured out for you*" (τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον).

The imagery of blood being poured out is drawn from the sphere of cultic offerings in the priestly literature of the Pentateuch.[63] In fact, the language of blood (αἷμα/דם) being poured out (ἐκχέω/שפך) features prominently in the blood manipulations of the levitical cult, particularly the חטאת offerings (Lev 4:7, 18, 25, 30, 34; cf. Exod 29:12, 14).[64] While the same terminology also appears outside of priestly contexts,[65] the use of this language at the last supper surely evokes the imagery of cultic offering. After all, the Passover context of the scene immediately situates the passage and its reference to blood within the broad domain of Israel's cultic worship. This cultic context for the word over the cup is further reinforced by the allusion to the covenant at Sinai contained in the first part of the statement (τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου). Moreover, as Luke's own gospel attests, the verb δίδωμι, which is used with reference to Jesus' body in Luke 22:19, can appear in cultic contexts to describe the giving of an offering (Luke 2:24; cf. Exod 30:14 LXX; Lev 22:14 LXX).[66] Although "body" and "blood" in Luke 22:19 – 20 may not function symbolically as the two parts of a sacrificial victim,[67] the confluence of cultic terminology and imagery in this passage cannot be ignored.

According to the word over the cup, the new covenant will be initiated by the blood of Jesus, just as the blood of sacrificial offerings featured prominently in the ceremony initiating the Sinai covenant (Exod 24:5 – 6, 8). However, whereas the covenant at Sinai is initiated through the blood of עלת and שלמים offerings, the specific language of blood being poured out (ἐκχέω/שׁפך) is confined in priestly contexts to the חטאת offering, which is characterized as an act of atonement (Lev 4:20, 26, 31, 35 LXX). A similar interpretation of the covenantal sacrifice as an act of atonement is attested within Jewish tradition, as *Tg. Onq.* and *Ps.-J.* of Exod 24:8 both stipulate that the blood ritual at Sinai was performed

63 Technically, the adjectival participle τὸ...ἐκχυννόμενον is modifying the cup rather than the blood, which appears in the dative case as the object of the preposition ἐν. However, as the cup stands metonymically for its contents, the difference is immaterial; it is the blood which is poured out in this passage.

64 Chilton (1994: 117).

65 Cf. Acts 22:20.

66 Walton (2000: 92 – 93, 107 – 110).

67 *Pace* Jeremias (1966: 221 – 223). See Schürmann (1955: 115 – 118).

by Moses to atone for the people.[68] Jesus' statement over the cup therefore melds the conception of a covenant initiated by a blood ritual with the terminology of the חטאת offering performed as an act of cultic atonement.

This blood, in the Lukan context, is poured out ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. In fact, the Lukan institution narrative is unique in its presentation of ὑπέρ-statements over both the bread and the cup. The conceptual background to these statements can most likely be located in the fourth servant song of Isaiah. Certainly the Isaianic reference is more immediately detectable in the Markan version, where the blood is poured out ὑπὲρ πολλῶν, which corresponds naturally to the "many" of Isa 53:11–12 (Mark 14:25). In Luke the third-person πολλῶν is adapted to ὑμῶν, so that Jesus' words are applied directly to the disciples. Thus, the verbal correspondence with Isaiah 53 is negated.[69]

Nevertheless, in its representation of the death of Jesus as a self-sacrifice voluntarily presented on behalf of others, the Lukan passage quite closely parallels Isa 53:10–12 conceptually. In Isa 53:10, the suffering and death of the servant is similarly conceived in cultic terms as an אשם offering (Leviticus 4–5; esp. 5:17–19).[70] This appropriation of the language of the Israelite cult to the servant figure serves in its Isaianic context as the summation of the servant's self-sacrificial suffering and death, as the surrounding verses expound both the nature of the servant's suffering and the scope of its effects.[71] In addition, in Isa 53:12, the servant pours out his life to death, bearing the sins of many (παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ/הֶעֱרָה לַמָּוֶת נַפְשׁוֹ). Once again, verbal parallels between Isa 53:12 LXX and Luke 22:19b-20 are lacking, yet the cup in Luke 22:20 which is poured out "for you" may reflect an engagement with the Hebrew of Isa 53:12. The priestly texts of the Pentateuch equate life with blood (Lev 17:11, 14; Deut 12:23), so that Jesus' voluntary outpouring of his own blood in Luke 22:20 might serve as a conceptual equivalent to the servant's voluntary outpouring of his own life in Isa 53:12.[72] Additionally, the use of ἐκχέω in Luke 22:20 may function as a literal rendering of the Hebrew *hiphil* הֶעֱרָה in Isa 53:12,[73] though it must be noted that the LXX never uses ἐκχέω to translate ערה.[74]

---

68 See Pesch (1978: 95); Léon-Dufour (1987: 145–146); Green (1988: 195–196); Lichtenberger (1996: 221–222). This interpretation of Exod 24:8 may also be presupposed in *Jub.* 6:11–12 (Hofius [1989: 226, n. 132]).

69 Note, however, that the use of δίδωμι in the breadword may echo παραδίδωμι in Isa 53:6, 12. See Schürmann (1955: 19–23, 115–117); Stuhlmacher (2004: 152).

70 For the cultic understanding of Isa 53:10 within early Christian tradition, see Mittmann-Richert (2008: 70–73).

71 Note the detailed structural analysis of Isaiah 53 in Beauchamp (1989: 327–337).

72 Mittmann-Richert (2008: 123–124).

73 Green (1988: 196–197).

In the broader Lukan context, the presence of an allusion to Isaiah 53 in the ὑπέρ-statements of Luke 22:19 – 20 may also be suggested by the direct quotation of Isa 53:12 in Luke 22:37. Not only does the quotation occur within the same scene as the possible allusions to the Isaianic servant in Luke 22:19 – 20, but it is also drawn from the Hebrew rather than the Greek text of Isa 53:12,[75] which may serve to validate the lack of verbal parallels between Isaiah 53 and Luke 22:19 – 20. Finally, perhaps Jesus' designation of himself as "one who serves" can also be taken as another indication of the influence of Isaiah 53 (Luke 22:27),[76] though again verbal parallels are lacking.

In summation, Jesus' interpretation of his own death in cultic terms as a voluntary self-sacrifice on behalf of others stands in close conceptual correspondence with the portrayal of the Isaianic suffering servant in Isa 53:10 – 12. In light of this conceptual correspondence and the close proximity of a direct quotation from Isa 53:12, many interpreters have located the background to Jesus' ὑπέρ-statements in the fourth servant song of Isaiah.[77] No other figure from the Hebrew Scriptures so closely corresponds to the characterization of Jesus and the interpretation of his suffering in Luke 22:19 – 20. Given Luke's engagement with Isaiah elsewhere in the Lukan corpus, it seems most probable that the correspondence between the Isaianic servant's voluntary suffering and Jesus' symbolic acts at the last supper could hardly be coincidental. The ὑπέρ-statements of Luke 22:19 – 20, which are rooted in the domain of cultic worship, are thus mediated into the Lukan context through the tradition of the Isaianic suffering servant in Isa 53:10 – 12.

Still, because of the lack of verbal correspondences between Isaiah 53 and the Lukan last supper, caution is warranted concerning the extent to which Isaiah 53 should be viewed as determinative for understanding the Lukan institution narrative. Indeed, the cultic implications of Luke 22:19 – 20 regarding the meaning of the death of Jesus would remain more or less the same whether they were mediated through the figure of the Isaianic servant or drawn directly from the cultic conceptions preserved in the Pentateuch and practiced within early

74 Pesch (1978: 96).

75 In Lk 22:37, the phrase "among transgressors" is rendered μετὰ ἀνόμων, which differs from the LXX (ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις) and corresponds to the MT (אֶת־פֹּשְׁעִים).

76 See O'Toole (2000: 337).

77 For a helpful discussion of the origin and conceptual background of the ὑπέρ-statements in the NT, see Bieringer (1992: 219 – 248). Interpreters who find an allusion to Isaiah 53 in the Lk 22:20 include France (1971: 123); Green (1988: 196 – 197); Lichtenberger (1996: 226); O'Toole (2000: 335); Mittmann-Richert (2008: 122 – 126).

Judaism.[78] Ultimately, then, the significance of Isaiah 53 with regard to the Lukan institution narrative may be that the Isaianic servant provides a basis or model for conceiving of the death of a divinely appointed individual as a cultic offering which accomplishes atonement for others. When the death of Jesus is interpreted in such terms in Luke 22:19 – 20, the figure of the servant is naturally evoked in the minds of many interpreters, yet the Lukan institution narrative itself would offer the same basic interpretation of Jesus' death regardless of whether the servant were actually in view in this passage.

2. The Meaning Assigned to Jesus' Death

Having surveyed the strands of tradition which converge within the Lukan institution narrative, we now must summarize the significance the passage attributes specifically to the death of Jesus. Jesus' distribution and interpretation of the bread and the cup on the night before his passion are clearly to be understood with reference to his death, yet what specific meaning do these symbolic acts assign to that event? This section of the chapter will briefly attempt to synthesize much of the preceding analysis in order to demonstrate that the institution narrative presents Jesus' death as a redemptive, covenant establishing act of atonement on behalf of his own.

Redemptive

The overt Passover context of the Lukan institution narrative suggests that the death of Jesus is to be understood in some relation to the Passover. Certainly Jesus does not explicitly call himself the Passover lamb. Yet, the meal is presented as a Passover feast, and the OT command to remember God's saving act in the Passover functions as the background for Jesus' new command to remembrance in conjunction with the elements of the eucharistic meal (Luke 22:19). Thus, the

78 One potentially significant aspect of an Isaianic background could be the universalism which would accompany a robust Isaianic reading of the passage. As the suffering servant, Jesus' sacrificial death enables the inclusion of the Gentiles into the new covenant people of God, in keeping with the universal scope of the Isaianic servant's ministry (cf. Isa 42:6; 49:6). See Schürmann (1955: 98 – 99); Benoit (1975: 130 – 131); Mittmann-Richert (2008: 125 – 131). Such an interpretation requires multiple steps, as one must move from Lk 22:19 – 20 to Isa 53:6, 12, then from Isaiah 53 to Isa 42:6 and 49:6, and then from Isaiah to Jer 31:31 – 34 through the key word "covenant" – all without any exact verbal correspondences between Luke 22 and Isaiah 53.

inclination of many interpreters to find a typological correspondence between the Passover and Jesus' death is surely justified.

In the history of Israel, the blood of the Passover lamb upon the doorposts of the Israelites provided protection from the wrath of God which befell the Egyptians (Exod 12:13). This climactic plague served as the means by which the Lord brought his people out of slavery, and it ultimately led to the constitution of the nation of Israel through the covenant at Sinai in Exod 24:1–11. When the Exodus events are then remembered within the scriptures of Israel, they are consistently understood in terms of redemption from bondage,[79] and they naturally become associated with expectations of eschatological deliverance and the establishment of the new covenant (cf. Jer 38:8 LXX).

In the last supper, the Exodus sequence of redemption would seem to serve as the typological prefiguration for a new act of redemption in the death of Jesus. The Passover *seder*, which commemorates the means by which the Lord provided for the redemption of his people from bondage in Egypt, is reconstituted as a new meal celebrating the death of Jesus as the means by which a new act of divine deliverance is accomplished (cf. 1 Cor 5:7). In this way, the death of Jesus appears to be presented as a means of redemption in correspondence with the preeminent redemptive act of God in the OT.

Covenant Establishing

In the Exodus narrative, the act of redemption accomplished through the Passover is followed shortly by a separate ritual at Mount Sinai establishing a covenant between Yahweh and the people of God. In the last supper, these two events, understood in typological correspondence to the death of Jesus, are brought together. Not only does the death of Jesus function as the salvation-historical consummation of the redemption prefigured in the Passover event, but, based upon the typological pattern of Exod 24:1–11, Jesus' death also serves as the event which establishes the eschatological new covenant anticipated in Jer 31:31–34. This is clear in the explicit reference to the new covenant in Jesus' word over the cup. With the disciples acting as representatives for a reconstituted people of God, Jesus interprets his death as the cultic offering which initiates a new covenant between God and his people. This covenantal dimension of Jesus' speech coheres nicely with the narrative's prior emphasis upon the decisive salvation-historical position of the rejection of Jesus (cf. Luke 2:34–35; 4:16–30). The death of Jesus will initiate a new era in the relationship between

79 See, for example, Deut 7:8; 9:26; 13:3–5; 15:5; 24:18; 2 Sam 7:23; 1 Chron 17:21; Mic 6:4.

God and his people, an epoch which Jer 31:34 suggests is made possible by the Lord's gracious forgiveness of sins.[80]

Cultic Act of Atonement

Given that the forgiveness of sins serves as the basis for the new covenant according to Jer 31:31–34, Jesus' interpretation of his death in cultic terms in Luke 22:19–20 is quite comprehensible, since the forgiveness of sins is consistently connected to acts of atonement within the cultic system of the Pentateuch and early Judaism.[81] Much as *Tg. Onq.* and *Ps.-J.* of Exod 24:8 understand the blood ritual of the covenant ceremony as an act of atonement for sins, and much as the suffering servant of Isa 53:10–12 pours out his life as a cultic offering which accomplishes atonement for "the many," so Jesus' words over the bread and the cup intimate that his body and blood are presented as a cultic offering. Hence, the death of Jesus establishes the new covenant by an act of atonement performed ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν.[82] The two ὑπέρ-statements in Luke 22:19–20 intimate the vicarious nature of this cultic offering, as the followers of Jesus are the recipients of its benefits. The words of institution, then, present the death of Jesus as a redemptive event which initiates a new covenant between God and his people by means of a cultic act of atonement on behalf of Jesus' followers.[83]

---

80 Lichtenberger (1996: 226); Wenham (1995: 14). Unlike Matthew, Luke does not explicitly mention the forgiveness of sins (cf. Matt 26:28). The Matthean addition may relate to Matt 1:21 ("... he shall be named Jesus, for he will save people from their sins"), or it could also come from Mark's baptismal statement in Mark 1:4.

81 Consider Lev 4:20, 26, 31, 35; 5:10, 13; 16:16, 30. The bond between the forgiveness of sins and the outpouring of blood is also retained elsewhere in the NT (cf. Heb 9:22). See Pesch (1978: 95).

82 Du Plessis (1994: 534) argues that the reference to a *new* covenant precludes any continuity with the cultic rituals of expiation under the old covenant. Hence, he contends that while Jesus' death is portrayed in the word over the cup as a cultic offering functioning as a seal of the covenant, the event is not understood as an act of atonement for the forgiveness of sins. However, the language of "blood" being "poured out" appears within a cultic context with particular reference to acts of atonement, such that the usage of such language in the Lukan word over the cup must be taken as a reference to the atoning function of Jesus' death. Furthermore, the prominence of the forgiveness of sins within the expectation for a new covenant in Jer 31:31–34 suggests that any reference to the initiation of such a covenant through a cultic offering would naturally be read in terms of the atonement concept, particularly in light of the evidence from the targummim on Exod 24:8.

83 The relational outcome of the death of Jesus coheres well with the purpose of the cult within Jewish practice. Just as the priestly cult existed in order to mediate continued access to God, so

3. Tradition and Lukan Thought

Some interpreters who are willing to acknowledge the pivotal significance which the Lukan institution narrative assigns to the death of Jesus nevertheless insist that the passage must not be taken as a genuine expression of Lukan soteriology.[84] According to this perspective, the pericope is included within Luke's gospel in faithfulness to the tradition which Luke has inherited, yet its profound interpretation of the death of Jesus does not factor prominently into Lukan thought. Apparently Luke is so strongly compelled by the tradition that he is obliged to transmit it faithfully, yet the tradition is not compelling enough for Luke to believe it with any real conviction.[85] Aside from the logical tension inherent to this line of reasoning, an examination of Luke's use of sources for this scene demonstrates that the Lukan institution narrative represents a creative engagement with traditional materials, and the relationship between this scene and other meal scenes throughout the third gospel reinforces the impression that the final meal of Jesus attained a seminal importance for Luke.

A comparison of Luke's account with the other NT institution narratives shows that the author of Luke 22:14 – 20 has not simply copied from his sources. Luke 22:15 – 17 is unique to Luke, and while the eschatological expectation expressed over the first cup in Luke 22:18 may possibly be adapted from Mark 14:25,[86] multiple minor differences also exist between Mark and Luke even at this lone point of general agreement between the two evangelists.[87] Likewise, the Lukan words of institution more closely resemble the Pauline version than the versions of the other synoptic evangelists, yet again the number of minor differences between Luke 22:19 – 20 and 1 Cor 11:23 – 25 suggest that Luke is not a slave to his sources.

---

the death of Jesus is understood in cultic terms as the means by which a new covenantal relationship is established between God and his people. See Mittmann-Richert (2008: 74 – 75).

84 See, for example, Kodell (1979: 223); Neyrey (1985: 17).

85 Mittmann-Richert (2008: 135).

86 Theobald (2006: 148 – 149).

87 Note, for instance, the Lukan inclusion of ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν to designate the beginning of the period of abstinence. Also, while Mark refers to drinking anew in the kingdom of God (ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ), the Lukan Jesus says that he will not drink again until the kingdom of God comes (ἕως οὗ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ). For a detailed exposition of the non-Markan character of Lk 22:15 – 18, see Schürmann (1953: 34 – 45).

Table 8 – New Testament Institution Accounts

Luke 22:19–20	1 Cor 11:23b-25	Mark 14:22–24	Matt 26:26–28
καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων· τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. [20] καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, λέγων· τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον.	…ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ᾗ παρεδίδετο ἔλαβεν ἄρτον [24] καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ εἶπεν· τοῦτό μού ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. [25] ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι λέγων· τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι· τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὁσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.	Καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς καὶ εἶπεν· λάβετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου. [23] καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες. [24] καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυνόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν.	Ἐσθιόντων δὲ αὐτῶν λαβὼν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἄρτον καὶ εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ δοὺς τοῖς μαθηταῖς εἶπεν· λάβετε φάγετε, τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου. [27] καὶ λαβὼν ποτήριον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων· πίετε ἐξ αὐτοῦ πάντες, [28] τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυνόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

A comparison of the differing institution accounts yields the following list of minor differences between Luke and Paul:

- Luke has the participle λαβών in contrast to the finite verb ἔλαβεν in 1 Cor 11:23.
- Luke includes ἔδωκεν in description of the giving of the bread. Paul does not.
- Paul places μου before the copula, whereas Luke places it after τὸ σῶμα.
- Paul lacks the adjectival participle διδόμενον.
- In contrast to Mark and Matthew, Luke and Paul include a ὑπέρ-statement with reference to the bread/body, yet Paul lacks a corresponding statement in the case of the cup.
- Paul places ὡσαύτως at the beginning of the clause introducing the word over the cup, whereas Luke places it after τὸ ποτήριον.[88]
- Paul includes ἐστιν in the explanation of the cup, whereas Luke lacks the copula.
- Paul modifies αἵματι with ἐμῷ, while Luke instead has μου, and their word order is consequently different as well.

88 Several manuscripts adapt the Lukan order to conform to Pauline tradition, though the best manuscripts (𝔓[75] א B) attest to the placement of ὡσαύτως after τὸ ποτήριον.

– The Lukan word over the cup includes the adjectival participle τὸ ἐκχυνόμενον, which is present in the synoptic tradition but lacking in Paul.

These minor differences between Luke and Paul suggest that the reading in Luke 22:19b – 20 was probably not produced by taking directly from Paul's version in 1 Corinthians. Rather, the Lukan and Pauline institution accounts are probably derived from a common liturgical source, likely received as oral tradition.[89] Similarly, the significant divergences between Luke and the other synoptic evangelists indicate that Luke is not dependent upon the Markan tradition for his last supper scene, though Luke's non-Markan source is likely to have borne a general resemblance to the tradition preserved in Mark, which accounts for the minor agreements between Luke and Mark. As such, Luke 22:14 – 20 reflects the third evangelist's creative adaptation of a non-Markan source,[90] and the distinctiveness of the Lukan account calls into question the supposition that Luke 22:14 – 20 is merely a received tradition with little bearing upon the Lukan conception of the death of Jesus. If anything, the Lukan meal scene is more vivid and extended than its NT parallels, so that there truly is no reason from the passage itself to minimize the importance of this scene within Lukan soteriology.

Finally, the position of the institution account within the broader context of Luke's narrative confirms the scene's significance. The last supper comes as the climactic meal scene within a gospel that uniquely locates much of Jesus' ministry and teaching at the table.[91] The various meal scenes in Luke are tied together by a consistent interest in the fellowship of Jesus with sinners and the opposition such inclusive fellowship invokes.[92] In Luke 5:29 – 39, for example, Jesus' meal with tax collectors becomes the occasion for a dispute with the Pharisees, with Jesus explaining that he has not come to call the righteous but sinners to repentance. In Luke 7:36 – 50, Jesus' acceptance of the service of a sinful woman gives rise to a lesson about the liberating power of forgiveness and the response of love that it induces. Also, the breaking of bread at Jesus' feeding miracle is depicted in terms evocative of Jesus' eucharistic blessing (Luke 9:16), so that the provision of bread for the multitudes might anticipate Jesus' provision of his body on behalf of his own. For Luke, as Minear notes, "The table becomes a place where human need meets divine grace, where the pres-

89 The minor differences between Luke and Paul also demonstrate that Lk 22:19b-20 is not merely a pastiche of the Pauline and Markan traditions. See Schürmann (1955: 17 – 42).

90 See Green (1988: 28 – 42); Bovon (2003: 92 – 94). For the view that Luke is dependent upon Mark, see Pesch (1978: 26 – 34).

91 Minear (1970: 324 – 325); George (1973: 209); Neyrey (1985: 8 – 10).

92 See Guillaume (1979: 139 – 144).

ence of Jesus transforms the sad remembrance of things past into the glorious promise of things to come."[93] The last supper serves as a continuation and intensification of these same themes, as Jesus' symbolic acts reveal the extent of his self-giving love for the disciples, even in light of their impending betrayal (22:21–23), prideful misunderstanding (22:24–27), and failure (22:31–38).

Following the resurrection, the scene of the last supper becomes the object of retrospection, with the table fellowship of Jesus with the disciples at Emmaus described in language that draws upon the Lukan institution narrative. Just as he had done on the eve of his Passion, Jesus takes and blesses and breaks the bread and then gives it to the disciples at Emmaus (Luke 24:30; cf. Luke 22:19). This eucharistic event prompts recognition of the risen Lord, as remembrance of the bread and cup serves as a crucial element in the epistemological transformation of the disciples with regard to Jesus' christological identity.[94] The last supper could scarcely be more central to the Lukan understanding of the death of Jesus.

IV. Conclusion

The present analysis has attempted to attend adequately to the complex interplay of scriptural undertones within the Lukan institution narrative, all the while remaining mindful that this compact passage consists of but a few short verses which leave much about the precise relationship of these various biblical themes unaddressed. On the eve of the passion, Jesus interprets his own death as a redemptive event that establishes a new covenantal relationship between God and his people through an act of cultic atonement.

On the one hand, this poignant teaching builds upon the salvation-historical interest of the anticipatory references to Jesus' death, furnishing a more developed exposition of the soteriological significance of Jesus' tragic destiny. On the other hand, given the institution narrative's strategic location in relation to Luke's passion account, Jesus' instruction offers a decisive interpretation for

93 Minear (1970: 325).

94 While the decisive awakening comes in the breaking of bread, the request of the men for Jesus to remain with them rather than continue his journey shows that they have responded positively to his teaching along the way (24:28). The epistemological transformation of the men is thus a process which culminates in a moment of recognition. Indeed, their experience in the breaking of bread immediately prompts retrospection back to Jesus' teaching along the way (Lk 24:32), confirming both the eucharistic character of the meal and the significance of Jesus' teaching along the way for the proper recognition of his identity. See Gillman (2002: 183); also Perrot (1982: 164).

the events which shortly follow. Jesus' plight against the power of darkness unfolds beneath the shadow of the upper room, so that Luke's audience can understand the rejection and trial and death of Jesus only in light of his interpretation of those events in the eucharistic words. Hence, we turn in the next chapter to the passion narrative, where the story of Jesus' death is developed upon the framework of Luke's anticipatory passion references and the words of institution.

Chapter 4 – The Passion Narrative within its Lukan Framework

I. Introduction

The preceding chapter concluded that the death of Jesus is interpreted at the last supper as an act of atonement which leads to salvation and the initiation of a new covenant between God and his people. The words of institution serve as a definitive interpretation of the soteriological significance of Jesus' death, placed upon Jesus' own lips, and set within the climactic meal scene of Luke's gospel. They constitute the core of Jesus' final teaching to his disciples, and they are situated within a passage that introduces the sequence of events which culminates in the crucifixion. Indeed, the basic form and content of the passion narrative is quite likely to have been given its structure within the context of the early church's celebration of the Lord's supper.[1] In light of their pivotal significance and placement within Luke's narrative, the eucharistic words offer a decisive cue for understanding the outcome of the passion narrative.

Such considerations ought to be kept in mind as we come now in the present chapter to the question of soteriological symbolism in the passion narrative. If Jesus' teaching at the last supper has already established a soteriological interpretation of the cross, then one ought not to be surprised should the events of the passion narrative either assume, reinforce, or perhaps elucidate this soteriological interpretation rather than repeat it as though it were being stated for the first time. In other words, the soteriological dimensions of the passion narrative are just as likely to be expressed allusively through symbolic actions and events as they are to be stated outright, particularly given the narrative form of Luke's story. We should come to the text open to either possibility.

Hence, we ought to be wary of a certain line of interpretation which supposes that the synoptic evangelists must be relatively uninterested in the soteriological interpretation of Jesus' death simply because their passion narratives do not contain the sorts of straightforward affirmations about the soteriological significance of the cross that can be found within the epistolary literature of the NT. The gospels are rather restrained in terms of their physical depiction of the crucifixion (cf. martyrdom literature), and Luke tends not to provide theological

1 See, for example, the detailed defense offered in Green (1988: 187 – 213); also Aitken (2004). In keeping with the customary divisions in the commentaries, the passion narrative can be said to stretch from the beginning of Luke 22 to the end of Luke 23.

commentary through narratival asides, instead allowing characters within the narrative to interpret the events which transpire.[2] Jesus is hardly a spout of doctrine elsewhere in Luke's gospel, so it is scarcely surprising that he does not act in this way in the passion narrative. These constraints of history and genre should temper our expectations as we approach the present chapter. If the soteriological dimensions of Luke's story of the cross are found to take a different shape from the doctrinal formulations of the Pauline epistles, this should not necessarily lead to an indictment of Luke for an undeveloped understanding of the cross.

On the other hand, if there is a risk of overlooking the soteriological dimensions of the passion narrative, one can easily make the opposite error and suppose that almost every aspect of the passion narrative is crafted solely to show the soteriological function of the cross. However, the Lukan cross is multifaceted. Indeed, we have already seen how Luke's anticipatory passion references are concerned to present the cross as an integral facet of Jesus' fulfillment of scriptural expectations for the messiah. While this christological concern is related to soteriology, in so far as Jesus' mission can be characterized as a soteriological task, these christological passion references are not addressed to the precise way in which the cross functions soteriologically. Christology and soteriology are connected and yet distinct, and this distinction will be important to keep in mind as we approach the passion narrative.

With these introductory considerations in mind, the present chapter will evaluate the extent to which the soteriological effects of Jesus' death are symbolized and enacted within the passion narrative, striving for a balanced approach to the matter. The chapter will begin by highlighting distinctively Lukan elements of the passion narrative in which christological concerns are primary, and any soteriological symbolism is secondary. Here I will be parting ways with certain aspects of many maximalist appraisals of the Lukan cross. Then, the second part of the chapter will discuss a series of events that demonstrate Luke's interest in the soteriological dimensions of the cross. While not every aspect of the passion narrative is addressed toward the soteriological effects of Jesus' death, Luke's story of the crucifixion does reflect a sustained concern to show the saving significance of the cross.

2 This can be seen clearly in comparison with Matthew (Matt 1:22–23; 2:15, 17–18, 23; 4:14–16; 8:17; 12:17–21; 13:35; 21:4–5; 27:9–10) and John (John 12:38; 18:9, 32; 19:24, 36–37).

II. Jesus' Christological Vocation in the Passion Narrative

In Jesus' gradual journey to the cross over the course of Luke's gospel, the narrator insists that the rejection and suffering of Jesus is a central feature of his messianic vocation and is therefore a divine necessity. The figure identified at his birth as the savior and messiah must fulfill his messianic role through the experience of rejection and suffering. This connection between Jesus' christological vocation and his fate of suffering remains prominent within the passion narrative, and some aspects of the passion narrative in which maximalist interpreters have often focused upon soteriological symbolism can be more accurately understood in relation to Luke's view of the cross as a crucial marker of Jesus' christological identity. Hence, the present section of this chapter will highlight the primacy of christological concerns in the quotation of Isa 53:12 in Luke 22:37, the "cup" at the Mount of Olives (Luke 22:42), and Jesus' final prayer from the cross (Luke 23:46). Additionally, the present section will also expound Luke's unique emphasis upon christological titles in his accounts of the trial and mockery of Jesus (Luke 22:66 – 71; 23:35 – 39), since this will serve to underscore the extent to which christological interests permeate Luke's passion story.

1. The Quotation of Isa 53:12 in Luke 22:37

At its outset, the Lukan passion narrative underscores the interplay between Jesus' suffering and his christological vocation through the quotation from Isa 53:12 in Luke 22:37. Explaining his exhortation for the disciples to acquire provisions and purchase swords, Jesus enigmatically states, "For I tell you, that which is written must be fulfilled in me: 'And he was numbered with the transgressors.' For that which is about me has its fulfillment."

> λέγω γὰρ ὑμῖν ὅτι τοῦτο τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί, τό· καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη· καὶ γὰρ τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει.

In the very next clause of Isa 53:12, the servant is said to bear the sins of many. Minimalist interpreters have occasionally cited the absence of this clause in Jesus' quotation as evidence for Luke's aversion toward the notion of atonement.[3] Maximalist interpreters have frequently argued just the opposite: The Isaianic quotation recalls the broader context of the fourth servant song

3 Note, for example, Hooker (1959: 86).

and serves as an important indication of the soteriological efficacy of the Lukan cross.[4] The soteriological implications of Jesus' quotation are therefore a matter of perennial dispute, as the passage is taken as evidence either for or against a Lukan *theologia crucis*, depending upon one's predisposition toward the evidence.

What is clear from the passage is that Jesus' quotation occupies a prominent position at the beginning of Luke's passion narrative, and the fulfillment formulae around the quotation suggest that the Isaianic reference is likely employed primarily with a view toward christological fulfillment, with any soteriological symbolism the passage might imply being secondary. The christological focus of this particular passage need not imply that Luke is generally uninterested in a redemptive understanding of the cross, and we will soon find that the passion narrative is replete with soteriological symbolism at other points. Still, in Luke 22:37 the stress clearly falls upon christological fulfillment in Jesus' experience of rejection. Jesus understands the passage from Isaiah with reference to his personal experience, declaring that the scriptural passage is about him (τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ) and finds its fulfillment in him (ἐν ἐμοί). The verse thus reiterates the Lukan conviction that Jesus' life and ministry is a fulfillment of scripture.

In this regard, the direct quotation of Isa 53:12 resembles the reading from Isa 61:1–2 at the outset of Jesus' public ministry in Luke 4:18–21.[5] At Nazareth, Jesus reads from the scroll of Isaiah and declares to the Nazarenes that the scripture is receiving its fulfillment in their hearing (Luke 4:21). The quotation from Isa 61:1–2 then serves as a heading over the beginning stages of Jesus' ministry, as the salvific blessings envisaged in the Isaianic passage begin to be experienced by the recipients of Jesus' ministry in Galilee (cf. Luke 7:22). As at the beginning of Jesus' public ministry, so at the beginning of his passion, a passage from Isaiah is directly quoted and declared to be fulfilled in the present experience of Jesus, serving as a heading for what follows.[6]

---

4 See France (1971: 115–116); Larkin (1977: 329–332). Bovon (2012: 183–184) likewise finds the verse to be soteriologically weighty, though perhaps by implication rather than overt reference.

5 Important differences in context certainly exist between the two Isaianic quotations, as the quotation in Lk 4:18–19 stands at the beginning of a pericope, whereas the quotation in Lk 22:37 comes at the end of the last supper discourse. Nonetheless, as direct quotations the two Isaianic references stand out within a gospel that otherwise tends to cite scripture more allusively, and each quotation is similarly placed within a pericope that proves to be paradigmatic for what follows. Hence, the comparison between the two citations is justified.

6 For the identification of Lk 22:37 as a heading over the passion narrative, see Larkin (1977: 330–331); Green (1990: 22–23).

Moreover, the language of fulfillment in Jesus' statement in Luke 22:37 closely resembles the wording of the third passion prediction (cf. Luke 18:31), both in its reference to "that which is written" and in its passive use of the verb τελέω, a verb which is employed in the passive voice solely with reference to Jesus' fate of suffering in Luke-Acts (cf. Luke 12:50; 18:31; Acts 13:29). These intratextual correspondences reinforce the impression that the quotation in Luke 22:37 must relate to Jesus' impending destiny of rejection, suffering, and death, particularly in light of the placement of the quotation at the outset of the passion narrative. When Jesus is arrested and condemned as a criminal (Luke 22:52–53; 23:18–25) and then crucified between two wrong-doers (Luke 23:32–33, 39–43), one cannot help but remember his solemn words from the previous evening.[7] That which is written about him has received its fulfillment in him; he has been numbered among the transgressors (ἄνομοι).[8]

But why does the quotation from Isaiah stop where it does? I would suggest that the precise parameters of the Isaianic quotation can be understood most naturally in relation to the theme of divine concealment that we have already noted in Luke's anticipatory passion references. The quotation reiterates what the passion predictions have consistently insisted, this time substituting a specific scriptural quotation for a general reference to the fulfillment of scripture: The rejection of Jesus is a fulfillment of scriptural expectations for the messiah and therefore a divine necessity. By stopping the quotation where he does, however,

7 Indeed, at Mark 15:28, a secondary reading preserved in some manuscripts includes this same quotation from Isa 53:12, which shows how naturally Jesus' crucifixion among criminals evokes the Isaianic reference. In all likelihood, the quotation in Mark has been added by a scribe under the influence of Lk 22:37. See Heiligenthal (1995: 46).

8 Hence, Jesus being reckoned among the ἄνομοι most naturally signifies the way in which he will soon be treated as a criminal, and the ἄνομοι need not be taken as one single figure or group of characters within Luke's narrative. Indeed, the identity of the transgressors may be purposefully ambiguous. In the immediate context, the transgressors might be the disciples. They have failed to heed Jesus' prior instruction regarding faithful dependence upon God for protection and provision (Lk 9:3–4; 10:3–4), as they already possess swords by the time of Jesus' command in Lk 22:36. Indeed, it could be that their possession of two swords "is enough" to establish their guilt and thereby fulfill the quotation from Isaiah (Lk 22:38). Soon the disciples will go so far as to strike preemptively with the sword (Lk 22:49–50), a lawless act of aggression rebuked by Jesus (Lk 22:51). The numbering of Jesus among the transgressors, then, can be understood within its immediate context as another component of the negative characterization of the disciples in this sequence of scenes. See Minear (1964: 328–329); Lampe (1984: 340–341). Still, the identification of the disciples with the ἄνομοι of Isa 53:12 would not exhaust the meaning of the Isaianic scriptural quotation. Rather, the strategic context of the passage at the beginning of the passion narrative, along with the language employed within the fulfillment formulae of Lk 22:37, serves to tie the quotation from Isa 53:12 particularly to Jesus' fate of suffering.

Jesus once again withholds from the disciples a corrective explanation of how his fate of suffering attains such a pivotal role within his christological vocation. His tragic destiny is revealed as a divine necessity, yet the link between Jesus' fate of suffering and his messianic vocation remains a mystery to the disciples, as their subsequent failings in the passion narrative amply demonstrate. In this manner, the quotation of Isa 53:12 in Luke 22:37 coheres with the Lukan emphasis upon the centrality of Jesus' tragic destiny within the divine plan for the anointed one, and the absence of the clause about the bearing of sins need not reflect a Lukan aversion toward atonement theology.[9]

2. "This Cup" and Jesus' Prayer at the Mount of Olives (Luke 22:39–46)

This emphasis upon the divine necessity of Jesus' suffering is further expounded through the following scene at the Mount of Olives, where Jesus prays for "this cup" to be removed from him (Luke 22:42). This scene is framed by references to temptation which signal the arrival of the "opportune time" anticipated at the end of the temptation story in Luke 4:1–13 (Luke 22:40, 46; cf. 4:2, 13), and Jesus' agony at the Mount of Olives is informed by a consideration of the scene's similarities with Jesus' earlier temptation experience.[10]

In the temptation scene, the devil challenges Jesus' identity as God's son (Luke 4:3, 9). At the Mount of Olives, Jesus addresses God as Father (22:42). In the temptation scene, the devil challenges Jesus at the pinnacle of the temple

9 Indeed, the history of interpretation shows quite clearly that while the disciples within the narrative do not hear the words from Isa 53:12 which pertain to the bearing of sins, actual readers of Luke's narrative at this point have quite often recalled the broader context of Isaiah 53, connected the quotation with the nearby words of institution and other Lukan allusions and quotations from Isaiah 53, and naturally interpreted the insuing events within the passion narrative soteriologically in light of the vicarious suffering of the Isaianic servant. I would maintain that such interpretions risk neglecting the christological thrust of the passage. As I have argued above, the emphatic fulfillment formulae in the immediate context of Luke suggest that the text from Isaiah is cited mainly in order to present Jesus' impending suffering as a fulfillment of his scripturally mandated vocation rather than to expound upon the soteriological efficacy of servant's suffering, even if in Isaiah the latter is presented as a key component of the former. If by metalepsis readers of Luke's gospel are supposed to connect the dots and interpret the insuing passion event as the vicarious suffering of the Isaianic servant, such concerns must not eclipse the overt christological focus of the Lukan text in this passage. Still, the existence of such an interpretive tradition does show that Luke's omission of the clause about the bearing of sins from his quotation of Isaiah does not necessarily imply that the third evangelist had an aversion toward the notion of vicarious atonement.

10 George (1973: 188); Neyrey (1985: 60–62); Holmås (2011: 108).

to enlist divine aid to avoid death in Jerusalem (4:9). At the Mount of Olives, Jesus receives divine aid in order to endure his fate in the holy city (22:43–44). Both passages thus present a struggle over obedience to the will of God, and Jesus is portrayed in each case as the obedient new Adam, the true son of God, in contrast to the old Adam who fell prey to temptation (cf. 3:22–23, 38; 4:3, 9).[11] The sweat of the old Adam was a consequence of his disobedience (Gen 3:19); the sweat of the new Adam falls to the ground as a reflection of Jesus' victorious struggle to remain obedient to the end (Luke 22:44).[12] Whereas the old Adam disobeyed the will of God and ate the forbidden fruit, Jesus as the new Adam remains faithful, resisting temptation and thereby accepting the cup which God has willed for him.

Beyond this christological theme, some interpreters have suggested that the cup in Luke 22:42 symbolizes the divine wrath against sin which Jesus will endure upon the cross, citing the way that cup imagery often occurs in contexts of divine judgment (cf. Ps 11:6; Isa 51:17–23; Jer 25:15, 17, 28).[13] Indeed, metaphoric cup imagery in the LXX is most frequently associated with the cup of wrath.[14] However, later sources likewise attest to instances in which cup imagery refers to one's divinely ordained fate without any connotations of divine wrath (cf. *Tg. Neof.* of Gen 40:23 and Deut 32:1; *Mart. Isa.* 5:13). This more neutral usage is

11 As many interpreters have noted, the Adamic background to the temptation narrative and hence to the scene at the Mount of Olives is established through the theme of divine sonship that extends through Jesus' baptism, his genealogy, his temptation, and the agony at the Mount of Olives. Whereas Matthew may present Jesus in his genealogy and temptation as the new Israel (Matt 1:1–2; 4:3, 6), Luke traces Jesus' genealogy back to Adam and then to God (Lk 3:38). Then, Luke places the temptation narrative immediately after the genealogy, so that the designation of Jesus as the "Son of God" in the Lukan temptation narrative rings with echoes of Adam's temptation. See especially Mittmann-Richert (2008: 181–185); also Neyrey (1985: 165–179). Larkin (1979: 250–254) instead argues that the background of Lk 22:43–44 is to be sought solely in the Isaianic servant songs, whereas Clivaz (2010: 322–323) opposes an Isaianic background and instead suggests that the passage recalls the struggle of Jacob in Gen 32:23–33.

12 Lexical connections between Gen 3:19 and Lk 22:44 include both "sweat" (ἱδρώς) and "ground" (γῆ). The manuscript evidence for the authenticity of Lk 22:43–44 is inconclusive, yet stylistic and transcriptional probabilities favor the inclusion of the verses. Their omission can be explained either by the strangeness of the verse's imagery, or by the christological difficulty which a scribe might have found in understanding why Jesus would have needed the ministering support of an angel. See Neyrey (1985: 55–57); Green (1986: 35–36); Head (1993: 123–126). Alternatively, Clivaz (2010: 637–638) posits that the omission of the verses arose in early second century Alexandrian circles out of a concern to safeguard against gnostic christological conceptions.

13 Kimbell (2014: 59–69); also Marshall (1978: 831); Green (1988: 261).

14 Note, for instance, Ps 74:9 LXX; Jer 49:12; Lam 4:21; Ezek 23:31–33; Hab 2:16; Zech 12:2.

also attested within the Jesus tradition (Mark 10:38–39; Matt 20:22–23; John 18:11), whereas notions of divine wrath are unambiguously connected with cup imagery in the NT only in Rev 14:10; 16:19; 18:6. If the element of divine wrath is present in the cup of Luke 22:42, it would seem to be secondary to Luke's primary interest in characterizing Jesus as the obedient new Adam who accepts his divinely ordained fate.[15]

At the very least, then, the cup entails the notion of a predetermined fate to which Jesus as a divinely appointed figure is willfully submissive.[16] The divine necessity of Jesus' suffering is therefore intertwined once again with his christological identity. Indeed, the parallels between the episode at the Mount of Olives and the temptation scene in Luke 4:1–13 suggest that Jesus' identity as the true son of God is inseparable from his willingness to suffer the fate which has been appointed for him by his father.[17]

3. The Examination before the Sanhedrin (Luke 22:66–71)

The centrality of Jesus' suffering for his messianic vocation is further underscored by Luke's redaction of the trial scene before the Sanhedrin. Luke heightens the focus upon Jesus' christological identity, as the Sanhedrin condemns Jesus solely on account of his alleged messianic pretensions.[18] Luke omits the gathering of false witnesses against Jesus and their accusation that he has

15 In *Mart. Pol.* 14:2, Polycarp describes his own martyrdom as sharing in the "cup" of Christ, possibly indicating that early Christians understood the cup of Gethsemane simply as a symbol of Jesus' tragic fate rather than a marker of divine wrath.

16 The symbolism of the cup thus corresponds to the baptismal imagery in Lk 12:50 (see Clivaz [2010: 392–393]). Interestingly, the two metaphorical images for Jesus' preordained fate are brought together in Mark 10:38–39.

17 The connection between suffering and christological identity at the Mount of Olives is further confirmed by the scene's parallels with the transfiguration scene (Lk 9:28–36), where Jesus is also identified as God's chosen son. In both passages, Jesus withdraws with his disciples to a mountain to pray (9:28–29; 22:39–40), and the weakness of the disciples is underscored through their sleep (9:32; 22:45–46). In its context, the transfiguration serves as the divine confirmation of Jesus' first passion prediction (9:22), with Moses and Elijah discussing Jesus' exodus which he is about to accomplish in Jerusalem (9:31). The heavenly voice then confirms Jesus' identity as God's chosen son (9:35), demonstrating the intimate connection between Jesus' messianic vocation and his impending fate of suffering. As with the temptation scene, the similarities between the scene at the Mount of Olives and the transfiguration reinforce the impression that the divinely appointed cup, Jesus' fate of suffering, is central to his christological identity as the son of God. See Kenny (1957: 448–449).

18 Schneider (1988: 118); Strauss (1995: 319).

threatened to destroy the temple (cf. Mark 14:55 – 60; Matt 26:59 – 62). Moreover, whereas the other synoptic evangelists present a single inquiry regarding Jesus' self-conception, Luke separates the issue of Jesus' messianic identity and divine sonship into two successive questions, intensifying the focus upon the titles that Jesus accepts for himself (Luke 22:67 – 70; cf. Mark 14:61 – 62; Matt 26:63 – 64).

The Sanhedrin's first question concerns whether Jesus is the Christ (Luke 22:67). This title has already been applied to Jesus affirmatively by angelic proclamation (2:11, 26), the testimony of the narrator (4:41), and Peter as a representative of the disciples (9:20). Consequently, the Sanhedrin's inquiry reflects a tragic dissonance between the ignorance of the Jewish authorities and the true identity of Jesus as it has been revealed to Luke's audience (cf. Acts 3:17; 13:27).[19] In reply, Jesus simply observes that no answer would be persuasive: "If I tell you, you will not believe, and if I ask you, you will not answer" (22:67 – 68).[20] The response of Jesus recalls the previous refusal of the temple authorities to respond to Jesus' inquiry regarding the validity of the ministry of John the Baptist (cf. Luke 20:1 – 8).[21] If they failed to affirm the heavenly origins of John's ministry, neither will they believe the truth about Jesus. Thus, Jesus' reply to the Sanhedrin is evasive yet implicitly affirmative.[22] He is the Christ, but if the Jewish authorities have not been able to recognize Jesus' messianic identity during his daily ministry in their midst (Luke 22:53; cf. 19:47 – 48; 21:37), a reasoned self-defense at this point would surely be superfluous.

Instead, Jesus declares that his present rejection will actually result in his vindication as messiah: "But from now on the Son of Man will be seated at the right hand of the power of God" (22:69). The phrase "from now on" (ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν) is a Lukan addition, a temporal marker which effectively coordinates the Sanhedrin's rejection of Jesus and Jesus' vindication as the exalted Son of Man. In Mark, this temporal designation is absent, and the quotation is extended to include a reference to the Son of Man coming on the clouds of heaven (Mark 14:62). As a result, the Markan version ties the vindication of the Son of Man not to his rejection but to his parousia. Hence, the particular form of the Lukan dec-

19 Heil (1989: 278).

20 This statement may echo Jer 45:15 LXX, where Jeremiah similarly laments the futility of responding to an authority that has already made up its mind. See Plevnik (1991: 337).

21 Schneider (1988: 117); Heil (1989: 278 – 279).

22 Walaskay (1975: 82) argues that Jesus' response is a denial of the messianic title, which in this context is to be conceived in a purely political sense. Certainly the messianic conceptions of the Sanhedrin are misguided from the Lukan perspective. Nevertheless, in Luke Jesus is the Christ, and he does not deny this title elsewhere. A helpful parallel might be Jesus' response to Peter's confession in Lk 9:20, where Jesus does not deny the messianic title but immediately speaks to the vocation of suffering which such a title entails.

laration coheres with the Lukan emphasis upon the bond between Jesus' rejection and his fulfillment of the messianic vocation.[23] In the Lukan context, "now" is the time of the power of darkness, the hour in which the plot against Jesus is accomplished (Luke 22:53). Nevertheless, this dark hour will ultimately end in the vindication of the Son of Man.[24] In ignorance the Sanhedrin will reject and condemn Jesus, yet this very act of rejection will constitute the fulfillment of Jesus' scripturally ordained role as messiah and thereby lead to his vindication at the right hand of God, in keeping with Jesus' own assertions about the fate of the Son of Man (cf. 18:31–33) and the exalted position of the messiah at the right hand of the Lord (cf. 20:41–44; Acts 7:56).

This daring claim by Jesus prompts a second question by the Sanhedrin in Luke 22:70: "Are you then the Son of God?" The question is elicited by Jesus' reference to a seat at God's right hand, a position occupied by one whom David himself calls "Lord" (κύριος) in Ps 110:1 (cf. Luke 20:41–44). The matter of Jesus' divine sonship, much like the issue of his messianic identity, has been settled for the audience from the outset of Luke's narrative. The angel Gabriel twice declares to Mary that her child will be called the son of God (1:32, 35). Jesus' divine sonship is then confirmed at his baptism (3:22), traced back through his genealogy (3:38), and demonstrated through his obedience in the face of temptation (4:3, 9). Indeed, Jesus is acclaimed as son of God even by demons (4:41; 8:28), and it is confirmed once more by the heavenly voice at his transfiguration (9:35). Additionally, Jesus claims the distinction for himself in his joyful praise upon the return of the 70 (10:22). Finally, in his prayer at the Mount of Olives, Jesus addresses God as Father, and the connections of the scene with the temptation narrative serve once again to characterize Jesus as the true and obedient Son of God (22:39–46). Therefore, as with the inquiry regarding Jesus' messianic identity, the question concerning Jesus' divine sonship highlights the failure of the Jewish leadership to recognize Jesus for who he is.

Jesus' reply, "You say that I am," apparently affirms the designation of divine sonship,[25] and the Sanhedrin responds that no further testimony is needed;

---

23 Brown (1994: 505).

24 This is different from the conventional, salvation-historical reading of Luke-Acts, where ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν is understood as an indication of Luke's abandonment of the expectation for an imminent parousia (e.g., Bartsch [1964: 94]). The temporal designation is not a reflection of Luke's non-eschatological perspective but rather a signal that Jesus' death will bring to fulfillment the scriptural expectations of the messiah and lead to his vindication.

25 Alternatively, Jesus' statement could be understood as a more ambivalent response, repeating the charge of the Sanhedrin while refusing a straightforward reply. Still, the verse would im-

the words from Jesus' "mouth" are enough (22:70 – 71). The conclusion of the Sanhedrin is profoundly ironic. While they recognize the sufficiency of Jesus' words to establish a charge against him, they fail to recognize that the words from Jesus' "mouth" (στόμα) are sufficient as true testimony to his identity (cf. Luke 4:17 – 22).[26] By his own confession, Jesus is the Christ, and as the Christ he is the Son of God. Moreover, the Sanhedrin's condemnation of Jesus will actually fulfill Jesus' own prediction about his fate (18:31 – 33) and consequently lead to his ultimate vindication at the right hand of God. His christological self-proclamation will be validated precisely through his rejection. "Now" that he is facing the rejection which he has long predicted, Jesus will be vindicated as Christ and Son of God. Accordingly, for Luke's audience, the trial before the Sanhedrin connects the christological identity of Jesus to the divine necessity of his suffering. For Luke, Jesus is condemned because he claims to be the Christ,[27] and the dramatic irony of the scene consists in the fact that this experience of rejection is an indispensable aspect of Jesus' messianic vocation.[28]

4. The Mockery of Jesus at the Cross (Luke 23:35 – 39)

The crucifixion scene builds upon this irony through the mockery of Jesus (Luke 23:35 – 39). As with the scene before the Sanhedrin, Luke omits any reference to the destruction of the temple in his account of the mockery at the cross (cf. Mark 15:29; Matt 27:40). In addition, Luke uniquely reiterates the christological challenge through a threefold repetition of the demand for Jesus to save himself (Luke 23:35, 37, 39), corresponding to the threefold experience of temptation in Luke 4:3, 6 – 7, 9.[29] These adaptations of the synoptic tradition effectively heighten the focus upon the connection between Jesus' identity as the Christ and his plight upon the cross, and the structural parallel with the temptation scene suggests that the mockery of Jesus can be conceived as a temptation for him to ac-

---

plicitly affirm Jesus' divine sonship for Luke's audience, showing that even Jesus' opponents have unknowingly proclaimed his identity (Bovon [2012: 246]).

26 Vanhoye (1992: 1546 – 1547); see also Heil (1989: 282 – 283).

27 Certainly the Sanhedrin will subsequently bring a threefold charge against Jesus before Pilate (Lk 23:2, 5). Nonetheless, the accusations fundamentally relate to the preceding christological dispute, for they appear to be intended as evidence of Jesus' scandalous claims to authority. Thus, Pilate reacts to the Sanhedrin by echoing their own question regarding Jesus' identity (Lk 23:2 – 3; cf. 22:67), asking Jesus, "Are you the king of the Jews?"

28 Mittmann-Richert (2008: 270).

29 Glöckner (1975: 176 – 177).

quiesce to the scoffers and abandon the suffering which constitutes his divinely ordained fate.

In the first instance of mockery, the Jewish rulers insist that if Jesus is the "Christ of God, the Chosen One" (ὁ χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐκλεκτός), then he will save himself. The titles employed by the mocking leaders recall Peter's confession prior to the first passion prediction (τὸν χριστὸν τοῦ θεου – Luke 9:20) as well as the pronouncement of the heavenly voice at the subsequent transfiguration scene (ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος – 9:35).[30] Just as the Jewish leaders were mistaken at the trial scene (22:66 – 71), they are again shown to be ignorant of the divinely revealed identity of Jesus,[31] and they take the crucifixion as sure confirmation that Jesus must not be the messiah. The leaders correctly relate Jesus' ability to save with his identity as the Christ (23:35; cf. 2:11), yet they wrongly suppose that the messiah cannot suffer such an ignominious death.[32]

This errant perspective is recapitulated in the mockery of the soldiers, as they address Jesus directly, "If you are the king of the Jews, save yourself" (23:37). The title, "king of the Jews," is drawn from the charge against Jesus before Pilate, where the Jewish leaders accuse Jesus of claiming to be "Christ, a king" (23:2 – 3).[33] In that passage, Pilate asks Jesus directly, "Are you king of the Jews," to which Jesus offers only an ambiguous reply, "You say so." Regardless of the precise meaning of Jesus' response, clearly "Christ" and "king" are equated by Jesus' accusers, so that the demand of the soldiers essentially functions as an intensified repetition of the initial mockery by the Jewish leaders. Upon his triumphal entry into Jerusalem, Jesus is hailed as the king who comes in the name of the Lord, and Jesus refuses to rebuke those who praise him in this way (19:38 – 40). Consequently, the mocking designation of Jesus as king of the Jews functions ironically as a true affirmation on the lips of unbelieving opposition, much like the other titles expressed by Jesus' accusers in the passion narrative. The title is even inscribed above his head upon the cross, so that Jesus literally dies as king of the Jews (23:38).

30 Rusam (2007: 91).

31 Büchele (1978: 84).

32 The demand for Jesus to save himself also echoes the demand which Jesus attributes to the townspeople at Nazareth (Lk 4:23). At Nazareth, as at the cross, the christological identity of Jesus is central (cf. Lk 4:18 – 21), and Jesus is identified with a title ("son of Joseph" – Lk 4:22; cf. 3:23) which is correct and yet ironically reflects the failure of the characters within the narrative to perceive Jesus' full identity. See Giesen (2005: 162); Mittmann-Richert (2008: 94 – 95).

33 Büchele (1978: 84).

The misguided mockery of Jesus reaches its peak in the demand of the criminal crucified next to Jesus (23:39). The criminal "blasphemes" (βλασφημέω), demanding, "Are you not the Christ? Save yourself and us!" Once again, Jesus' ability to save is tied to his identity as the Christ. The demand of the criminal is particularly audacious, since it implies that Jesus is no more worthy of salvation than the criminals with whom he is being crucified. Furthermore, the use of βλασφημέω to describe the criminal's mockery is highly suggestive. The term can simply refer to mockery without reference to a deity (cf. Acts 18:6), so that its use need not imply anything more than simple reviling. Conversely, Luke is well aware of the religious connotations of the term (cf. Luke 12:10; Acts 19:37; 26:11), and in light of the christological content of the criminal's mockery in the present context, the narrator's use of βλασφημέω to describe the criminal's behavior can quite naturally be read as Luke's determination that the criminal has spoken blasphemously in reviling Jesus.[34]

Considered as a whole, the threefold mockery of Jesus presents an emphatic demand for Jesus to save himself in order to validate his messianic identity. According to the perspective of the accusers, if Jesus is the "Christ of God," then he cannot suffer the degrading death of crucifixion.[35] From the Lukan perspective, the reality is just the opposite; Jesus can fulfill his messianic vocation only through the obedient acceptance of his divinely ordained fate. In this regard, it is important to recall the resonance of the mockery at the cross with Peter's confession that Jesus is the "Christ of God" (Luke 9:20; cf. 23:35).[36] Peter's confession is immediately followed by the first passion prediction, intimating that Jesus' identity as the Christ does not preclude but rather necessitates the tragic end which he endures upon the cross (Luke 9:20 – 22).[37] The dramatic irony at work within Luke's crucifixion scene thus draws upon the framework established prior to the passion narrative, by which Luke insists that Jesus' suffering is foundational to his christological identity.

5. Jesus' Prayer from the Cross (Luke 23:46)

Jesus does not respond to the mocking voices at the cross. Instead, he speaks words of assurance to the penitent criminal (Luke 23:43), and he offers a prayer of confident trust at the moment of his death (Luke 23:46):

34 See Giesen (2005: 164); also Marshall (1978: 871).
35 Wolter (2008: 760).
36 Nolland (1989: 3.1146).
37 Rusam (2007: 91).

καὶ φωνήσας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπεν· πάτερ, εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου. τοῦτο δὲ εἰπὼν ἐξέπνευσεν.

Quoting from Ps 31:5, Jesus addresses God as his father, and he entrusts his spirit into God's hands. In Psalm 31, the psalmist turns to God for deliverance from death (Ps 31:1–4), expressing confidence that he will be protected from the hand of his enemies (Ps 31:8). Jesus' prayer upon the cross therefore contains an ironic element, as it is uttered at the very moment that he is dying a violent death at the hands of his opponents. Still, Jesus' prayer is surely meant to be understood in a positive sense as an expression of trust in God. Jesus adds the vocative πάτερ to the prayer, and the attitude of hope in the prayer seems to look forward to the vindication that Jesus will ultimately experience (cf. Luke 22:69; Acts 7:55–60).[38] Just as the psalmist awaits vindication in the midst of distress (cf. Ps 31:9–14), Jesus reaffirms his hope in his father at the height of his suffering. In this regard, the presentation of Jesus at the moment of his death corresponds to the characterization of Jesus at the Mount of Olives (cf. Luke 22:42), where Jesus likewise addresses God as father and resolves to accept the divinely ordained fate that awaits him. Jesus has remained faithful to the end, accepting the cup from his father and now offering his spirit into the father's hands.

When compared with the final prayer of Jesus in the other synoptic gospels, the prayer of the Lukan Jesus is far more positive than the anguished cry recorded by Mark and Matthew.[39] In the cry of dereliction, Jesus cries out, "My God, my God, why have you forsaken (ἐγκατελιπές) me?" This quotation from Ps 22:1 may be omitted from the Lukan account because Peter in Acts explicitly denies that Jesus was forsaken by God (ἐγκαταλείπω – Acts 2:27).[40] Whatever the reason for Luke's divergence from the synoptic tradition, the omission of the cry of dereliction and the quotation of Ps 31:5 fit naturally with the portrayal of Jesus as the faithful Son of God who obediently accepts his fate from the hand of his father.

38 Wolter (2008: 762).

39 Jesus' prayer is not necessarily a replacement of the cry of dereliction, since the quotation of Ps 22:1 in Mark and Matthew occurs at an earlier stage than this final prayer from the cross in Luke (cf. Mark 15:34; Matt 27:46). Rather, Jesus' prayer in Luke appears to correspond more closely to the loud cry at the moment of Jesus' death in Mark 15:37 and Matt 27:50. Consequently, Luke's omission of the cry of dereliction could theoretically be unrelated to the quotation of Ps 31:5 at Lk 23:46.

40 See Bons (1994: 96–97).

6. Summary

The quotation of Isa 53:12 in Luke 22:37, the characterization of Jesus as the faithful Son of God at the Mount of Olives, the christological focus in Jesus' examination before the Sanhedrin and in the mockery of Jesus upon the cross, and Jesus' prayer of trust from the cross in Luke 23:46 – each of these aspects of the Lukan passion narrative is distinctive in comparison to the other synoptic evangelists. In addition, these various Lukan peculiarities within the passion narrative all relate to the framework of christological vocation and divine necessity which is expounded steadily over the course of Luke's anticipatory allusions to Jesus' rejection, suffering, and death.

Hence, the anticipatory passion references in Luke's gospel are dominated by a single christological conviction: Because he is the Christ, Jesus has to suffer. In the passion narrative, however, Jesus actually suffers because he is the Christ. A tragic destiny is not only constituent for Jesus' christological vocation, but his christological identity also happens to serve as the cause of his tragic destiny. While Jesus is being rejected and put to death on account of his christological claims, these degrading acts are actually the precise means by which Jesus' messianic vocation is fulfilled and his messianic identity confirmed. In this manner, the Lukan passion narrative both corroborates and creatively plays upon the framework of divine necessity established within the anticipatory references to Jesus' death, confirming the conviction that suffering is central to Jesus' christological mission, and revealing the sad irony that Jesus' christological identity was in fact the cause of his suffering.

We shall soon see that these christological dimensions of the passion narrative are intertwined with elements of soteriological symbolism in Jesus' condemnation and crucifixion. However, interest in the soteriological significance of the Lukan cross must not obscure the extent to which the cross functions as an essential event for Lukan christology. Jesus' quotation of Isa 53:12 and his acceptance of his divinely ordained cup are situated within contexts in which Luke's christological interest is primary, as Luke understands these events as crucial indications of the divine necessity of Jesus' suffering in the scriptural plan. This christological concern is then extended through the trial and mockery of Jesus all the way to Jesus' final words from the cross, where his prayer of trust shows the extent of his faithful submission to his scripturally determined fate.

III. The Soteriological Significance of Jesus' Death in the Passion Narrative

Though the passion narrative is not solely addressed to soteriological concerns, many of the distinctive elements of Luke's passion story do provide striking confirmation of Luke's sustained interest in the soteriological dimensions of the death of Jesus. Before turning to the relevant texts, however, I would first like to address an important distinction that has often been a point of confusion in discussions of the soteriological dimensions of the passion narrative, *viz*. the difference between the event itself and its effects. The death of Jesus as an event is conceived as an act of atonement in the words of institution. The outcomes of this event are the establishment of a new covenant and the redemptive experience of salvation for the people of God. In the passion narrative, the soteriological symbolism is focused primarily upon the soteriological effects of Jesus' death, and some interpreters have tended to separate these effects from the event upon which they are based, so that the salvific experiences depicted within the passion narrative are said to be accomplished not on account of any objective efficacy in the cross itself, but rather through the altered disposition of those who become open to divine mercy upon seeing Jesus' suffering.[41] The cross, according to this perspective, is soteriologically effective, but only through an exemplary rather than an objectively atoning function.

In this regard, the soteriological framework established by the last supper must not be forgotten. At the last supper, the experience of salvation and the forgiveness of sins implicit in the new covenant are inextricably connected to the sacrificial body and blood of Jesus given on behalf of his own as a cultic offering. When the soteriological outcomes of the death of Jesus envisioned at the last supper are then demonstrated within the passion narrative, they must be rooted in the event itself as it has already been interpreted by Jesus in the words of institution.[42] It may be true that the death of Jesus serves an exemplary purpose within the Lukan conception of discipleship, yet we shall see that this does not exhaust the soteriological function of the Lukan cross. Having addressed this important distinction, let us consider the sequence of events within which the soteriological dimensions of the passion narrative unfold.

---

41 Particularly clear examples of this approach can be found in Büchele (1978: 86 – 87); Untergaßmair (1980: 203 – 207); Karris (1985: 115).

42 On the close literary connection between the last supper and the rest of the passion narrative, see Brown (1994: 291 – 293).

1. The Innocence of Jesus and the Barabbas Exchange (Luke 23:18 – 25)

Interpreters have universally acknowledged that the Lukan passion narrative uniquely emphasizes the innocence of Jesus.[43] Over the course of his trials and crucifixion, Jesus' innocence is affirmed repeatedly by Pilate (Luke 23:4, 14, 22), Herod (23:8 – 11, 15), the repentant criminal crucified beside Jesus (23:41), and the centurion at the foot of the cross (23:47).[44] With the exception of the centurion's more positive δίκαιος declaration, the affirmations of Jesus' innocence are typically expressed by means of negations which denote a total lack of guilt or wrongdoing. Pilate finds "no charge" in this man (23:4, 14). Likewise, the examination of Herod confirms that "nothing worthy of death" has been done by Jesus (23:15). At the insistence of the crowd that Jesus be crucified, Pilate asks, "What evil has this man done? I have found no charge of death in him" (23:22). Similarly, the penitent criminal confirms, "This man has done nothing out of place" (23:41).

The privative nature of Jesus' innocence contrasts with the positive liability of the criminals crucified with Jesus (23:41). Indeed, the criminals next to Jesus are repeatedly described as wrong-doers (κακοῦργοι – 23:32 – 33, 39). They suffer justly (δικαίως), receiving the worthy penalty for what they have done (23:41). When Jesus, by contrast, is declared δίκαιος (23:47), this implies that he is crucified unjustly, for nothing worthy of death has been done by him. Though he is innocent, he has been numbered with transgressors (22:37) and shares in their fate. Thus, the Lukan passion narrative presents a righteous man who has done nothing wrong (cf. κακός – 23:22) suffering under the penalty rightly prescribed for wrong-doers (κακοῦργοι).

In this regard, the release of Barabbas in exchange for the crucifixion of Jesus symbolically enacts the redemption which takes place through Jesus' death (23:18 – 25). It is important to note that in his redaction of the Barabbas ex-

43 See, for example, Carroll and Green (1995: 72 – 74); Kodell (1979: 224); Sterling (2001: 398 – 399).

44 The heightened attention to Jesus' innocence fits naturally within a variety of possible backgrounds. Consequently, various interpreters have cited this aspect of the passion narrative as evidence for a motif of martyrdom, the suffering servant, or the suffering righteous. Others have insisted that regardless of its background, the theme of innocence is primarily intended to serve an apologetic purpose, citing Jesus' innocence as a feature of Luke's defense of the church to the state, or of the state to the church, or of the gospel to non-Christian audiences. The very diversity of plausible backgrounds and ulterior motivations for this theme within Luke's gospel may suggest that the background to Jesus' innocence is not as significant as its bare reality. Clearly Jesus is presented as one who suffers innocently, unfairly enduring a punishment which he has not earned.

change, Luke omits any indication that the release of a prisoner is customary at the Passover (cf. Mark 15:6; Matt 27:15; John 18:39).[45] Consequently, whereas the other gospels portray Pilate asking the crowd to make a choice between Jesus and Barabbas (Mark 15:9; Matt 27:17; John 19:39),[46] Luke presents the crowd challenging and overturning a decision that Pilate has already made.[47] For Luke, the matter has been examined, and Jesus is to be disciplined and then released (Luke 23:15–16). The release of Jesus intended by Pilate is a matter not of custom, but of justice.

The discharge of Barabbas in Luke therefore ceases to be a conventional expression of clemency which the crowd prevents from being applied to Jesus, as it is in the other gospels. Instead, Luke depicts the event as a redemptive exchange in which the sentence determined for Jesus is experienced by Barabbas, and the punishment rightly suited for Barabbas is applied to Jesus. The guilty prisoner who merits the death penalty is released (ἀπολύω – Luke 23:18, 22, 25; cf. 23:15–16), and an innocent victim is put to death:

> ἀπέλυσεν δὲ τὸν διὰ στάσιν καὶ φόνον βεβλημένον εἰς φυλακὴν ὃν ἠτοῦντο, τὸν δὲ Ἰησοῦν παρέδωκεν τῷ θελήματι αὐτῶν.

Each experiences what the other deserves, and the contrast between Jesus and Barabbas is heightened by the particular way in which the exchange is described. The guilty man is identified by his crime rather than by his name: "He released the one who had been cast into prison because of insurrection and murder, whom they demanded" (cf. Mark 15:15; Matt 27:26). Conversely, Jesus is identified by name, and his name is even brought forward and placed before the verb: "But Jesus he handed over to their will" (cf. Mark 15:15). The narrator's terse depiction of this exchange offers a halting reminder that the liberation of the guilty individual and the death of the innocent Jesus are indissolubly connected.

---

45 The addition in some manuscripts of a reference to the Passover custom at Lk 23:17 or 19 is clearly a secondary harmonization with the other synoptic evangelists. See Metzger (1994: 153); Bovon (2012: 281–282).

46 Maclean (2007: 321–333) argues that Mark and Matthew characterize the exchange of Barabbas for Jesus with the imagery of the levitical scapegoat ritual. Within this portrayal, Jesus is presented as the immolated sacrificial victim whose death accomplishes the purification of the temple. With Luke, any such connotations are lost, since Luke has omitted the reference to a yearly custom and thereby altered the nature of the interaction between Pilate and the people.

47 The crowd's opposition to Jesus is surprising, as it represents a reversal among the people of Jerusalem (cf. Lk 19:48; 21:38; 22:2). See Wolter (2008: 747–748).

One will recall that at the last supper the death of Jesus is portrayed as a redemptive moment typologically prefigured in the saving act of God in the Passover. Just as the Passover serves as the means by which the people experience redemption in the Exodus, the death of Jesus at the last supper functions as the means of a new act of divine liberation. The redemptive effect of Jesus' death which is anticipated in the last supper is then demonstrated in the exchange of Barabbas for Jesus in the passion narrative, where again a prisoner in bondage is set free through the death of an innocent victim (cf. Exod 12:5). Certainly the Barabbas pericope makes no overt allusion to the Passover, and I do not wish to propose that the Exodus is in mind in this episode, though the temporal setting of the passion narrative during Passover week may be suggestive. Rather, the exchange of Barabbas for Jesus serves as a representative enactment of the soteriological outcome which the words of institution attribute to the death of Jesus.[48] The "giving over" of Jesus' body (παραδίδωμι – Luke 23:25; cf. δίδωμι in Luke 22:19) allows for a captive to be released. In this way, the Lukan redaction of the pericope reinforces the soteriological interpretation of Jesus' death found at the last supper, intimating that the death of Jesus accomplishes liberation from bondage.

2. Jesus' Prayer of Forgiveness (Luke 23:34a)

Upon being fastened to the cross, Jesus prays, "Father, forgive them, for they do not know what they are doing" (Luke 23:34a). This prayer is absent from many early manuscripts, including $\mathfrak{P}^{75}$ and Codex Vaticanus. On the other hand, the prayer is present in most of the Old Latin and Syriac versions, and it is also attested by patristic sources, including Irenaeus,[49] Marcion,[50] Hippolytus,[51] and Origen.[52] Thus, the early manuscript evidence for the prayer's omission is offset by the early patristic evidence supporting its inclusion, and hence external considerations are inconclusive for resolving the text-critical issue.[53]

48 Similarly Kimbell (2014: 71 – 73).

49 *Haer.* 3.18.5.

50 Epiphanius, *Pan.* 42.11.6.

51 *Ben. Is. Jac.* 27.28.

52 *Pasch.* 2.43.7 – 14; *Hom. Lev.* 2.1.5.

53 Whitlark and Parsons (2006: 189 – 190) emphasize the external evidence for the shorter reading, arguing that the evidence from the Greek manuscripts is determinative in support of the prayer's absence. However, Eubank (2010: 522 – 524) cautions that the matter is not so straightforward, since the longer reading is attested within all four text-types in the manuscript

Internal probabilities, however, decisively favor the prayer's authenticity. This prayer of forgiveness for sins of ignorance coheres with passages in Acts in which the offer of forgiveness is connected to the ignorance of Jesus' executioners (Acts 3:17; 13:27).[54] If the prayer were not a part of the original text, there would be no basis within the passion narrative for these statements in Acts. Additionally, the prayer of Stephen in Acts 7:60 is more likely patterned upon the prayer in Luke 23:34a than vice-versa. The numerous parallels between Stephen's martyrdom and Jesus' crucifixion demonstrate that the broader description of Stephen's death is patterned upon the death of Jesus, in keeping with the Lukan tendency to present parallels between the life of Jesus and the experience of the early believers in Acts.[55] Likewise, Stephen's prayer for the forgiveness of those who kill him clearly recalls the prayer of Jesus, yet the language of each prayer is unique. Unless a scribe has carefully transported the content of Stephen's prayer to Luke 23:34a without adopting its wording, the two prayers are likely the work of a single author.[56] This is all the more compelling when one considers that the language of Jesus' prayer is characteristically Lukan.[57] The simplest explanation for the thoroughly Lukan style and content of Jesus' prayer is that it belongs to the original text of Luke's gospel.

In requesting the forgiveness of his executioners who do not know what they are doing, the prayer of Jesus likely alludes to the offering for sins committed in ignorance within pentateuchal ritual law (Lev 4:13–20; 5:17–19; cf. Num 15:22–29).[58] In the levitical prescriptions, those who act sinfully and do not know it, upon realizing their sin, are to present the appropriate sacrifices as atoning offerings, and it will be forgiven to them.[59] Each of the verbs in Jesus' request

---

tradition and supported by the early evidence of the church fathers. Particularly significant in this regard is the presence of the longer reading in both Origen and Codex Sinaiticus, two sources which consistently follow the Alexandrian tradition and therefore show early attestation for the longer reading in the non-Western tradition. See also Crump (1992: 80–83).

54 Carras (1997: 608).

55 Elements common to the two scenes include a reference to garments (Acts 7:58; cf. Luke 23:34), atmospheric anomalies (Acts 7:55–56; cf. Luke 23:45), the offering of one's spirit at the moment of death (Acts 7:59; cf. Luke 23:46), and the prayer for forgiveness of the executioners (Acts 7:60; cf. Luke 23:34a). See Delobel (1997: 34–35).

56 Eubank (2010: 526).

57 The form of Jesus' prayer precisely corresponds to the form of the Lord 's prayer in Lk 11:4, as in each case a request for forgiveness is followed by a statement expressing the basis for the request. Likewise, the phrase τί ποιοῦσιν conforms to typical Lukan style (e.g., Lk 2:48; 3:10, 12, 14; 6:11; 10:25; 12:4; 16:3–4; 19:48). See Eubank (2010: 526); Carras (1997: 608).

58 See Carras (1997: 612–614); Mittmann-Richert (2008: 71, 99).

59 In Num 15:22–31, this is contrasted with high-handed, defiant sin, for which there is apparently no provision for atonement. In Lev 4:13–20, the whole congregation is in view, and

upon the cross is found in Lev 5:17–18 LXX (ποιέω, ἀφίημι, οἶδα), so that the prayer echoes the levitical stipulations for atonement through the אשם offering:

Table 9 – Luke 23:34a and Leviticus 5:17–18 LXX

Luke 23:34a	Leviticus 5:17–18 LXX
ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγεν· πάτερ, **ἄφες** αὐτοῖς, **οὐ** γὰρ **οἴδασιν** τί **ποιοῦσιν.**	καὶ ἡ ψυχή ἣ ἂν ἁμάρτῃ καὶ **ποιήσῃ** μίαν ἀπὸ πασῶν τῶν ἐντολῶν κυρίου ἃν οὐ δεῖ **ποιεῖν** καὶ οὐκ ἔγνω καὶ πλημμελήσῃ καὶ λάβῃ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν [18] καὶ οἴσει κριὸν ἄμωμον ἐκ τῶν προβάτων τιμῆς ἀργυρίου εἰς πλημμέλειαν πρὸς τὸν ἱερέα καὶ ἐξιλάσεται περὶ αὐτοῦ ὁ ἱερεὺς περὶ τῆς ἀγνοίας αὐτοῦ ἧς ἠγνόησεν καὶ αὐτὸς **οὐκ ᾔδει** καὶ **ἀφεθήσεται** αὐτῷ

Beyond these direct lexical connections between the levitical text and Luke 23:34a, the prevalence of ignorance terminology in the levitical context (ἀγνοέω, ἀγνοια, οὐκ ἔγνω) further reinforces a levitical background to Jesus' prayer, since the theme of ignorance is prominent in the Lukan interpretation of the crucifixion (cf. Acts 3:17; 13:27). Indeed, Origen, in his exposition of Leviticus, links Jesus' prayer to the levitical prescriptions at precisely this point, citing Luke 23:34a as confirmation that a community can commit sins of ignorance (*Hom. Lev.* 2:5; cf. Lev 4:13).[60]

These cultic undertones of Jesus' prayer may be mediated through the tradition of the Isaianic servant in Isa 53:10–12, where the suffering servant makes intercession for transgressors and is also depicted as an אשם offering. Some interpreters have cautioned against such an interpretation, arguing that the intercession of the Isaianic servant is accomplished not through prayer but through the bearing of sin in the context of Isaiah 53.[61] However, since Jesus' prayer also contains a verbal allusion to the אשם offering, one might suppose that in Luke 23:34a the two forms of intercession are brought together. Jesus intercedes through his prayer, yet he does so in language which suggests that his death it-

---

the prescribed sacrifice is a חטאת offering. Lev 5:17–18 considers the case for an individual, prescribing an אשם offering. The passage from Numbers provides prescriptions for both the community and the individual, though the precise regulations differ slightly from the texts in Leviticus.

60 For a critique of the cultic interpretation of Jesus' prayer, see Matthews (2009: 128–131). Matthews notes the differences in context between the levitical prescriptions and Jesus' prayer, but he unduly downplays the lexical and thematic connections between Leviticus and Lk 23:34a.

61 Carras (1997: 612); Giesen (2005: 158).

self is also a cultic intercession, in keeping with the depiction of the Isaianic servant's death in Isa 53:10 – 12. One must note that Isa 53:12 LXX removes the notion of intercession, so that an Isaianic allusion at this point in Luke's text would depend upon the form of the text found in the MT.[62] This is plausible, since Luke's prior use of Isa 53:12 in Luke 22:37 conforms more closely to the MT than the LXX,[63] suggesting that Luke may well have been familiar with a form of the text that included the intercession of the servant. Certainly we must be cautious in the absence of any verbal correspondences with the text of Isaiah. Yet if an allusion to the suffering servant is present in Luke 23:34a, it would cohere quite well with the sense of Isa 53:10 – 12 MT.[64]

Aside from the cultic aspects of Luke 23:34a, Jesus' prayer for forgiveness also aligns naturally with the reference to the new covenant at the last supper (Luke 22:20), since in Jer 31:31– 34 the forgiveness of sins functions as the basis for the new covenant established between God and his people.[65] Indeed, when the new covenant is established, God will be merciful toward the iniquity of his people and remember their sins no longer, and all of the people, from the least to the greatest, will know the Lord (Jer 31:33 – 34; cf. Rom 11:26 – 27; Heb 8:8 – 12).

As with the Barabbas pericope, I do not wish to imply that Jesus' prayer from the cross entails a direct allusion to Jeremiah's description of the new covenant. Rather, I am simply calling attention to the coherence between the soteriological effects attributed to Jesus' death at the last supper, on the one hand, and the suggestive demonstration of those effects in the events of the passion narrative, on the other. In the words of institution, Jesus declares that his death establishes a new covenant between God and his people, a relationship which in Jeremiah is marked by personal knowledge of God and the forgiveness of sins. When Jesus then prays for the forgiveness of those who act in ignorance as he dies upon the cross, one can see that the depiction of Jesus' death in the passion narrative corroborates the interpretation of that event in the eucharistic words.

Certainly the imagery in Luke 23:34a is allusive and imprecise. The verse makes no explicit claim that the forgiveness for which Jesus prays is based upon the atoning death which he suffers, nor does the passage offer any refer-

62 Bock (1987: 145 – 146).

63 See above, p. 87, n. 75.

64 More speculatively, Ford (1983: 96) reads Lk 23:34a in relation to the proclamation of a Jubilee Year in Lk 4:18 – 21, through which Ford suggests that the crucifixion scene presents Jesus as a new high priest inaugurating a Jubilee Year on a new Day of Atonement.

65 On the connection between the new covenant and the forgiveness of sins, see Lichtenberger (1995: 412 – 413).

ence to a new covenant. However, as a suggestive illustration of what Jesus has already said at the last supper, the prayer of forgiveness coheres remarkably well with the soteriological interpretation of Jesus' death found in the words of institution, reinforcing the impression that Jesus' death is an act of cultic atonement with decisive consequences for the relationship between God and his people.

3. The Salvation of the Penitent Criminal (Luke 23:35 – 43)

Jesus' prayer from the cross is not met with a response of repentance by those for whom he prays. Instead, the Jewish leaders, the soldiers, and the blaspheming criminal sarcastically cry out for Jesus to save himself. The verb σῴζω appears four times in the three statements by the mockers (23:35, 37, 39).[66] Those who assail Jesus suppose that he is incapable of bringing salvation if he cannot save himself. The Lukan viewpoint toward Jesus' death, however, utterly inverts such a perspective.[67] Only through his suffering is Jesus able to accomplish salvation (cf. Luke 9:24), and at the last supper Jesus shows that his sacrificial death will be the occasion for a new redemptive act on par with God's great saving act in the Exodus. Thus, from the soteriological framework furnished by Luke, the demand of the mockers rings with dramatic irony, as they rightly recognize the soteriological vocation of the messiah (cf. Luke 2:11) yet fail to perceive the means by which that ministry will be accomplished.[68]

The mockery of Jesus in Luke 23:35 – 39 provides an ironic backdrop to the exchange between Jesus and the penitent criminal in Luke 23:40 – 43. At the very moment that Jesus is being mocked for his inability to save, he provides an assurance of salvation to the penitent criminal as he dies upon his cross (Luke 23:42 – 43). The criminal requests Jesus to remember him whenever Jesus comes into his kingdom.[69] In reply, Jesus says, "Truly I say to you, today you

66 On the significance of this verb in the immediate context of the present passage, see Fitzmyer (1989: 212).

67 See Meynet (1988: 910).

68 Hagene (2003: 186).

69 Many manuscripts employ the preposition ἐν rather than εἰς for the criminal's request. The former would most naturally reflect the criminal's expectation of an eschatological entrance into the kingdom. Brown (1998: 1005 – 1008) favors εἰς, arguing that the "today" of Jesus' reply coordinates the coming of Jesus' kingdom with the cross rather than a future eschatological event. Certainly Brown is correct as to the Lukan perspective toward Jesus' kingdom entrance, yet this need not eliminate the possibility that the criminal's request reflects his own expectation that Jesus will come into his kingdom at some indefinite future time. Jesus' "today" would then

will be with me in paradise."[70] Within Jewish and early Christian eschatological expectation, παράδεισος serves both as the heavenly abode of the righteous (*1 En.* 60:8, 23; *2 En.* 8:3 – 8; perhaps 2 Cor 12:4) and as a symbol of eschatological salvation (cf. Isa 51:3; *4 Ezra* 7:36; *Test. Levi* 18:10 – 14; *Test. Dan* 7:9 – 12; Rev 2:7; 22:1 – 5).[71] The concept derives from the imagery of the primordial garden in Genesis (cf. Gen 2:8 LXX), with entrance into Eden conceived as a metaphor for eschatological blessing (*Ps. Sol.* 14:1 – 10; *4 Ezra* 8:52).[72] Accordingly, Jesus' promise to the repentant criminal constitutes an assurance of eschatological life and implies the forgiveness of the criminal's sins, since the taint of sin is forbidden in paradise.[73]

In its context, the promise of Jesus to the penitent criminal is closely coordinated with Jesus' death. Not only is the statement uttered shortly before Jesus dies, but the assurance also comes as the climax of a scene that has been preoccupied with the relationship between Jesus' messianic ministry of salvation and his death upon the cross.[74] The mockers take the death of Jesus as evidence that Jesus is incapable of bringing salvation and is therefore not the messiah, a perspective that is profoundly ironic in light of Luke's consistent assurance that Jesus will fulfill his messianic task and bring salvation through suffering. In the midst of this mockery, the promise of Jesus to the penitent criminal stands as a decisive confirmation of the Lukan perspective, revealing that Jesus' death denotes his entry into paradise and illustrating that eschatological salvation is attained not through an escape from death, but through Jesus' obedient submission to a fate of suffering (cf. Luke 22:39 – 46).[75]

---

be both emphatic and corrective, promising to the criminal more than he even requested. See Grelot (1967: 194 – 195).

70 This promise can be coordinated with Jesus' desire at the last supper. At the table, Jesus longs to eat the Passover with the disciples before he suffers (μεθ᾽ ὑμῶν), and he declares that "from now on" he will not partake of the bread or the wine until the arrival of the kingdom of God (Lk 22:15, 16, 18). Now, to the penitent criminal Jesus provides the assurance of immediate entry (σήμερον) into paradise "with him" (μετ᾽ ἐμοῦ). The "today" of Jesus' promise contrasts with the indefinite nature of the criminal's request. For Jesus, "today" is the time of fulfillment and salvation (cf. Lk 4:18 – 21; 19:9 – 10). See Grelot (1967: 205 – 210); Untergaßmair (1980: 203); Giesen (2005: 169 – 170).

71 Grelot (1967: 200 – 202); Giesen (2005: 171 – 174); Macaskill (2010: 72).

72 Gurtner (2006: 193).

73 Neyrey (1985: 137).

74 Fitzmyer (1989: 213); Bovon (2012: 311 – 312); Kimbell (2014: 77 – 79).

75 An informative comparison to Jesus' assurance to the penitent criminal can be found within Jewish tradition regarding the conditions of access to the tree of life, where Torah becomes an essential path to the primordial garden (cf. Prov 3:18; *Pss. Sol.* 14:1 – 10; *Tg. Neof.* and *Tg. Ps.-J.* of Gen 3:24). See Kister (2010: 141 – 145).

4. The Darkness and the Temple Veil (Luke 23:44 – 45)

The assurance of eschatological salvation to the penitent criminal is immediately followed by two portents of the cosmic significance of the crucifixion: the darkening of the sky and the rending of the temple veil. The darkness which falls over the land at Jesus' death at midday contrasts with the light which breaks forth in association with his birth at night in the infancy narrative (cf. Luke 2:9 – 11).[76] Additionally, the mention of darkness at this hour corresponds with the statement of Jesus upon his arrest, "But this is your hour, and the power of darkness," a statement which in turn recalls that Satan had fled from the temptation scene until an opportune time (Luke 22:53; cf. 4:13). The symbol of darkness is also equated with the power of Satan in Acts 26:18, where Paul conceives of his mission as one of turning people "from darkness to light and from the power of Satan to God." In the Acts passage, the contrast between light and darkness is paralleled by the contrast between the power of Satan and God, so that clearly the symbol of darkness is linked with satanic power. At the very least, therefore, the cosmological anomaly in Luke 23:44 – 45 must signify the satanic influence at work in putting Jesus to death (cf. Luke 22:3, 31).[77] Still, might the darkness entail any further symbolic significance?[78]

Luke is unique in adding a genitive absolute to the description of the darkness: "while the sun failed/eclipsed" (τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπόντος – 23:45a). The eclipse of the sun may serve simply as a natural explanation for the strange darkness, yet according to Mittmann-Richert, this additional detail could also allude to the eschatological shaming of the sun in Isa 24:23 MT, where the failure of the sun marks the reign of the Lord of Hosts at Mount Zion.[79] This may then be connected with Isa 60:19, where the light of the sun is replaced by the light of divine glory, so that the failing of the sun in Luke 23:44 – 45 denotes the entrance of Jesus into his kingdom and glory (cf. βασιλεία – 23:42). However, in the LXX the reference to the sun in Isa 24:23 is replaced by the falling of the wall of the city (πεσεῖται τὸ τεῖχος). Thus, lexical connections between the darkness of Luke 23:44 – 45 and the eschatological failure of the sun in Isaiah are lacking, which suggests that caution is warranted with regard to the specificity of this proposed intertextual resonance.

---

76 Mittmann-Richert (2008: 105).

77 Büchele (1978: 108); Chance (1988: 118 – 119).

78 For a summary of the diverse interpretations which have been proposed, see Kimbell (2014: 80 – 83).

79 Mittmann-Richert (2008: 148 – 149).

Nonetheless, the symbolism of the darkness likely entails some sort of eschatological dimension at the crucifixion scene, if not through an intertextual connection with Isaiah, then perhaps through an intratextual link with Peter's reference to darkness in his Pentecost sermon. In Acts 2:16–33, Peter declares that the eschatological salvation envisioned by Joel, which presents the darkening of the sun as a sign of the eschatological day of the Lord (Joel 2:28–32), has arrived following the death and resurrection of Jesus. The way in which Peter's Pentecost sermon correlates the eschatological day of the Lord with the death and resurrection of Jesus suggests that the darkness at the cross probably involves some eschatological symbolism.[80]

The precise signification of the eschatological darkness, however, is not specified by the narrator. Kimbell suggests that the darkness is symbolic of the divine judgment against sin which Jesus endures upon the cross.[81] Indeed, darkness is frequently an expression of divine judgment in the OT (Exod 10:21–23; Deut 28:29; Jer 15:9; 23:12; Lam 3:1–2; Ezek 32:7–8; Amos 5:18–20; Zeph 1:15), and the failure of the sun in particular is often associated with the judgment which accompanies the eschatological day of the Lord (Isa 13:9–11; Joel 2:1–2, 10, 31–32; 3:14–15; Amos 8:9–10; Mic 3:5–6).[82] However, the symbolism of darkness in the OT is polyvalent. In fact, darkness is occasionally associated with the divine presence rather than with divine wrath (Exod 14:20; Deut 4:11; 5:22; 2 Sam 22:10–12; Ps 18:12; cf. Josephus, *A.J.* 3.203; 8.106). Moreover, Luke omits the cry of dereliction found in Mark and Matthew, recording instead a confident prayer of trust at the moment of Jesus' death (Luke 23:46; cf. Mark 15:34; Matt 27:46). This redaction of the synoptic tradition might work against understanding the darkness in Luke 23:44–45 as a symbol of divine wrath endured by Jesus. If the notion of divine judgment is present in the darkness at the cross, then the judgment in view is likely to be the impending divine punishment upon those who have rejected Jesus, in keeping with Luke's consistent connection between the death of Jesus and the judgment of Jerusalem (cf. Luke 13:34–35; 19:41–44; 21:20–24; 23:28–31). As such, the failure of the sun might stand as a divine response to the mocking voices in the scene, confirming the satanic origin of their opposition and perhaps anticipating a decisive judgment against them.[83]

80 Green (1994: 505–506).

81 Kimbell (2014: 87).

82 Kimbell (2014: 84).

83 Additionally, the extent of the darkness (ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν γῆν) helps to highlight the global significance of the crucifixion. See Bovon (2012: 324); Wolter (2008: 762).

The rending of the temple veil which follows the description of darkness then offers a second divine witness confirming the cosmic significance of what is transpiring. The Lukan depiction of the torn veil is brought forward, so that it is narrated prior to Jesus' death rather than afterward (Luke 23:45; cf. Mark 15:38; Matt 27:51). Still, the timing of the incident is closely coordinated with the moment of Jesus' death, which is depicted in the very next verse, and the rending of the veil is likely transposed to its new location in order to pair the extraordinary event with the supernatural darkness as a second cosmic intervention at the cross.[84] Also, the Lukan placement of the tearing of the veil brings the event into closer proximity with Jesus' assurance of paradise to the penitent thief, and I will suggest below that the symbolism of the torn veil entails a certain paradisiacal dimension. Thus, the forward placement of the torn veil can be explained in terms of the distinctively Lukan elements of the immediate context, and the slight shift in sequence need not be taken as the narrator's subtle attempt to excise the crucifixion scene of the notion of atonement.[85] If this had been a concern for Luke, surely he could have removed the torn veil altogether, for John's gospel shows that the torn veil was not an indispensable element of the passion tradition (cf. John 19:17–37).

The noun καταπέτασμα appears in the LXX with reference to (1) the inner veil separating the holy place from the holy of holies (Exod 26:33; cf. 2 Chron 3:14; 1 Kgs 6:36 LXX), (2) the outer veil at the entrance of the courtyard (Exod 37:16 LXX), as well as (3) the screen between the courtyard and the sanctuary (Exod 26:37). However, the term is most frequently used for the inner veil, and in fact καταπέτασμα is consistently modified by a locative genitive or other syntactical marker to designate which veil is in mind whenever the term is not applied to the inner veil.[86] Therefore, the absence of any syntactical marker specifying the precise veil in mind at the crucifixion scene likely indicates that the inner veil is in view. In addition, the inner veil is the only veil that is explicitly attributed a specific function within the Hebrew Scriptures, and since the rending of the veil at the very least implies the cessation of its function, the veil in Luke 23:45 is probably the inner veil.[87]

---

84 Bovon (2012: 326); Kimbell (2014: 92).

85 *Contra* Ehrman (1993: 201).

86 The noun appears 31 times for the inner veil, twice for the screen, and five times for the outer curtain. See the detailed lexical analysis in Gurtner (2006: 29–46, 74–81). For examples of the modification of καταπέτασμα with the locative genitive to specify an alternative veil, see Exod 37:5, 16 LXX; 39:19 LXX; Num 3:26; 4:32; 1 Kgs 6:36.

87 Gurtner (2006: 47–51). Chance (1988: 119) argues that the torn veil must be the outer veil, because if it were the inner veil, then a torn veil would symbolize the cessation of the efficacy of

The principal function of the inner veil was to provide cultic separation between two spheres of differing holiness.[88] The veil separated the most holy place from that which was less holy (Exod 26:33), serving as a physical barrier to protect the sanctity of the divine presence. The veil prevented visual and physical access to the place of utmost sanctity, and entrance into the holy of holies was allowed only once a year by the high priest on the day of atonement, when the blood of the sacrificial victim allowed the high priest to come behind the veil into the holy place (Lev 16:1–20). As a barrier, the veil also shielded the cultic participants from the lethal force of the divine presence, a function which is illustrated by the way in which transgression of the barrier is met with consuming fire from the most holy place (cf. Lev 10:1–5). Perhaps for this reason, the veil was to be used as a covering for the tabernacle during transport (Exod 40:3, 21; Num 4:5). Finally, the veil also played a role in the חטאת offering, as the blood of the animal was to be sprinkled toward the veil seven times (Lev 4:6; 17).

The protective function of the veil as a cultic barrier shielding the divine presence was underscored by the embroidery of cherubim upon the curtain (Exod 26:31; 2 Chron 3:14).[89] As angelic guardians, the cherubim were placed at the east of the Garden of Eden to protect the entrance into the abode of the divine presence (Gen 3:24), and throughout the Hebrew Scriptures the cherubim are closely associated with the presence of God (Exod 25:18–20; Num 7:89; 1 Sam 4:4; 2 Sam 22:11). Indeed, in Solomon's temple, the most holy place was occupied by two wooden cherubim (1 Kgs 6:23–27), and the walls of the temple were engraved with cherubim (1 Kgs 6:29). Therefore, the presence of cherubim on the inner veil reflected the role which the veil played in protecting the divine presence from violation, and naturally the temple and the Garden of Eden became associated within eschatological contexts in Jewish tradition and early Christianity.[90]

---

the temple cult and restored access to God through Jesus' death, and this would be out of keeping with the Lukan perspective toward the temple and his alleged lack of interest in atonement theology. Chance's argument begs the question, for the Lukan perspective toward the temple is in no small part expressed in the symbolism of the torn veil, and if the factors cited above indicate that the torn veil is the inner veil, then the torn veil itself may serve as an example of a Lukan interest in atonement.

88 For a detailed description of the function of the inner veil, see Gurtner (2006: 52–71).

89 Gurtner (2006: 57–59).

90 In Rev 21:22; 22:1–5, for example, the description of the new Jerusalem draws heavily upon Edenic imagery as it is found in the eschatological expectations of Zech 14:8–11 and Ezek 47:1–14 (cf. Gen 2:10). For a brief exposition of the links between Eden, the temple,

Given the cultic function of the inner veil, the rending of the veil in Luke 23:45 likely signifies the removal of the barrier which separated humanity from the divine presence.[91] At the cross, accessibility to the presence of God is restored, and paradise is regained. Eschatological salvation has arrived. This is illustrated dramatically through the tearing of the veil, the paradigmatic symbol of the separation between humanity and the divine presence in the temple.[92] The cherubim who guard the presence of God are removed,[93] and access to the eschatological Garden is now open.[94] Moreover, because the tearing of the veil involves the cessation of its function, the torn veil implies that the cultic requirement of atonement to provide access to the divine presence is satisfied decisively at the cross (cf. Lev 16:1–20).[95] The tearing of the veil opens the door to the presence of God, and so Jesus' assurance of entry into paradise is confirmed by a divine sign

and the city of Jerusalem, along with a helpful bibliography, see Macaskill (2010: 76–77); also van Ruiten (1999: 219–224).

91 Green's (1994: 506–514) interpretation of the torn veil draws heavily upon the sociological function of the temple as a source of division between Jews and Gentiles from the Lukan perspective. The torn veil is taken to symbolize something akin to what is described in Eph 2:11–18, where the death of Jesus breaks down the dividing wall between Jew and Gentile and offers universal access to salvation. This is reflected in Lk 23:47–48 by the positive responses of both the Gentile centurion and the penitent people. Green's reading accurately highlights the focus upon the universal character of salvation in Luke-Acts, and his treatment of the function of the temple in Acts reveals the way in which the temple ceases to be a cultural center within the Christian movement as the message of salvation goes out to the nations. However, Green's particular understanding of the symbolism of the torn veil depends upon the assumption that the veil stands *pars pro toto* for the temple, a presupposition which is unsupported within early Christian and Jewish literature, where the veil is never symbolic of the temple as a whole (see Gurtner [2006: 96]). Thus, the particular symbolic meaning of the torn veil lies elsewhere, though Green's analysis offers helpful insight on the broader issue of Luke's attitude toward the temple and conception of salvation.

92 Sylva rightly affirms that the torn veil symbolizes "communion with the God of the temple," but he neglects the specific Edenic undertones of the passage and unnecessarily denies much of the symbolic significance of the veil. See Sylva (1986: 243–250).

93 Note the total absence of cherubim in the NT, aside from Heb 9:5, which describes the temple in the past tense.

94 Creation motifs may also extend into the resurrection appearances and the birth of the early church in Luke 24 and the early chapters of Acts. For instance, Wright (2003: 652) finds an echo of Genesis in the new knowledge attained by the Emmaus disciples upon eating with the risen Lord in Lk 24:31 (cf. Gen 3:7), and Marguerat (1993: 222–224) proposes that Acts 2–5 should be read as a creation narrative culminating in the fall of Ananias and Saphira as the original sin in the church.

95 Bovon (2012: 326).

at the temple.[96] The promise of paradise thus depends upon the passion suffered by Jesus, a point confirmed by the tearing of the veil at the moment of Jesus' death.

5. The Centurion's Declaration (Luke 23:47)

The cosmic signs of Luke 23:44–45 are followed quickly by the death of Jesus (Luke 23:46) and the reaction of the centurion (Luke 23:47). At the moment of Jesus' death, the centurion exclaims, "Surely this man was δίκαιος" (Luke 23:47). Luke's version differs from the synoptic tradition, according to which the centurion proclaims that Jesus was the "Son of God" (cf. Mark 15:39; Matt 27:54). The nearly universal tendency within scholarship has been to seek out a single conceptual background for the declaration. Accordingly, interpreters have read the declaration of δίκαιος as the climactic cornerstone of the portrayal of Jesus as the suffering righteous of the Wisdom tradition, or the suffering Davidic messiah, or the Isaianic suffering servant, or the innocently suffering martyr.[97]

The very diversity of alternative proposals ought to be taken as a reminder of what is the most obvious, yet somehow the least acknowledged, feature of the centurion's declaration in relation to the question of its background: the ubiquity of δίκαιος across Greco-Roman, Jewish, and early Christian literary tradition. At the height of the passion, the Lukan centurion has characterized Jesus with one word that cannot be traced back decisively to any single background precisely because it occurs so frequently throughout multiple strands of tradition which clearly emerge elsewhere in the Lukan corpus.

The usage of δίκαιος to describe pious Israelites in the infancy narrative and at the burial of Jesus suggests that for Luke the term primarily entails the notion of Torah faithfulness (Luke 1:6; 2:25; 23:50).[98] Beyond this core of meaning, the usage of δίκαιος as a christological title in the speeches of Acts may indicate

96 Citing Josephus, *B.J.* 6.293–296 (cf. Acts 21:30), one might contend that the torn veil is merely a portent of the temple's destruction (Chance [1988: 121–122]). However, as noted above (n. 87), the veil never stands symbolically for the temple elsewhere in early Christian and Jewish literature. Moreover, since Luke does not include the prediction of the temple's destruction at the trial or mockery of Jesus, the tearing of the veil is unlikely to be a portent of that destructive event in Luke's gospel, even if it might feasibly entail such symbolism in Mark and Matthew (Brown [1994: 27]).

97 See above, p. 22–26.

98 See Radl (1999: 301).

that the declaration of the centurion is to be read in light of an Isaianic background (Acts 3:13 – 14; cf. Isa 53:11).[99] On the other hand, the usage of the Psalms throughout the passion narrative might suggest that the background to the centurion's declaration is to be sought in the Psalms, where δίκαιος appears over 50 times.[100] Indeed, Psalm 31, which Jesus has just quoted in the immediately preceding verse, contains a reference to the "righteous one" in Ps 31:18 (30:19 LXX). Alternatively, given the identity of the centurion and the Lukan interest in the innocence of Jesus, one might read the declaration of δίκαιος as a forensic statement of innocence corresponding to Greco-Roman or Jewish martyrdom tradition. Each of these readings is theoretically plausible because (1) δίκαιος is employed in each proposed background tradition in ways which at least ostensibly resonate with Lukan usage, and because (2) clear traces of each of these traditions, at least in the case of the Psalms and the Isaianic servant, can be found elsewhere in Luke-Acts.

In view of the manifold scriptural resonances of δίκαιος, perhaps the attempt to adjudicate between competing background traditions is misguided. At the very least, it is futile, as countless efforts to establish a single background to the centurion's declaration have done little to move interpreters toward a consensus on the matter. As we shall see in chapter five, Luke clearly employs multiple scriptural sources in his passion references, often through direct quotation, and his statements about the fulfillment of scripture in relation to the passion consistently emphasize the universality or comprehensiveness of the fulfillment: *All* that is written by the prophets must be fulfilled (Luke 18:31; cf. 24:26 – 27, 44 – 47). Given his interest in Jesus' comprehensive fulfillment of scripture, Luke would surely have been puzzled by the impulse within contemporary scholarship to determine which strand of tradition is the most important or controlling background for all the others in the passion narrative.[101]

The quest for a single scriptural background to the δίκαιος declaration is therefore unlikely to yield a decisive conclusion. Even so, one can readily appreciate the inherent polyvalence of the term δίκαιος on the lips of a Gentile centurion in the midst of a narrative steeped in allusions to the Jewish scriptures. Within the story-world of Luke's narrative, the Roman soldier is likely to have intended his exclamation as a declaration of innocence. Luke's audience, however, is able to recognize that δίκαιος might also entail a vertical dimension, denoting

99 See below, p. 143 – 144.

100 Jipp (2010: 263 – 264).

101 For instance, those who favor the Psalms as the decisive background to the passion narrative tend to deny any Isaianic allusions in the crucifixion scene or the sermons of Acts. Consider Jipp (2010: 257, 264 – 266); Karris (1986: 67).

not only that Jesus is innocent of the charges directed against him, but also that Jesus is righteous before God, in keeping with Luke's prior use of δίκαιος.

In fact, Luke's introduction of the centurion's declaration highlights the divine element at the scene. The centurion, according to Luke, glorified God (ἐδόξαζεν τὸν θεὸν) by saying what he did. As such, the response of the centurion falls in line with a succession of prior positive reactions to Jesus' ministry. The witnesses of Jesus' healing of the paralytic "glorify God" on account of what they have seen (Luke 5:25 – 26), as do the townspeople of Nain following the raising of the widow's son (7:16). The crippled woman, the Samaritan leper, and the blind beggar near Jericho all likewise "glorify God" in response to Jesus' healing acts on their behalf (13:13; 17:15; 18:43). Luke consistently employs δοξάζειν τὸν θεόν to describe the reaction of characters who have witnessed the miraculous outcomes of Jesus' mighty works.[102] Not all who "glorify God" become disciples of Jesus (cf. 5:25 – 26; 7:16), yet the reaction denotes that the agent of the praise has attributed what has been done to God. Consequently, the use of such terminology to describe the reaction of the centurion indicates that the event which has taken place is ultimately to be attributed to God.

The importance of the centurion's declaration, then, does not depend entirely upon identifying a specific intertextual resonance in the ambiguous predicate δίκαιος. Upon even a minimalist reading, the narrator's presentation of the centurion confirms that Jesus has died as an innocent man, and the event itself is not a senseless tragedy but a miraculous work for which God is to be praised.[103] Furthermore, the use of δοξάζειν τὸν θεόν would seem to imply that the death of Jesus entails a benefit for others, since this phrase is consistently employed in contexts where the agents of praise have either received the benefits of Jesus' ministry themselves or else observed the positive outcomes of Jesus' mighty works for others.[104] The centurion's declaration can therefore be added to the other dimensions of the passion narrative that reinforce the soteriological efficacy of the cross, a point that has too often been obscured by the relentless search for a literary background to Luke 23:47.

---

102 For a detailed analysis of this phrase in Luke-Acts, see Doble (1996: 26 – 68); also Glöckner (1975: 188).

103 See Nolland (1989: 3.1159).

104 In the immediate context, the penitent criminal seems to be the most obvious beneficiary of Jesus' ministry at the cross (Lk 23:43), though the precise basis for the centurion's declaration is left ambiguous: In Mark, the centurion's declaration is based upon seeing Jesus' final breath (Mark 15:39). In Matthew, the declaration arises from beholding an earthquake and other "things that happened" (τὰ γενόμενα – Matt 27:54). By contrast, Luke's centurion cries out after seeing "what had happened" (τὸ γενόμενον), a vague reference that could theoretically include all the events for which the centurion was present (cf. Acts 10:37).

6. Summary

So long as one does not demand of the gospel passion narratives more than they are likely to provide by virtue of their very form, one can appreciate that the Lukan description of the crucifixion is profoundly concerned with the soteriological effects of Jesus' death. Indeed, the soteriological significance of what is taking place in the passion narrative is underscored through an impressive series of events that illustrate the soteriological import of Jesus' death in various ways. At the last supper, Jesus establishes that his death will accomplish salvation and initiate a new covenant relationship between God and his people. In the passion narrative, these soteriological outcomes of Jesus' death are illustrated through representative enactments (e. g., the Barabbas exchange, the prayer of forgiveness, and the penitent criminal), scriptural allusions (e. g., אשם offering, the promise of paradise), and a cosmic sign (e. g., the tearing of the veil). Accordingly, the centurion's response to the crucifixion confirms that a divine work for the benefit of others has taken place at the cross. Hence, the passion narrative reflects a sustained interest in the soteriological effects of the cross.

While the soteriological focus of the passion narrative is directed primarily toward the salvific outcomes of Jesus' death, the basis for those outcomes in the atoning nature of the event itself is also implied in the allusion to the cultic system in Jesus' prayer of forgiveness and in the symbolic event of the torn veil. In his death, Jesus satisfies the cultic requirement of atonement for sins and is therefore able to offer forgiveness and eschatological salvation to sinful humanity.

Quite significantly, these soteriological elements of the passion narrative are all distinctively Lukan. Thus, Jesus' prayer of forgiveness and the story of the penitent criminal are unique to Luke. Furthermore, many elements from the synoptic tradition, such as the Barabbas exchange, the tearing of the temple veil, and the declaration of the centurion, are adapted in such a way as to reveal a special interest in the soteriological dimensions of the death of Jesus. Together these various Lukan particularities are an impressive testament to the third evangelist's concern to highlight the soteriological significance of what was taking place as Jesus was being put to death.

These soteriological dimensions of the passion narrative reinforce the interpretation of Jesus' death established at the last supper. They also help to vindicate the christological claims of Jesus, showing that the cross truly is an indispensable element of Jesus' messianic ministry of salvation. Decisive confirmation of Jesus' christological identity will of course come principally through the resurrection. Yet by illustrating the efficacy of Jesus' death within God's salvation-historical plan, the soteriological symbolism in the passion narrative sub-

verts the mocking voices at the cross, confirming that the death of Jesus truly is a divine necessity for the fulfillment of Jesus' christological vocation. Christology and soteriology are thus inextricably intertwined in the passion narrative, as Jesus is shown to be a suffering messiah who accomplishes his saving ministry through his death.

IV. Conclusion

Previous interpreters, particularly those of a more maximalist persuasion, have often fixated upon the specific soteriological implications of the various elements of the passion narrative. An interest in soteriological matters is surely warranted, as the present chapter has affirmed that many aspects of Luke's passion story do convey the soteriological significance of Jesus' death. Yet the present analysis has also found that some aspects of the passion narrative are more profitably considered in line with the theme of christological fulfillment than with the agenda of determining the cross' soteriological function. The quotation from Isa 53:12 and the cup in Luke 22:42, for example, are situated within passages that are primarily concerned to show how Jesus' suffering is a divinely ordained component of his messianic vocation, and so these facets of the passion narrative are not directly addressed to the soteriological function of the cross within the divine plan of salvation.

The cross for Luke is both revelatory and redemptive, and an exclusive focus upon soteriological symbolism might actually run the risk of underrating the extent to which the cross functions as an indispensable indication of Jesus' messianic identity within Lukan christology. On the other hand, when minimalist interpreters affirm the divine necessity of the cross within Lukan christology while downplaying its significance for Lukan soteriology, they are likely to miss the extent to which the soteriological symbolism of the passion narrative actually helps to demonstrate the fulfillment of Jesus' messianic vocation and thereby to confirm his christological identity. Thus, the christological and soteriological dimensions of Luke's passion story are best understood in relation to one another.

Certainly the death of Jesus presented a number of questions for the early Christian movement, and it would not be surprising for Luke's passion narrative to reflect an interest in a range of salient concerns. In addition to the christological and soteriological dimensions of the passion narrative, the history of scholarship has often debated the nature of Luke's apologetic interest in his portrayal

of Jesus' innocence or in his designation of liability for Jesus' death.[105] Alternatively, many interpreters have been drawn to the ethical themes at work in Luke's passion story, as the pattern of Jesus' suffering may set a model for the suffering of Jesus' followers.[106] The present chapter has not exhausted the themes at work within the Lukan passion narrative, nor does it preclude a multifaceted interpretation of Luke's story of the cross.

I have focused upon two particular dimensions of the passion narrative that are central to the question of the place of the cross in Lukan thought. In considering the christological and soteriological dimensions of Luke's passion story, I have sought to demonstrate that many of the unique elements of the Lukan passion narrative are best understood in light of (1) Luke's anticipatory passion references, where Jesus' death is understood as a crucial facet of his christological identity, and (2) the interpretation of Jesus' death provided at the last supper, where Jesus' death is presented as an event of unmatched significance within salvation-history. The passion narrative may well draw upon a variety of backgrounds and literary antecedents at various points, yet the coherence of Luke's story of the cross emerges in its development of these central themes pertaining to Jesus' death throughout Luke's gospel.

In the next two chapters, I will turn from the passion narrative to the post-resurrection proclamation of the cross, examining the early Christian kerygma from two different vantage points. First, chapter five will analyze the various references to Jesus' death in Luke 24 and the book of Acts, focusing upon the content of particular passages and highlighting the christological thrust of the scripturally inspired descriptions of Jesus' death following the resurrection. Then, chapter six will turn from the exegesis of individual passages to a structural analysis of the apostolic kerygma, locating the position of the death of Jesus within the pattern of proclamation in order to establish the place of the cross within the pattern of Lukan soteriology. In this way, the next two chapters will seek to demonstrate that the retrospective passion references following the resurrection in Luke and Acts both reinforce and fill out the description and interpretation of the passion found in Luke's gospel.

105 On the question of responsibility for the death of Jesus, see Weatherly (1994: 13 – 49). For the broader issue of the apologetic function of the passion narrative, see Neagoe (2002).

106 See, for example, Barrett (1979: 73 – 84); Untergaßmair (1980: 212 – 213); Matera (1986: 198 – 205).

Chapter 5 – The Death of Jesus Proclaimed

I. Introduction

Why do most of the references to the death of Jesus in Luke 24 and the book of Acts appear to lack the sort of overt soteriological interpretation of Jesus' death that one finds in Paul's letters? This has been the single most persistent question within the history of research on the retrospective references to Jesus' death in Luke-Acts. The minimalist response has typically been straightforward: The retrospective passion references do not develop a soteriological interpretation of the cross because Luke is either uninterested or perhaps even averse toward such an understanding of the passion. Maximalist interpreters have instead sought to show that the question is based upon a false premise by demonstrating that the scriptural language employed to describe Jesus' death throughout Acts implies a certain salvific efficacy for the cross in Lukan thought.

The present chapter will seek a middle ground between the two sides of the debate. On the one hand, it is true that most of Luke's retrospective passion references are not primarily concerned with the soteriological function of the cross. The majority of Luke's retrospective passion references occur within the context of passages primarily addressed to a christological apologetic, in which the leading figures of the early Christian movement correlate the death and resurrection of Jesus to scriptural expectations for the messiah. As such, most of the post-resurrection statements about the death of Jesus are primarily intended to show how the cross functions as a marker of Jesus' messianic identity, and only secondarily might these references to the death of Jesus be concerned with the question of how the cross serves as a mechanism within the divine plan of salvation. This christological focus coheres with the emphasis upon christological fulfillment throughout the passion references in Luke's gospel.

On the other hand, maximalist interpreters are justified in finding soteriological implications in the scriptural language of some of Luke's retrospective passion references. In particular, the language of Jesus being "hanged upon a tree" implies a soteriological understanding of Jesus' death. At any rate, the statement of Paul in Acts 20:28 clearly demonstrates that Luke is neither averse toward nor uninterested in a soteriological interpretation of Jesus' death.

A consideration of the post-resurrection references to the cross in light of Luke's sustained interest in christological fulfillment may therefore offer a fresh vantage point from which to consider the question at the outset of this chapter: Most of the post-resurrection references to the death of Jesus do not develop a detailed exposition of the soteriological efficacy of the cross because

they are addressed primarily to christological rather than soteriological concerns, yet Luke's interest in the soteriological significance of the cross can still be detected in his retrospective passion references. If it can be maintained, such a conclusion would be entirely in keeping with what we have seen thus far in Luke's gospel, where Luke's concern for christological fulfillment emerges as a distinctive feature of his passion story.

The present chapter will be divided into two sections. First, I will survey the use of scripture in the apostolic proclamation of the cross, suggesting that scripture is employed in Luke's retrospective passion references primarily in order to show Jesus' comprehensive fulfillment of scriptural messianic expectations. Then, I will turn to the exception which proves the rule – Acts 20:28 – where soteriological and parenetic concerns displace Luke's christological apologetic in order to present an interpretation of Jesus' death that echoes Jesus' teaching at the last supper.

II. Scripture and the Apostolic Proclamation of the Cross

In continuity with the Lukan passion predictions, the post-resurrection references to the passion at the end of Luke's gospel emphasize the necessity of Christ's suffering as a fulfillment of scripture. To the disciples travelling to Emmaus, the risen Lord expounds the scriptural necessity of a suffering messiah, explaining that the scriptures had foreseen that the Christ must suffer and then enter into his glory (Luke 24:25 – 27). In a similar manner, in his final appearance to the disciples at Jerusalem, Jesus returns to the notion of scriptural fulfillment, reminding the disciples that he had already told them that "everything written about me in the Law of Moses and the Prophets and Psalms must be fulfilled" (Luke 24:44). In both instances, the suffering of Jesus is presented as a central element of his scripturally ordained messianic vocation.

Also in both post-resurrection cases, as in the third Lukan passion prediction (cf. Luke 18:31), the reference to scripture is universal. Indeed, the comprehensiveness of the Lukan conception of scriptural fulfillment is stressed at every turn. No particular passage from scripture is mentioned in this context. Rather, "*all* that is written" about the messiah must be fulfilled (Luke 18:31; 24:44), and Jesus begins from Moses and "*all* the Prophets" to interpret in "*all* the scriptures" the things concerning himself (Luke 24:27). According to the resurrected Christ, the Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms all testify to the divinely determined ministry of the messiah, including his suffering (Luke 24:44 – 47).

In fact, Jesus' climactic, threefold delineation of scriptural references in Luke 24:44 – 45 may well offer a framework for the use of scripture with reference to

the passion in the book of Acts. Having stressed the universality of the scriptural expectation for a suffering messiah at the end of his gospel, Luke proceeds in Acts to show how specific passages from the Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms have been fulfilled through Jesus' experience of suffering and vindication. By employing scriptural references from each of these categories over the course of Acts, Luke reinforces the fullness of Jesus' fulfillment of scriptural messianic expectations. In this manner, Jesus' final statement to his disciples in Luke's gospel provides an interpretive signal for the audience, alerting the readers of Luke-Acts to the likelihood of resonances with the mentioned bodies of scripture.[1] The present analysis will follow this interpretive cue, considering the apostolic proclamation of the cross in Acts in terms of its resonances with the Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms.[2]

But first, a brief qualification regarding the method and scope of the following paragraphs: The attempt to identify and interpret appropriations of Scripture in NT texts intersects with a range of issues related to one's understanding of early Jewish reading strategies, differing frameworks of intertextuality, and the fluidity of the texts considered as Scripture within the emergent Christian movement.[3] The dynamics of inner-biblical exegesis are undoubtedly complex, and a full analysis of the use of Scripture within the apostolic kerygma lies far beyond the purview of the present work. My intentions in the following analysis are limited to the following concerns: I wish simply (a) to call attention to those appropriations of Scripture in relation to Jesus' death that have commonly been recognized by recent commentators on the book of Acts;[4] (b) to evaluate the extent to which these particular uses of scripture are intended in the speeches of Acts as demonstrations of the soteriological significance of Jesus' death, in keeping with the longstanding soteriological debates over these passages; and (c) to

1 See Rusam (2007: 100 – 102).

2 The present analysis will be confined exclusively to those usages of scripture which are addressed to the suffering aspect of Jesus' fulfillment of messianic expectations. A more comprehensive analysis of the use of scripture in the apostolic kerygma would undoubtedly uncover many more scriptural resonances.

3 For a helpful orientation to the issues involved, see Tooman (2011: 4 – 23). For an overview of the discussion of the use of Scripture in Luke-Acts, see Litwak (2012: 147 – 169).

4 Where interpreters disagree as to the presence of an appropriation of Scripture, I have sought to indicate and respond to that disagreement, whether in the main body of the text or in the footnotes. For the most part, however, the scriptural resonances discussed in the present analysis are widely recognized among commentators, even if their interpretation and implications for Lukan theology remain a matter of dispute. Hence, I have not found it necessary to delineate criteria to identify more subtle appropriations of Scripture, given the overt nature of the scriptural resonances under discussion.

suggest that these uses of Scripture are inter-related in so far as they function in their respective contexts to reinforce a Christological apologetic regarding Jesus' fulfillment of scriptural messianic expectations.

1. The Law of Moses

In the speeches of Acts, resonances between the Law of Moses and Jesus' experience of suffering emerge in two ways.[5] First, the rejection of Jesus is interpreted in the early chapters of Acts in terms of the experience of Moses, so that Jesus is conceived as the prophet-like-Moses (Deut 18:15 – 20) whose rejection has been typologically prefigured in Israel's stubborn rebellion against God's anointed leader of the Exodus. Moessner argues that the prophet-like-Moses motif entails a soteriological interpretation of the death of Jesus as an act of atonement,[6] yet the present analysis will find that the characterization of Jesus as the prophet-like-Moses is geared toward a christological apologetic demonstrating Jesus' fulfillment of scripture, and any soteriological implications of this christological category are not articulated with specific reference to the outcomes of Jesus' suffering.

The seeds of the prophet-like-Moses motif are planted in Luke's gospel at the transfiguration scene, where Jesus speaks with Moses and Elijah about his coming ἔξοδος in Jerusalem (Luke 9:31).[7] The heavenly voice commands Jesus' disciples to "listen to him", an imperative which echoes Moses' admonition to the Israelites to listen to the prophet like him whom God will raise up (Luke 9:35; cf. Deut 18:15).[8] The ensuing journey of Jesus and his disciples to Jerusalem can be understood either in terms of a new exodus or in terms of a first visitation corresponding to Moses' initial unsuccessful visitation to the Israelites in Egypt (Luke 19:44; cf. Acts 7:23).[9] In either case, the placement of the journey section of Luke's gospel immediately after the transfiguration scene surely casts Jesus' expedition to Jerusalem in a Mosaic hue.

---

5 In Luke's gospel, the Law of Moses is also evoked in relation to the death of Jesus through the Passover typology at the last supper scene and the undertones of levitical sacrifice in the words of institution and enactments of the passion narrative.

6 See Moessner (1982: 339).

7 See Moessner (1989: 66 – 68).

8 Johnson (1999: 57).

9 Moessner understands the journey section in terms of a new exodus (1989: 69 – 70). Johnson, on the other hand, prefers the visitation interpretation. See Johnson (2011: 34 – 38); idem (1999: 56 – 59).

In Acts, the prophet-like-Moses motif from Luke's gospel is extended in the speeches of Peter and Stephen. Thus, in his sermon at Solomon's colonnade, Peter appeals to Deut 18:15, 18 – 19 to insist that his audience should repent in order to receive the eschatological blessings of salvation offered by the resurrected Lord (Acts 3:22 – 23). Indeed, those who fail to listen to the prophet-like-Moses will be cut off from the people of God, a warning apparently derived through a conflation of Deut 18:19 and Num 15:31 (Acts 3:23).[10] Granted, the prophet-like-Moses motif is not directly connected to Jesus' experience of rejection in Peter's speech. Nevertheless, the clear application of the Deuteronomic motif to Jesus prepares the reader to recognize a correspondence between Jesus' rejection as it is described in Luke's gospel and the Israelites' dismissal of Moses as it is subsequently described by Stephen in Acts 7.

Hence, in Stephen's self-defense, the life and ministry of Moses is described in terms which resonate with the description of Jesus in Luke and Acts. Stephen remarks that Moses was powerful in his words and deeds (Acts 7:22), a characterization which corresponds to the description of Jesus in Luke 24:19.[11] Moses' initial visitation to his own people corresponds to Jesus' visitation (Acts 7:23; cf. Luke 7:16; 19:44),[12] both of which are closely connected to the notion of divine deliverance (Acts 7:25; Luke 1:68, 78).[13] Accordingly, Stephen characterizes Moses as a divinely commissioned individual who is met with misunderstanding and rejection by God's people (Acts 7:25 – 29, 35, 39 – 41). Though rejected by his people, Moses is vindicated by God and established as the "ruler and redeemer" (Acts 7:35 – 36) who leads the people of God out of captivity, performing "signs and wonders" in their midst (Acts 7:36).

The parallels with Jesus' own experience of rejection and vindication are clear. Just as Moses performed signs and wonders in the Exodus (Acts 7:36), so Jesus was attested by signs and wonders during his ministry (Acts 2:22; cf. Deut 34:10 – 12). Jesus is similarly misunderstood, unrecognized, and rejected (Luke 2:50; 18:34; 19:44; cf. Acts 7:25). Nonetheless, through the resurrection Jesus has been exalted as "source and savior" for repentance to Israel and for-

10 Bauckham (2008: 364). Alternatively, the warning in Acts 3:23 may conflate Deut 18:19 and Lev 23:29. See Fitzmyer (1998: 289); Hagene (2003: 125); Pervo (2008: 109).

11 Glöckner (1975: 165).

12 The primary distinction between the visitation of Jesus and Moses' visitation concerns the divine initiative. Whereas Jesus' visitation is presented as a divine commission, Stephen describes Moses' act of visitation as arising from his own initiative. See Gerber (2008: 228 – 229); also Johnson (1999: 56).

13 Glöckner (1975: 165).

giveness of sins (Acts 5:31),[14] much like Moses was sent as "ruler and redeemer" to deliver the Israelites (Acts 7:35). Consequently, when Stephen emphatically asserts that Moses predicted the coming of a prophet like him (Acts 7:37),[15] the audience of Acts surely recognizes that the rejection and vindication of Moses is to be understood as a typological prefiguration of Jesus' own experience of suffering and exaltation.[16] In this way, Luke's development of the prophet-like-Moses motif helps to ground the suffering of Jesus in a scriptural antecedent from Torah, demonstrating Jesus' christological fulfillment of scripture.

Pace Moessner, however, this christological motif is not developed in order to expound the soteriological outcomes of Jesus' suffering and death, as the soteriological efficacy of the cross is never clearly connected to the characterization of Jesus as the prophet-like-Moses. Rather, the speakers of Acts seem to employ the prophet-like-Moses motif primarily as a warning against those who fail to believe in the one whom Moses anticipated, and any soteriological dimensions of the prophet-like-Moses motif appear to operate at a more general level to characterize the whole of Jesus' ministry, and particularly the resurrection, as a work of deliverance.[17]

Aside from the prophet-like-Moses motif, the Law of Moses also emerges within the apostolic witness to the passion through the allusions to Deut 21:22–23 in the speeches of Peter and Paul.[18] Three times in Acts, speakers refer to Jesus being "hanged upon a tree" (Acts 5:30; 10:39; 13:27–29). The language is likely drawn from Deut 21:22–23, where the individual hanged on a tree is said to be "a curse of God."[19] It is certainly curious that the author of

14 For the interpretation of ἀρχηγός as "source", cf. Heb 2:10; 12:2. See Neyrey (1985: 162–163).

15 Note the emphatic demonstrative pronoun: οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ Μωϋσῆς (Acts 7:37).

16 Thus, the motif is developed not only with specific reference to the prediction in Deuteronomy 18, but also through a more general correspondence between the experiences of Moses and Jesus.

17 For a helpful critique of an over-emphasis upon the prophet-like-Moses motif for Lukan christology and soteriology, see Strauss (1995: 278–282).

18 The following three paragraphs are adapted from Wilson (2013 a: 47, 55–58).

19 The Deuteronomic resonance has been challenged by Chapman (2008: 243–244), who argues that the phrase "hanged upon a tree" is merely a common Semitic expression that need not necessarily evoke the Deuteronomic passage. However, Chapman unduly neglects the polemical setting within which the possible Deuteronomic resonances are found in Acts, especially in the case of the initial reference in Acts 5:30. In the midst of an ongoing debate between the Sanhedrin and the leading figures of the early church regarding Jesus' christological credentials, it is hard to imagine Luke unintentionally allowing his Christian representatives to employ language evocative of Deut 21:23 in order to describe Jesus' death, since the language could so easily be understood in such a way as to entail a scriptural challenge to the church's christological claims

Luke-Acts would have Peter and Paul repeatedly employ this terminology with reference to the death of Jesus, for the passage from Deuteronomy, with its notion of a cursed death, may have first been applied to Jesus' crucifixion by Jewish opponents of early Christianity in order to dispute Jesus' messianic identity.[20] In this regard, the application of Deut 21:23 to the death of Jesus coheres with the Lukan tendency to juxtapose the aversion of the Jewish leadership toward a crucified messiah with the bold insistence that the death of Jesus is actually central to the fulfillment of his messianic vocation (cf. Luke 23:35 – 39).[21]

Hence, the initial allusion to Deut 21:23 in Acts occurs (1) on the lips of the foremost leader of the early Christian movement, (2) at a trial before the Sanhedrin in Jerusalem, and (3) in the midst of an on-going dispute over the legitimacy of the church's christological claims (Acts 5:30). The surrounding context, Acts 5:17 – 42, is characterized by tragic irony, as the Jewish leadership is shown to be powerless against the work of God in the apostolic mission. In fact, the predominant theme of the entire passage is the misguided ignorance of the Jewish leadership with regard to the purposes of God. From beginning to end, the reader is reminded that the Jewish leadership is unaware of God's favor upon the apostolic movement and its founder.[22] "Zealous" to constrain the apostolic message, the leadership in Jerusalem nevertheless fails to recognize that the God of their fathers has been at work in Jesus and in the early Christian mission (Acts 5:17; 29 – 32). The tragic irony reaches its height in the speech of Gamaliel, a man who recognizes the futility and danger of opposing the work of God and yet represents a council that is oppressing the apostles.

Within such a context preoccupied with the Jewish leadership's misguided resistance against the purposes of God, Peter's allusion to Deut 21:23 in Acts 5:30 ties together with the irony at work throughout the rest of the passage, drawing upon the dissonance between the perspective of the Jewish leadership and

---

(Pervo [2008: 145, n. 150]). Thus, the commentaries are surely correct in taking the phrase "hanged upon a tree" as an allusion to Deut 21:23.

20 See Chapman (2008: 251); Hurtado (2003: 188); Lindars (1961: 135, 233). Alternatively, the apostles may have creatively applied Deut 21:22 – 23 to the death of Jesus as a result of their own reflection (Elgvin [1997: 19]). Able (1999) suggests that Deut 21:23 came to be used by early Christians due to the development of "tree" *testimonia* within the early Christian movement. Finally, Dahl (1969: 23 – 24) contends that Paul has taken his citation of Deut 21:23 from a Jewish-Christian midrash involving the story of Isaac.

21 See above, p. 103 – 108.

22 The ignorance of the Jewish leadership regarding the purposes of God is underscored by their lack of awareness that the apostles have escaped prison and are teaching in the temple (5:19 – 25) and by the conclusion of the episode (5:42), in which the apostles continue to teach in the temple, proclaiming Jesus as the Christ.

the understanding of Luke's audience.[23] In the story-world of Acts, Peter's antagonists would have likely agreed with the application of Deut 21:23 to the case of Jesus. The allusion reinforces Jesus' cursed destiny, and from the perspective of the Jewish leadership, the manner of Jesus' death would be taken as decisive proof that Jesus is not the messiah. The readers of Acts, on the other hand, know that Peter is a trustworthy spokesperson,[24] and they also recognize that the death of Jesus functions as an indispensable part of Jesus' fulfillment of scriptural messianic expectations.

The allusion to Deut 21:23 in Acts 5:30 therefore highlights the misunderstanding of the Jewish leadership concerning the purposes of God in Jesus, describing the death of Jesus in terms which expose the dissonance between believing and unbelieving perspectives toward Jesus' tragic destiny. Far from invalidating the christological claims of Jesus and the early Christian movement, the manner of Jesus' death by crucifixion serves to confirm Jesus' fulfillment of that which is written in the Law of Moses. He has died as one "hanged upon a tree," thereby enduring a fate foreseen in Torah. In this manner, the allusions to Deut 21:23 in the apostolic kerygma help demonstrate the fulfillment of the Law of Moses in the passion experience of Jesus.

In addition to the rhetorical function of Deut 21:23 within Luke's christological apologetic, the allusions to Deut 21:23 in Acts may also presuppose a soteriological interpretation of Jesus' death. Excluding the book of Acts, the influence of Deut 21:22–23 appears most prominently in the NT in Gal 3:13 and 1 Pet 2:24, where the passage from Deuteronomy is read as part of a broader scriptural witness to the redemptive nature of Christ's death.[25] In the passage from Galatians, the quotation of Deut 21:23 functions as a scriptural proof demonstrating that Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law through his crucifixion. This redemption is accomplished by an exchange in which Christ becomes a curse "for us" (ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν), which Paul proves scripturally by the quotation of Deut. 21:23.

---

23 With the exception of the allusion to Deut 21:23, all of the material of Peter's speech has been introduced in previous scenes, so that the Deuteronomic allusion stands out all the more in this context (Fitzmyer [1998: 333]).

24 By this point in Acts, Peter has been legitimated as a reliable character within the narrative. He has led the brothers in the selection of Judas' replacement (1:15 f.), acted as the spokesperson for the believers at Pentecost (2:14), and performed miraculous healings (3:4 f.; 5:15–16). Furthermore, the description of Peter parallels in many ways the description of Jesus during his ministry (Lk 5:17–26; cf. Acts 3:1–10), and prior to his passion Jesus proleptically anticipates Peter's eventual role of leadership among the believers (Lk 22:31–32).

25 See Wilcox (1977: 85–86, 93).

In 1 Pet 2:24, the allusion to Deut 21:22–23 is found in a parenetic section of the letter that appeals to Christ's death as an example of endurance in the experience of suffering (1 Pet 2:21–25). The author does not provide an introductory formula to call attention to any of his scriptural citations, though virtually all of the passage is obviously adapted from Isa 53. In 1 Pet 2:24, Jesus is said to have borne our sins "in his body upon the tree." The phrase ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον closely parallels τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τοῦ ξύλου from Deut 21:23 (LXX). Certainly the divine curse from Deuteronomy is not explicitly mentioned. However, as in Galatians, 1 Pet 2:24 does describe an exchange between Christ and believers which is accomplished through his death, conflating the language of Deut 21:23 with allusions to Isa 53:12 and 5, respectively. Christ "bears our sin" (cf. Isa 53:12) "in his body upon the tree," and "by his wounds we are healed" (cf. Isa 53:5).

Unlike Gal 3:13 or 1 Pet 2:24, the allusions to Deut 21:23 in Acts are unaccompanied by any explicit references to a divine curse or the soteriological efficacy of the cross, but are such concepts implied by the very presence of the allusions? Luke utilizes a diverse range of terminology to refer to the crucifixion of Jesus,[26] so the author of Acts was under no compulsion to describe Jesus' death in terms which recall a passage from scripture that was employed by Jews during the first century in order to affirm the accursed state of those who die by crucifixion.[27] Indeed, the divine curse is the distinguishing feature of Deut 21:23, and any allusion to the passage from Deuteronomy likely recalls that element of the verse.

Given Luke's interest in formulating a christological apologetic vis-à-vis the Jewish scriptures, one might suppose that Luke is unlikely to have evoked such a scriptural resonance within the polemical context of Acts 5 without having in mind something akin to the sentiments expressed in the other NT uses of the Deuteronomic passage. Luke elsewhere affirms and even emphasizes the innocence of Jesus in his suffering. If Jesus has truly suffered the curse of God, as the allusion to Deut 21:23 would imply, then it has not been as a punishment for his own sin. Consequently, the application of Deut 21:23 to the crucifixion of Jesus by the leader of the early Christian movement in Jerusalem is most easily coordinated with the broader contours of Lukan christology under the assumption that the divine curse mentioned in Deuteronomy and suffered by Jesus

26 In addition to the phrase κρεμάννυμι ἐπὶ ξύλου, the author of Acts also employs σταυρόω (Acts 2:36; 4:10) as well as προσπήγνυμι (Acts 2:23) to refer specifically to the crucifixion, and more general references to Jesus' suffering utilize a further diversity of terminology and imagery (cf. Acts 3:18; 17:3; 20:28; 26:22–23).

27 For the application of Deut 21:22–23 to those executed by crucifixion, see Chapman (2005: 41–43); Fitzmyer (1978: 504–510).

has been endured on behalf of others.[28] Such a soteriological understanding of the cross fits naturally with the emphatic ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν of the Lukan last supper (Luke 22:19 – 20), and this interpretation corresponds to the other uses of Deut 21:23 in the NT. Therefore, I am inclined to agree with the many interpreters who have found a redemptive understanding of the cross presupposed in the allusions to Deut 21:23.[29]

Summary

In this manner, the apostolic proclamation of the cross utilizes multiple motifs from Torah to demonstrate the fulfillment of the Law of Moses in the passion experience of Jesus.[30] As the conventional minimalist outlook toward the Lukan cross affirms, Luke's uses of the prophet-like-Moses motif and Deut 21:23 occur in christological rather than soteriological contexts. However, maximalist interpreters are correct in noting that the allusions to Deut 21:23 in Acts do seem to presuppose a soteriological understanding of the cross that coheres with the soteriological interpretation of Jesus' death in Luke's gospel.

2. The Prophets

In addition to the scriptural resonances demonstrating the fulfillment of the Law of Moses in Jesus' experience of suffering, the apostolic proclamation of the cross also draws upon multiple scriptural models in order to show how Jesus has fulfilled that which has been written in the Prophets about the suffering of the messiah.

At a general level, the fulfillment of the Prophets through Jesus' rejection emerges through the characterization of Jesus as the persecuted prophet *par excellence*, a divinely anointed spokesperson whose rejection by Israel has been typologically prefigured in the experience of the OT prophets. Developed in the anticipatory references to Jesus' fate of suffering (Luke 4:25 – 27; 13:31 – 35), this theme also arises in the Lukan passion narrative, where the temple guards ask Jesus to prophecy immediately after Luke has shown the fulfillment of Jesus' pre-

28 Hurtado (2003: 188).

29 See Morris (1965: 142 – 143); Baker and Green (2000: 75 – 76); Hurtado (2003: 185 – 188); Peterson (2004: 65); Kimbell (2014: 155 – 159).

30 Interestingly, the Passover typology of the Lukan last supper is not developed through the passion references in Acts, though perhaps the Passover motif can be coordinated with the characterization of Jesus as the prophet-like-Moses. See Moessner (1982: 334).

dictions regarding Judas' betrayal and Peter's denial (Luke 22:63–64; 22:47–53 [cf. 22:21–23]; 22:54–62 [cf. 22:31–34]).[31] The characterization of Jesus as the paradigmatic persecuted prophet then emerges once again in Stephen's speech in Acts 7. At the height of his address, Stephen indicts his opponents for their rejection of Jesus, comparing their stubborn response to Jesus with the negative treatment of the prophets by previous generations (Acts 7:51–53).[32] Hence, in his suffering Jesus fulfills that which is prefigured in the experience of the biblical prophets.

Beyond this general correspondence between Jesus and the persecuted biblical prophets, the apostolic proclamation of the cross also underscores the fulfillment of what is written in the Prophets through quotations and allusions to the Isaianic suffering servant. In the history of scholarship, the quotation from Isa 53:7–8 in Acts 8:32–33 and Luke's use of παῖς and δίκαιος in the sermons of Acts have played an important role within discussions about the soteriological efficacy of the Lukan cross.[33] I would suggest, however, that the central concern of the third evangelist in his use of the fourth servant song is actually christological rather than soteriological. In this regard, both minimalist and maximalist readings of the fourth servant song in Luke-Acts tend to err in demanding soteriological answers from passages addressed to christological questions. Soteriological interests drive interpreters beyond the text itself, with maximalists locating the significance of Luke's Isaianic allusions in the atoning work which such resonances imply,[34] and minimalists finding evidence of a Lukan aversion toward atonement in the parts of Isaiah 53 which Luke avoids.[35] In both cases, the christological focus of Luke's use of the fourth servant song is often neglected.[36] In the present analysis, therefore, I would like to highlight the extent

31 Even the mockery itself fulfills an earlier prediction by Jesus (cf. Lk 18:32). The focus upon fulfilled prophecy is heightened by Luke's redaction, since Luke brings forward the mockery of Jesus so that it follows immediately upon the fulfillment of his earlier predictions regarding Judas and Peter (cf. Mark 14:65; Matt 26:68). See Carroll (1990: 114); Soards (1990: 91–92); Neyrey (1985: 70–71).

32 Fitzmyer (1998: 385).

33 See above, p. 24–26.

34 See Larkin (1977: 334–335); Peterson (2004: 67–69); Genz (2015: 97–109).

35 See Cadbury (1927: 280–281, n. 282); Haenchen (1971: 92); Franklin (1975: 65); Sellner (2007: 406–407); Marguerat (2007: 309).

36 Authors who clearly expound the christological emphasis in Luke's use of Isaiah 53 include Glöckner (1975: 171–174); Strauss (1995: 353). Genz likewise stresses the christological significance of Isaiah 53 for Luke more generally, yet he perceives the soteriological implications of such christology to be a matter of central importance within the pericope of the eunuch (2015: 105–106).

to which the usage of Isaiah 53 in Acts is directed primarily toward a christological apologetic demonstrating Jesus' fulfillment of scriptural expectations.

As with other christological motifs in Luke-Acts, the application of the Isaianic servant songs to Jesus begins in Luke's gospel, and the prominent quotation from Isa 53:12 at the outset of the Lukan passion narrative intimates that the passion experience of Jesus fulfills the suffering predicted for the Isaianic servant (Luke 22:37; cf. 23:34 – 43). In Acts, the application of Isaiah 53 to Jesus is reinforced most emphatically through the quotation of Isa 53:7 – 8 in Acts 8:32 – 33. The quotation occurs during an encounter between Philip the evangelist and an Ethiopian eunuch returning home from a journey to Jerusalem. Analysis of Acts 8:32 – 33 has most frequently focused upon the soteriological implications of the Isaianic quotation in relation to the cross, the appropriateness of the quotation in relation to its specific context in Acts 8, and possible reasons for the quotation's peculiar parameters (i. e., explanations for why the quotation preserves precisely those points in the middle of Isaiah 53 in which the notion of atonement is unmentioned).

What has been mentioned less frequently is the emphasis placed upon the scriptural source of the quotation. Three times in the passage, the prophetic identity of Isaiah is mentioned. Twice the narrator directly relates that the eunuch was reading from "the prophet Isaiah" (Acts 8:28) or "Isaiah the prophet" (Acts 8:30). The eunuch then reinforces the narrator's stress upon Isaiah's prophetic identity through his question to Philip about whom "the prophet" is speaking (Acts 8:34).[37] Additionally, the narrator introduces the Isaianic quotation as a "passage of scripture" (Acts 8:32), and Philip's response to the eunuch's question is said to begin "from this scripture" (Acts 8:35). These references to the scriptural source of the eunuch's reading material are highly repetitive, underscoring the Lukan interest in Jesus' fulfillment of scriptural messianic expectations through his experience of suffering.

As such, Acts 8:34 – 35 focuses upon the identity of the servant rather than upon the particular nature of the servant's suffering.[38] The eunuch asks about whom the prophet is speaking, and Philip's reply is summarized in christological terms as the good news about Jesus which arises from "this scripture." The central concern is thus to demonstrate that the prophetic passage finds its fulfillment in Jesus.[39]

---

37 Whenever Isaiah is mentioned by name in Luke-Acts, he is consistently identified as "the prophet" (cf. Lk 3:4; 4:17; Acts 28:25).

38 Bock (2012: 140 – 141).

39 Tannehill (1990: 111).

This christological interest in the episode with Philip and the eunuch fits naturally with the references to scriptural fulfillment at the close of Luke's gospel, particularly in light of the extensive parallels between Luke 24 and Acts 8.[40] In both passages, a supernaturally arranged meeting along the road becomes the occasion for a consideration of the relation between the life of Jesus and the scriptures of Israel. More specifically, in each case the Christian spokesperson explains the good news about Jesus "beginning from" the scriptures (ἀρξάμενος ἀπό – Luke 24:27; Acts 8:35).[41] On the road to Emmaus, Jesus begins from "the Law of Moses and all the Prophets" to explain the things concerning himself in "all the scriptures." Philip on the road to Gaza begins from "this scripture" (i.e., Isa 53:7–8) to preach Jesus to the eunuch. The links between the two passages corroborate Luke's christological interest in Jesus' fulfillment of scriptural messianic expectations. What Jesus states in general terms in Luke 24 is expounded through a reference to a particular passage of scripture by the narrator in Acts 8. The Isaianic quotation in Acts 8:32–33 thus serves as another facet of Luke's concern to show how Jesus' suffering fulfills that which is written in the Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms.[42]

Additional christological applications of the Isaianic servant motif also occur in the speeches of Acts.[43] In Acts 3:13–14, Jesus is characterized as God's servant (παῖς), the righteous one (δίκαιος) whom Peter's audience handed over (παραδίδωμι) but whom God has glorified (δοξάζω). The titles παῖς and δίκαιος may be drawn from the fourth servant song (Isa 52:13; 53:11), a possibility made all the more likely by the usage of παραδίδωμι (cf. Isa 53:6; 12) and δοξάζω (cf. Isa 52:13) in the immediate context.[44] Certainly in Isaiah the servant is handed over by God rather than by his adversaries.[45] Nonetheless, the coordination of Isaianic titles and terminology in such close proximity suggests that for Peter the humiliation and vindication experienced by Jesus is to be understood according

40 See, for example, Fabien (2010: 241–251); Rosica (1994: 126–127); Lindijer (1978: 77–83); Grassi (1964: 464–467).

41 Parsons (1998: 116–117).

42 See also Bock (2012: 143). Some interpreters find reference to the resurrection in the notion of Jesus' life and judgment being "taken up" (Haenchen [1971: 312]; Conzelmann [1987: 68–69]; Tannehill [1990: 111]). However, the two uses of αἴρω in this quotation more naturally relate to Jesus' unjust suffering and death (Fitzmyer [1998: 413]; Genz [2015: 99–100]).

43 See especially Genz (2015: 184–265).

44 See Fitzmyer (1998: 284–285).

45 Luke conflates divine and human initiative in the tragic fate of Jesus (cf. Acts 2:23; 3:18; 4:27–30), so that the stress upon human responsibility for the death of Jesus in Acts 3:13–14 does not negate the intertextual resonance with the fourth servant song.

to the pattern of the Isaianic servant's suffering and glorification.[46] Shortly following this Isaianic allusion, Peter affirms that the suffering of Jesus fulfilled what God had foretold through the mouth of all the prophets (Acts 3:18), echoing the language of the risen Jesus in Luke 24:26–27, 44, 46. As in Acts 8, then, the use of the fourth servant song in Peter's sermon functions as a proof of Jesus' fulfillment of messianic expectations in the biblical prophets.

The title παῖς also appears with reference to Jesus in Acts 3:26 and 4:27, 30. In the former passage, the uses of παῖς in Acts 3:13 and 3:26 form an *inclusio*, so that the usage of παῖς in 3:26 derives its meaning from the initial allusion to the Isaianic servant in Peter's sermon.[47] In Acts 4, the title is employed in the midst of an interpretation Jesus' rejection, trial, and death as a fulfillment of Ps 2:1–2. As God's "holy servant", Jesus is characterized as the "anointed one" against whom the rulers of the earth have gathered (Acts 4:25–27). The notion of anointing is elsewhere connected by Luke in a paradigmatic fashion with the anointing of Isa 61:1–3 (cf. Luke 4:18–19; Acts 10:38).[48] This may form a natural connection between the quotation of a Davidic psalm and the usage of παῖς in Acts 4:27, 30, where παῖς likely carries Isaianic undertones in view of the prior usage of the title in Acts 3.[49] From the Lukan perspective, both Ps 2:1–2 and Isa 52:13–53:12 describe a divinely anointed figure opposed by his own people.[50] The application of Ps 2:1–2 to the rejection of Jesus can therefore be conflated with Isaianic imagery, with the result that Jesus' identity as the Davidic messiah is conceived in close connection to his fulfillment of the fourth servant song.

Finally, Stephen's speech in Acts 7 may also evoke Isaianic resonances in connection with Jesus' rejection. At the end of a lengthy exposition of Israel's history, Stephen indicts the Jewish leadership as betrayers and murders of the "Righteous One" (ὁ δίκαιος – Acts 7:52),[51] castigating his audience for being "stiff-necked and uncircumcised of heart" and for continuing the legacy of their fathers, who persecuted the prophets (Acts 7:51–53). Stephen's language recalls the idolatry of Israel with the golden calf (cf. Exod 33:3–5; Deut 9:6, 12–13) and effectively implies that his audience is subject to divine punishment (cf. Jer

46 *Contra* Benoit (1975: 116–118); Jones (1984: 154–155); De Jonge (1991: 49–50); Jipp (2010: 264–266).

47 Hagene (2003: 216–217).

48 Isaiah 61 in turn evokes the major themes of the servant songs, so that the prophet in Isa 61:1–3 can naturally be understood as the servant of Isa 42:1ff. (Beuken [1989: 415–417, 438–439]). In this way, the use of Isa 61:1–3 in Luke-Acts ties into the broader characterization of Jesus as the Isaianic servant.

49 Goulder (2000: 72–73); O'Toole (2000: 322–323); Soards (1994: 74).

50 Hagene (2003: 218–219).

51 Δίκαιος is also used in Acts 22:14 as a title for Jesus, though not in reference to the passion.

9:25–26; Ezek 44:7–9; Lev 26:40–42). In light of the Isaianic allusion in Acts 3:13–14, some have found an allusion to Isa 53:11 in the substantival use of δίκαιος as a title for Jesus within Stephen's statement about Jesus' rejection at the hands of his own people.[52] In addition, the description of Stephen's death recalls the description of the death of Jesus in the passion narrative. Just as Jesus commits his spirit into the hands of the father, Stephen prays for Jesus to receive his spirit (Acts 7:59; cf. Luke 23:46). Also, both Stephen and Jesus intercede for the sins of their persecutors (Acts 7:60; cf. Luke 23:34), which in the case of Jesus may entail an allusion to Isa 53:12, where the servant makes intercession for the transgressors.[53] In this way, multiple facets of Stephen's story may recall the suffering servant motif present in the Lukan description of the death of Christ, though any Isaianic resonance at Stephen's martyrdom is surely subdued.

At any rate, in both Luke and Acts, the most overt uses of the servant motif occur in contexts which stress the fulfillment of scripture by Jesus in his experience of suffering (Luke 22:37; Acts 3:13–18; 8:32–35). Accordingly, the allusions to the Isaianic servant in the sermons of Acts are most profitably viewed in the first instance through a christological rather than soteriological lens. The Lukan allusions and quotations of the fourth servant song are a key element of Luke's proof that what is written in the Prophets has been fulfilled in the passion. Certainly our analyses of the last supper and passion narrative have found that soteriological implications from Luke's use of the servant songs likely exist, and the fourth servant song may well have served as a precedent for understanding the death of Jesus as an offering that atones for others.[54] Still, Luke is not dependent upon Isaiah 53 alone to interpret Jesus' death as an act of atonement, and christological fulfillment stands as the foremost concern of the third evangelist in his application of Isaiah 53 to Jesus.

3. The Psalms

The third section of scripture mentioned in Luke 24:44–47 is the Psalms. Reference to the fulfillment of the Psalms is unique to Luke 24:44 among passages mentioning scriptural fulfillment in Luke's gospel, and one might suppose that the designation stands alongside the Law of Moses and the Prophets as a metonym for the third category of the scriptures of Israel, the Writings

52 Stuhlmacher (2004: 156); Franklin (1975: 62–63); Ménard (1957: 83).
53 Stuhlmacher (2004: 156).
54 See above, p. 86–88.

(כְּתוּבִים).[55] Such an understanding of Luke 24:44 would correspond with the stress upon universality in the references to scriptural fulfillment. Conversely, the other Lukan references to the Psalms refer consistently to passages from the book of Psalms (cf. Luke 20:42; Acts 1:20; 13:33), and quotations and allusions from particular Psalms do appear with reference to the passion in both Luke's gospel and Acts. The reference to the Psalms in Luke 24:44, therefore, should probably be taken literally.[56]

Prior to the book of Acts, the Lukan passion narrative employs several Psalms in its depiction of the death of Jesus.[57] The division of Jesus' garments recalls Ps 22:18 (Luke 23:34), and the repetitive mocking demand for Jesus to save himself alludes to Ps 22:8 (ἐξεμυκτήριζον – Luke 23:35). The offer of sour wine evokes Ps 69:21 (Luke 23:36). Also, Jesus' final words, "Father, into your hands I commit my spirit," are drawn from Ps 31:6 (Luke 23:46). Beyond these commonly affirmed allusions and quotations, some interpreters have found further resonances with the Psalms in the christological titles of the passion narrative, the depiction of Pilate and Herod, the declaration of the centurion in Luke 23:47, and the distance of the bystanders in Luke 23:49.[58] Thus, Luke's passion narrative draws heavily upon the language and imagery of the Psalms to depict Jesus' death, providing a basis for the christological use of the Psalms in the passion references of Acts.

The apostolic proclamation highlights Jesus' fulfillment of the Psalms through his experience of rejection and suffering at several points. In Acts 1:16–20, Judas' apostasy is interpreted as a fulfillment of Ps 69:25 and 109:8.[59] As in the Lukan usage of the Law of Moses and the Prophets, the passage emphasizes the theme of scriptural fulfillment. Peter informs the Jerusalem disciples, "The scripture had to be fulfilled, which the Holy Spirit foretold through the mouth of David concerning Judas" (Acts 1:16). When the scriptures are quoted, Peter specifically refers to what is written in "the book of Psalms" (Acts 1:20). These fulfillment formulae introduce the quotation in a manner which evokes Jesus' declaration of fulfillment in Luke 24:44–45, so that the treachery of

55 Johnson (1991: 402). Cf. 4QMMT.

56 See Rusam (2007: 102).

57 Jipp (2010: 260–264); Rusam (2007: 84–99).

58 See Jipp (2010: 262–264); Weren (1989: 200–202).

59 On the adaptation of these two Psalm quotations to their context in Acts, see Pervo (2008: 53–54).

Judas is understood as a satisfaction of one facet of scriptural expectations for the messiah.[60]

In Acts 4:11, Peter applies the language of Ps 118:22 to the rejection of Jesus by the Jewish leadership and the vindication of Jesus by God. The allusion to the Psalm contains no introduction,[61] much like the allusions to Deut 21:23 in the speeches of Acts. However, Peter's application of Ps 118:22 to Jesus recalls Jesus' own use of Ps 118:22 in conflict with the Jerusalem authorities (Luke 20:17–18).[62] In the gospel passage, Jesus' interlocutors object to the conclusion of the parable of the wicked tenants, in which the Lord of the vineyard destroys the tenants and gives the vineyard to others (Luke 20:15–16). Jesus responds to his opponents by merging quotations from Ps 118:22 and Isa 8:14–15; Dan 2:34–35, 44–45 via the keyword "stone": "But he looked at them and said, 'What then does this text mean: 'The stone that the builders rejected has become the cornerstone'? Everyone who falls on that stone will be broken to pieces; and it will crush anyone on whom it falls.'" Jesus' response to his interlocutors serves as scriptural confirmation of the message implied by the preceding parable: The Jewish leadership will suffer judgment in light of their opposition to Jesus, the beloved son whom God will establish as the new cornerstone of the people of God. Leadership over God's people, symbolized in the parable by tenancy over the vineyard, will be taken from the high priests and elders and scribes and given to others.

Read in light of Jesus' words in Luke's gospel, Peter's allusion to Ps 118:22 in Acts 4 verifies the completion of what Jesus has declared. Just as the Jewish leadership once questioned the authority of Jesus (Luke 20:1–2), so they now challenge the authority of his apostolic representatives who carry on his ministry (Acts 4:7). Nonetheless, the rejection of Jesus by the Jewish leadership has been overturned by God,[63] who now works through the apostles rather than the high priests and elders to bring salvation to the new people of God by the name of

60 Verbal links between Lk 24:44–45 and Acts 1:16, 20 include the reference to what is written (Lk 24:44; Acts 1:20), mention of the scriptures (Lk 24:45; Acts 1:16), mention of the Psalms (Lk 24:44; Acts 1:20), and the terminology of fulfillment (δεῖ πληρωθῆναι – Lk 24:44; Acts 1:16).

61 Elsewhere in Luke-Acts, οὗτός ἐστιν introduces either descriptions or titles rather than scriptural quotations (see Bock [1987: 200]).

62 The language employed in Acts 4:11, however, differs from Lk 20:17, which more closely follows the LXX. See Conzelmann (1987: 33); Johnson (1992: 77–78).

63 Jervell (1998: 179).

Jesus (Acts 4:8–12; cf. Luke 20:9–18).[64] The Psalm has been fulfilled.[65] The rejected stone has been made the cornerstone, and the Jewish leadership no longer retains its role tending God's vineyard, as the apostles now serve as leaders over the new people of God.

Finally, in addition to the above Psalm citations, Ps 2:1–2 is also employed with reference to the rejection and death of Jesus. In Acts 4:23–31, the Jerusalem believers pray for divine empowerment in the face of opposition, quoting Ps 2:1–2 and interpreting Jesus' rejection in light of that Psalm. The language of the Psalm is applied with precision to Jesus, against whom were gathered (συνήχθησαν – Acts 4:27; cf. Acts 4:25; Ps 2:2) both Herod and Pilate, along with the Gentiles and the peoples of Israel.[66] In this manner, the experience of Jesus stands as a fulfillment of God's words "through the mouth of David," as the passion is interpreted once again according to the pattern of scriptural prophecy and fulfillment.[67]

4. Summary

The retrospective references to Jesus' rejection and death throughout Acts are largely rooted in scriptural imagery and language. In fact, when the quotations and allusions to the Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms in the apostolic proclamation of the cross are compiled, they account for the majority of references to the passion in Acts. Leaving aside for the moment the curious case of Acts 20:28, the only allusions to the passion in Acts which do not employ relatively clear scriptural resonances are the references to Jesus' crucifixion in Peter's Pentecost sermon (Acts 2:23, 36) and the general summaries of Paul's proclamation

64 By using σῳζω to describe both the healing of the crippled man and the salvation of those who believe in Jesus, Peter's message casts the physical healing of the man as a symbol of the salvation available to all through Jesus (Acts 4:9, 12). See Tannehill (1991: 407).

65 Brunson (2003: 120).

66 Weren (1989: 197–198). Herod and Pilate may serve as representatives of Israel and the Gentiles, respectively, since Herod was a half-Jewish vassal of Rome (see Walaskay [1975: 89]). However, the ethnic identity of the two men is not highlighted in Luke-Acts, and the two men are more likely both mentioned on account of the plurality of "rulers" and "kings" mentioned as opponents to the messiah in the psalm.

67 Bock (1987: 205–207). Additionally, the content of Acts 4:28 recalls Peter's earlier description of Jerusalem's opposition against Jesus in Acts 2:23. Previously Peter had spoken of the predetermined will of God being accomplished through the "hands of lawless men" (τῇ ὡρισμένῃ βουλῇ...διὰ χειρὸς ἀνόμων – 2:23). Now the rejection of Jesus is attributed to the "hand" and "plan" of God (ὅσα ἡ χείρ σου καὶ ἡ βουλή [σου] προώρισεν γενέσθαι – 4:28).

in Acts 17:2–3 and 26:22–23 (see appendix 2).[68] Otherwise, the book of Acts derives its descriptions of the passion from scriptural sources.

In keeping with the threefold division of scripture into the Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms, the references to the death of Jesus in Acts draw in relatively equal measure upon types and proof-texts from each of these three scriptural sources. Jesus is characterized as the prophet-like-Moses who endures the fate of the Isaianic suffering servant and is vindicated as the Davidic messiah whose rejection has been overturned by God.[69] Luke's interest in these uses of scripture is primarily christological, and soteriological concerns are secondary. By intermingling a diverse range of scriptural resonances within a framework of prophecy and fulfillment, the references to Jesus' suffering and death in Acts reinforce the role of the passion as an indispensable component of Jesus' christological identity in Lukan thought.

In the third gospel, Jesus must suffer a tragic destiny in order to fulfill the divinely ordained vocation of the messiah set forth within scripture. This is corroborated by the passion references in Acts, which demonstrate the totality of Jesus' fulfillment of scriptural expectations for a suffering messiah by describing the passion experience of Jesus with the language and imagery of specific passages of scripture. In fact, the majority of the scriptural allusions employed in the apostolic references to the cross are anticipated by the use of the same scriptures in Luke's gospel, which further serves to underscore the continuity between the third gospel and the book of Acts with regard to the passion.

III. Acts 20:28

We turn now to the single most striking statement concerning the death of Jesus in the book of Acts, a lone verse which occurs in Paul's speech to the Ephesian

68 In the case of Acts 2:23–24, the departure from a scripturally derived description of Jesus' death may be lexically motivated, as the passage contrasts the death and resurrection of Jesus through a chiastic wordplay that depends upon a *hapax* (προσπήγνυμι) to describe the crucifixion. See Wilson (2013b).

69 The interweaving of these christological categories may have arisen naturally from the inherent similarities among the various messianic types recognized by early Christian interpreters within the scriptures of Israel. The prophet-like-Moses, for instance, shares many titles, functions, and characteristics with the Isaianic servant, who in turn shares many qualities with the Davidic messiah. Indeed, the theme of the Isaianic new exodus naturally fuses Mosaic tradition with Davidic expectations for the messianic age. See Turner (1996: 233–244); Park (2008: 179–197). Pao (2000) also addresses the importance of the Isaianic new exodus for Luke-Acts, though he stresses the ecclesiological rather than christological thrust of this theme.

elders at Miletus. In Acts 20:28, Paul grounds his exhortation for the elders to watch over the flock in the solemn conviction that the church has become God's possession through the most precious of means, διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου. The verse is considered by itself in the present analysis because of its uniqueness in Acts. Not only is the language which alludes to Jesus' death exceptional for Acts, but this verse is also unique in two other respects. First, Acts 20:28 is the only reference to the death of Jesus in Acts which occurs in a speech addressed to the Christian community. To some interpreters, this has been a key consideration in accounting for why the verse appears to be the most explicit reference in Acts to the soteriological significance of the cross.[70]

A second distinctive feature of Acts 20:28 is that the verse contains the only reference to the death of Jesus in Acts which is addressed to soteriological and parenetic concerns rather than a broader christological apologetic. As we have seen, the passion references throughout Acts typically function within an argument regarding the christological identity of Jesus. The majority of the passion references in Acts employ specific scriptures to demonstrate that the suffering of Jesus fulfills scriptural expectations for the messiah, and those passion references which do not include scriptural allusions or quotations nevertheless mention the death of Jesus because it is a component of Jesus' fulfillment of the divine plan for the messiah (Acts 2:23; 17:2 – 3; 26:22 – 23). While some soteriological implications may be drawn out from these other passion references, such concerns are secondary to the immediate context of the statements. Only Acts 20:28 alludes to Jesus' death expressly with a view toward what it accomplishes soteriologically.

Perhaps the unique soteriological focus of the passion reference in Acts 20:28 goes hand in hand with the unique audience of Paul's Miletus speech. Correlation, however, does not necessarily imply causation, and the distinctive emphasis of Acts 20:28 need not signify that the soteriological interpretation of the cross was solely a matter of inter-Christian discussion. Luke's summary of the apostolic kerygma does emphasize its christological apologetic, and on that account the soteriological significance of the cross is not developed in most of the passion references in Acts.[71] But the present analysis has also found that the soteriological meaning of the cross is likely implied in the use of Deut 21:23 in description of the crucifixion. In addition, I will suggest in the next chapter that the pattern of the apostolic kerygma actually presupposes an understanding of Jesus' death as an act of atonement. Thus, the soteriological meaning of the

70 See Moule (1966: 171); Wolter (2009: 23 – 31).
71 Marshall (1971: 174 – 175).

cross is not confined to Paul's Miletus speech in Acts, even if Acts 20:28 is unique in its soteriological focus.[72] With the particularity of Paul's statement in mind, the present work will now consider the text and interpretation of Acts 20:28.

1. Text of Acts 20:28

To establish the text of Acts 20:28, one must decide between two evenly attested readings concerning the genitive following τὴν ἐκκλησίαν:

> προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς καὶ παντὶ τῷ ποιμνίῳ, ἐν ᾧ ὑμᾶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔθετο ἐπισκόπους ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ, ἣν περιεποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου.

Shall the overseers shepherd the church "of God" (τοῦ θεοῦ), as printed in the critical editions, or the church "of the Lord" (τοῦ κυρίου)?[73] Schmid argues that early patristic sources reflect a tendency to refer to Christ as "God" both generally and in the specific context of the crucifixion. Hence, Ignatius (*Eph.* 1:1) and Tertullian (*Ux.* 2:3) both use the expression "blood of God." Tertullian also refers to God as the victim of the crucifixion (*deum crucifixum* – *Carn. Chr.* 5), and Melito of Sardis likewise states that at the crucifixion God was killed (*Peri Pascha* 96). To Schmid, this apparent tendency within patristic sources suggests that the original reading in Acts 20:28 may have been κυρίου, and the variant θεοῦ could have arisen as a christologically motivated clarification of the original reading.[74] Alternatively, the reading of θεοῦ could also have arisen to harmonize with Pauline usage.[75]

---

72 Therefore, the attempt to show that a doctrine of atonement is confined to discussions among Christians in Paul's letters, which in Lukan scholarship has served as a means of explaining why an overt soteriological interpretation of the cross is lacking outside of Acts 20:28 in the book of Acts, may be superfluous (see above, p. 15).

73 The θεοῦ reading is preserved in ℵ and B, whereas κυρίου is attested in A C* and D, along with $\mathfrak{P}^{74}$ (7th century). The evidence from the ancient translations and church fathers is similarly divided. A third variant preserved in the Byzantine textual tradition, τοῦ κυρίου καὶ (τοῦ) θεοῦ, is likely a harmonization of the two earlier variants.

74 Schmid (1999: 582 – 583). Schmid is responding to the theological reconstruction proposed in Ehrman (1993: 87 – 88), whereby the κυρίου reading is understood as an ideologically motivated corruption of the text.

75 Lindemann (2009: 191). Cf. 1 Cor 1:2; 10:32; 11:22; 15:9; 2 Cor 1:1; Gal 1:13; 1 Tim 3:15. Some interpreters instead cite the correspondence with Pauline usage as a factor supporting the originality of θεοῦ, since the remainder of this speech also conforms in many ways to Pauline usage (see DeVine [1947: 396]; Johnson [1992: 363]).

On the other hand, one might posit that κυρίου arose as a secondary reading in light of the phrase διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου at the end of the verse. According to this reconstruction, the original θεοῦ has been amended in order to avoid the notion of "God's own blood," an expression which is otherwise absent from the NT and potentially problematic theologically.[76] The majority of commentators favor this hypothesis.[77] Indeed, "church of God" certainly seems like the harder reading, though the evidence cited by Schmid might call into question the extent to which the idea of "God's own blood" was actually troublesome for early scribes.

Though the matter is rather unclear, the present analysis will proceed from the reading adopted in the critical editions. At any rate, the variant will have little effect upon our understanding of the soteriological content of the verse. Whether the original reading was κυρίου or θεοῦ, the blood mentioned in the verse in either case must be the blood of Jesus shed upon the cross, which is the crucial concern for our purposes.[78]

2. Interpretation of Acts 20:28

The most contentious issue in the exegesis of Acts 20:28 involves the interpretation of the final phrase (διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου). The most natural rendering of the genitive phrase is "his own blood." However, as the presumed antecedent of "his" would be "God" in Acts 20:28, the reference to "his own blood" is initially unsettling to many interpreters.[79] The blood in the verse must be the blood of

76 DeVine (1947: 395 – 396).

77 Note, for instance, Barrett (1994: 2.976); Fitzmyer (1998: 679 – 680); Walton (2000: 94 – 95); Gaventa (2004: 48).

78 Another variant occurs at the end of the verse, as the Byzantine tradition, some later Greek manuscripts, and a few church fathers attest to ἰδίου αἵματος rather than αἵματος τοῦ ἰδίου. External evidence, however, strongly favors the latter reading, which consistently appears in the earliest Greek manuscripts.

79 Accordingly, the verse has given rise to a variety of theologically motivated alternative translations, none of which is as plausible as the natural reading of the verse. Many exegetes prefer to translate the phrase as "the blood of his own (son)," positing either a textual emendation to include the word υἱοῦ at the end of the verse, or else suggesting that τοῦ ἰδιοῦ be read as a substantival title for Christ (see, for example, Glöckner [1975: 182 – 183, n. 191]; Jervell [1998: 512]; Sellner [2007: 469 – 470]; Genz [2015: 296 – 298]). Dolfe (1990: 64 – 67) proposes that "blood" should be understood holistically as a relational reference, so that the phrase should be translated as "the one who was nearest to him." Marshall (2011: 164) and Gaventa (2004: 48 – 49) instead accept a more straightforward translation of the phrase and seek to explain its peculiarity by pointing to the close inter-relationship between God and Jesus in Lukan

Jesus,[80] yet Luke does not clearly refer to Jesus as θεός elsewhere. Even here the designation comes only as the antecedent to ἰδίου. Thus, the peculiar language of the verse is surely anomalous within Luke-Acts. Nevertheless, the designation of Christ as θεός may not be unprecedented within the NT (cf. Rom 9:5), and at any rate our interpretation of the soteriological content of the verse does not depend upon the precise christological implications of Paul's statement.

The imagery of blood in connection with Jesus' death is likely drawn from the realm of cultic sacrifice (cf. Heb 9:12; 13:12; 1 Pet 1:18–19),[81] where blood is conceived as a vessel of one's life (cf. Lev 17:11, 14).[82] An instructive parallel in this regard emerges in the saying over the cup at the Lukan words of institution (Luke 22:19–20). Indeed, Luke 22:19–20 and Acts 20:28 contain the only two explicit references to the blood of Jesus in Luke-Acts, and the respective passages containing these two blood statements, Luke 22:14–38 and Acts 20:17–35, are framed in such a way as to recall one another.[83] Each passage serves as the farewell address of the main protagonist to his followers. Both passages point toward the suffering of the Christian leaders in Jerusalem, and a succession of leadership is enacted in each passage through the words of the protagonist (cf. Luke 22:28–30).

In this common context, both Jesus and Paul utilize the imagery of sacrificial blood to interpret Jesus' death as the means by which the new people of God is formed. In Luke 22:19–20, the outpouring of the blood is the means by which the new covenant between God and his people is established. In Acts 20:28, the blood is the means by which God acquires (περιποιέω) the church as his possession. The verb περιποιέω appears at only two other points in the NT (Luke 17:33; 1 Tim 3:13). However, the noun form περιποίησις appears in 1 Pet 2:9 in a function similar to the usage of the verbal form in Acts 20:28. In the Petrine context, the audience is addressed as a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's possession (λαὸς εἰς περιποίησιν), drawing upon the imagery of Exod 19:5–6, where Israel is identified in similar terms as a λαὸς περιούσιος (cf. Deut 7:6; 14:2; 26:18).[84] In Acts 20:28, the church is similarly conceived as

---

thought in general (cf. Lk 7:16; 8:39; 9:43) and in the Miletus speech in particular. Alternatively, the verse may be a combination of two formulae: "church of God" and "Christ has acquired his people by blood" (see Roloff [1985: 306]; Barrett [1994: 2.977]).

80 *Contra* Grayston (1990: 232), who suggests that "his own" refers to Paul or the Ephesian elders.

81 Walton (2000: 92).

82 On the positive association of blood with life in Hebrew sacrificial ritual, see Sklar (2005: 172–173); McCarthy (1973: 208); McCarthy (1969: 166, 175).

83 See, for example, Neyrey (1985: 43–48); Walton (2000: 100–117); Quesnel (2001: 477).

84 Barrett (1977: 114).

the special possession of God. Yet while the Petrine verse does not specify how the church became God's possession, Acts 20:28 specifies that the acquisition was accomplished through the blood of Jesus. In this regard, Titus 2:14 may furnish another illuminating comparison, for here Jesus is said to have given himself for us in order to redeem us from all lawlessness and to cleanse a people for his own possession (ὃς ἔδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, ἵνα λυτρώσηται ἡμᾶς...καὶ καθαρίσῃ ἑαυτῷ λαὸν περιούσιον). While περιποίησις and περιούσιος are not identical, both terms are employed in similar contexts in the LXX in translation of סְגֻלָּה (Exod 19:5; Mal 3:17),[85] and both Acts 20:28 and Titus 2:14 consider the death of Jesus as the means of preparing a people to be a possession.[86]

Together, the Lukan words of institution and Acts 20:28 combine to form a new covenant counterpart to the initial establishment of the covenant relationship between God and Israel at Sinai. In Exod 19:5 – 6 and 23:22 LXX, God assures the Israelites that if they keep his covenant, they will be his treasured possession. This covenant relationship is then sealed through the blood of the covenant sacrifice in Exod 24:3 – 8. From the Lukan perspective, the blood of Jesus now seals the new covenant between God and his people (Luke 22:19 – 20; cf. Exod 24:3 – 8), so that Paul can rightly tell the Ephesian elders that the church has become God's possession through Jesus' blood (Acts 20:28; cf. Exod 19:5 – 6; 23:22 LXX).[87] In Acts 20:28, then, the combination of sacrificial blood imagery with the concept of God acquiring the church ultimately traces back through the words of institution to the experience of Israel at Sinai.[88] The conception of the church as God's possession itself recalls the covenantal experience at Sinai, a connection which is reinforced by the passage's parallels to the Lukan last supper scene.

In the context of Paul's Miletus speech, the blood of Jesus is invoked as the basis for a parenetic appeal to the Ephesian elders to exercise diligence in their protective oversight of the church.[89] Significantly, Acts 20:28 is the first impera-

85 Marshall (2011: 162, n. 122).

86 Dupont (1962: 188). Note, however, that Tit 2:14 does not explicitly mention the blood of Jesus, referring instead simply to his self-offering. Because Tit 2:14 also employs redemption terminology in the context of Jesus' death, Marshall views the verse as a bridge connecting Mark 10:45, with its notion of ransom, to Acts 20:28, with its conception of the church as God's possession. Indeed, Marshall (2011: 158 – 162) contends that Acts 20:28 is a "deliberate substitute" for the ransom saying (see also Genz [2015: 303 – 306]). Certainly Tit 2:14 combines concepts that are expressed separately in Mark 10:45 and Acts 20:28, though whether Luke intends for Acts 20:28 to function as a counterpart to the ransom saying must remain an open question.

87 Lambrecht (1979: 326).

88 See Dupont (1962: 189 – 192); Kimbell (2014: 56).

89 Bock (2007: 629 – 630).

tive in Paul's address. If so precious a price has been given to acquire the church, then surely the elders must offer their utmost as they shepherd the flock.[90] Jesus has offered the paradigmatic model of self-giving servant leadership (cf. Luke 22:27).[91] Hence, it is fitting in this context for Paul, having described his own exemplary service for the benefit of the church (Acts 20:18–21, 26–27), now to cite the example of Jesus as the ultimate foundation for the ministry of shepherding entrusted to the elders.

In this regard, the parenetic appeal to Jesus' death in Acts 20:28 touches upon a common scriptural theme, for the inestimable worth of Jesus' blood is also invoked as a foundation for parenetic appeals elsewhere in the NT.[92] For example, as Paul exhorts the Corinthian believers to avoid sexual immorality, he reminds them that they have been bought at a price (1 Cor 6:19–20; cf. also 1 Cor 7:22–23). More explicitly, 1 Pet 1:17–19 appeals to the "precious blood of Christ" to exhort the believers to live "in fear." Heb 10:28–29 similarly warns of the certain judgment which awaits the one who profanes the "blood of the covenant." In each of these passages, the redemptive value of the death of Jesus is presupposed within the framework of inter-Christian discourse and applied to matters of Christian conduct. Acts 20:28 functions in much the same way within Paul's farewell address, suggesting an aspect of continuity between the Lukan perspective toward the cross and the general contours of early Christian tradition.

Indeed, the continuity between Acts 20:28 and broader NT tradition has often been cited in order to downplay the significance of this verse within Lukan theology. Most minimalist interpreters have granted that Acts 20:28 contains an explicit statement affirming the atoning nature of the cross,[93] yet they have tended to characterize Paul's statement as a vestige of traditional Pauline material that Luke has simply inherited.[94] However, Luke was not obligated to preserve this material, even if it is traditional.[95] Furthermore, the contextual

90 Perhaps this parenetic dimension of the passage accounts for the unique language of the verse; the striking reference to "his own blood" may highlight the supreme cost of the acquisition.

91 See Walton (2000: 110–115).

92 Dupont (1962: 193–195).

93 Note, however, Zehnle (1969: 400); Glöckner (1975: 182–183); Sellner (2007: 475–476).

94 See Moule (1966: 171); Pilgrim (1971: 380); Franklin (1975: 66); Kodell (1979: 223); Beck (1981: 37); Giles (1985: 137); Conzelmann (1987: 175); Bovon (2006: 185); Pervo (2008: 523–524).

95 Székely (2008: 154). The extent to which Acts 20:28 can be characterized as traditional can also be contested, as shepherding imagery and references to overseers are by no means common within the Pauline epistles (see Lindemann [2009: 190–193]).

and thematic parallels between Paul's expression and Jesus' words of institution strongly suggest that Acts 20:28 has been strategically situated within its present context. Consequently, there is little reason to doubt that the verse gives voice to the Lukan perspective on Jesus' death.

IV. Conclusion

The numerous references to the death of Jesus following the resurrection build upon the central concerns of Luke's gospel regarding the passion. Hence, the importance of the cross within the Lukan conception of christological fulfillment is reinforced and elucidated through the use of scriptural allusions in the passion references of the apostolic kerygma. In the apologetic context of most of the sermons in Acts, this christological interest is primary, and the soteriological significance of the passion lies in the background, a supposition to be deduced from the scriptural allusions employed in the passion references. In Acts 20:28, however, the soteriological meaning of the cross stands in the foreground, as Paul cites the blood of Jesus as the means by which God has acquired the church. Luke's retrospective passion references thereby corroborate the testimony of his gospel with regard to the passion, affirming that the suffering of Jesus fulfills scriptural expectations for the messiah and enables the restoration of the relationship between God and his people.

Chapter 6 – The Pattern of Proclamation within a Jewish Context

I. Introduction

The preceding chapters have argued that Luke is concerned to present the death of Jesus as an intrinsically soteriological event. At the last supper, Jesus' death is understood as an act of atonement leading to the salvation of God's people and the establishment of the new covenant. The passion narrative then reinforces this interpretation of Jesus' death through a series of scriptural allusions, representative enactments, and cosmic signs. Also, although the post-resurrection kerygma is situated within the context of speeches primarily directed toward a christological apologetic, the soteriological significance of the cross is likely implied by the use of Deut 21:23 in some of the passion references of Acts, and Paul's parting words to the Ephesian elders preserve an interpretation of Jesus' death that corresponds to the Lukan words of institution. In both Luke and Acts, the death of Jesus is presented in soteriological terms.

Presumably, then, the cross should possess an important function within the pattern of Lukan soteriology. If Jesus' death truly is conceived by Luke as a remedy to the ruptured relationship between God and his people, then one would naturally expect that for Luke the divine forgiveness of sins and the experience of salvation would be connected to the cross of Christ. In other words, if the soteriological interpretation of Jesus' death offered throughout the present analysis is sound, then the pattern of Lukan soteriology ought to correspond to what has been said about Luke's soteriological interpretation of the cross.

It is precisely at this point that many interpreters have found cause for concern. H. Sellner, for example, in his treatment of Lukan soteriology, suggests that the forgiveness of sins is experienced independently from any notion of Jesus' death as a cultic sacrifice in Luke-Acts. In Sellner's assessment, the speeches of Acts do not connect forgiveness with Jesus' death, but with repentance and faith in his name and the sending of the spirit.[1] Additionally, Luke's gospel portrays the forgiveness of sins as a present experience resulting from Jesus' earthly ministry of healing and proclamation rather than from Jesus' death.[2] Any conception of the cross as an atoning sacrifice can therefore only be a "*Fremdkörp-*

1 Sellner (2007: 404).

2 Sellner (2007: 403 – 404). See also Du Plessis (1994: 536); Lieu (1997: 199); Lewis (2005: 355).

er," a lifeless vestige of Christian tradition, within the framework of Lukan soteriology, in so far as the forgiveness of sins is attained for Luke through other avenues.[3] Sellner's characterization of Lukan soteriology echoes a common refrain of many interpreters, particularly in the claim that the speeches of Acts do not directly link the death of Jesus to the forgiveness of sins, which can be experienced through repentance apart from any act of cultic atonement.[4]

Indeed, the origins of a minimalist interpretation of the Lukan cross emerge within 19th century discussions regarding the allegedly anomalous character of the proclamation of salvation in Acts.[5] When interpreters have found that the forgiveness of sins is disconnected from Jesus' death in the apostolic kerygma, they have tended to reason backward from there to conclude that the cross must not have any soteriological function within Lukan thought.

The present work has moved in the opposite direction, beginning with the event itself before turning now to the broader question of Lukan soteriology. I have sought to establish that Jesus' death is conceived as a saving event, and now the task remains to consider the place of that event within the broader framework of Lukan soteriology. Toward that end, the present chapter will seek to show that the soteriological significance of the death of Jesus may well be presupposed within the call to repentance and offer of forgiveness in the post-resurrection kerygma in Luke 24 and Acts. Far from being a *Fremdkörper* within Lukan soteriological thought, I believe that the atoning significance of the death of Jesus functions for Luke as an indispensable basis for the apostolic offer of salvation.

The above thesis will be supported by comparing the pattern of proclamation in Luke-Acts to the common pattern of religion within early Judaism on one particular point: the inter-dependence of the concepts of repentance, divine forgiveness, and cultic atonement.[6] Too often, these concepts have been con-

3 Sellner (2007: 479).

4 See, for example, Dodd (1936: 25); Brown (1969: 122 – 123); Talbert (1983: 99); Tyson (1986: 170); Marguerat (2001: 205); Wolter (2009: 23 – 25).

5 See above, p. 4 – 6.

6 While acknowledging the diversity which certainly exists within early Judaism, the present analysis affirms the notion of a common pattern of religion which can be found throughout various strands of Jewish practice and belief, at least with regard to the concepts under consideration in this chapter. In comparison to the unified narrative of Acts, the sources for reconstructing an early Jewish pattern of religion are undeniably diverse in terms of genre, social location, and ideological outlook. Nonetheless, in so far as a basic relationship of repentance, cultic sacrifice, and divine forgiveness can be traced through the various sources under discussion, the chronological, geographic, and ideological diversity found within representations of early Juda-

ceived within Lukan scholarship as independent and unrelated categories, when in fact repentance, divine forgiveness, and cultic atonement are very closely related within much of early Judaism. When the Lukan kerygma is read in light of this Jewish background, one can see that the basic Jewish pattern of religion corresponds well with the apostolic pattern of proclamation. While correlation certainly does not imply causation, the correspondence in structure between the apostolic kerygma and the pattern of religion within early Judaism may indicate that the death of Jesus is understood in the apostolic kerygma as an act of atonement serving as a requisite condition for the forgiveness of the sins of the penitent individual.

Before proceeding, it is important to acknowledge that constraints of space and scope obviously preclude anything approaching a comprehensive comparison of early Judaism and the apostolic kerygma. Indeed, such a study could scarcely be accomplished within the span of a single monograph, let alone a single chapter within a work devoted to a single theme within the framework of Lukan soteriology. My aim in this chapter is merely to survey the inter-dependence of repentance, cultic atonement, and divine forgiveness within early Judaism, and then to consider the place of the cross within the apostolic kerygma in light of this inter-dependence. Certainly the comparison of Lukan soteriology and early Judaism could be expanded in either direction,[7] yet I hope that the brief sketch of the present chapter will be sufficient for the limited purpose that it seeks to accomplish, at least pointing the way forward in discussions of the place of the death of Jesus within the framework of Lukan soteriology. With this qualification in mind, the present chapter will now begin with an examination of the pattern of religion within early Judaism before turning to the contours of the apostolic kerygma.

---

ism need not preclude a systemic comparison between the pattern of proclamation in Acts and the pattern of religion in early Judaism. See Sanders (1977: 13 – 23); Boccaccini (1998: 8 – 11).

7 In particular, the significance of the Spirit in relation to both the concept of purification and the reception of forgiveness and knowledge under the new covenant might merit further investigation, especially as the themes of knowledge and ignorance have already been shown to feature prominently within the anticipatory references to Jesus' death in Luke.

II. Repentance, Divine Forgiveness, and Atonement within Judaism

1. The Priestly Pattern of Religion

Because the levitical ritual system is determinative for cultic observance within early Judaism,[8] this chapter will begin by considering the relationship between repentance, atonement, and forgiveness within levitical law. The principle passages of interest are Leviticus 4–5, which sets out the regulations for non-calendrical purification offerings, and Leviticus 16, which describes the rites for the Day of Atonement. Together these passages provide the priestly prescription for the removal of sin from the people of Israel and Israel's sanctuary.

Leviticus 4–5 and Leviticus 16 apparently prescribe two stages in the process of sacrificial atonement for sins and ritual impurities.[9] First, purification (חטאת) and guilt (אשם) offerings throughout the year primarily function to atone (כפר) for the offerer.[10] Thus, Lev 4:1–5:13 expounds the stipulations for the performance of the purification offerings, describing the particular requirements for the offering on behalf of priests (4:3–12), the community as a whole (4:13–20), chieftains (4:21–26), and ordinary individual Israelites (4:27–5:13).

---

8 Sanders (1992: 90).

9 Moral guilt and ritual impurity represent two distinct yet interrelated concepts within the levitical system. See Maccoby (1999: 49–50). The inner workings of the levitical system are somewhat ambiguous, as many of the ritual acts prescribed within Leviticus do not include an explanation of their exact function. Thus, opinions vary regarding the precise logic undergirding the levitical prescription for the removal of sin. My understanding of the relationship between Leviticus 4–5 and Leviticus 16 depends upon the view of the sacrificial system expounded in Gane (2005: chapters 3–12). For our purposes, what is important is not so much the precise manner in which the sacrificial rituals accomplish atonement and the removal of sin, but rather the fundamental pattern according to which divine forgiveness is predicated upon acts of atonement, and cultic sacrifice is conceived as an expression of the worshiper's disposition toward God. Regardless of the precise function of specific rituals prescribed in Leviticus 4–5 and 16, the connection between divine forgiveness and cultic sacrifice is quite evident in the priestly code.

10 The חטאת-offering has customarily been characterized as a "sin" offering in most English translations. However, the חטאת-offering is prescribed not only in contexts of moral guilt but also in contexts of ritual impurity in which no sin has been committed (Lev 12:6; 14:13; 15:15). Thus, the חטאת-offering is more accurately labeled a purification offering, since its primary purpose is to remove the contamination, whether sin (Lev 4:20, 26, 31, 35; 5:6, 10, 13) or ritual impurity (Lev 12:8; 14:19; 15:15, 30), from the offerer. Likewise, the term כפר is difficult to translate. The verb entails the notion of both purification and ransom, so that it can be translated "to purge", "to ransom", or more generally, "to atone". See Sklar (2005); Sklar (2008: 18–23); also Gane (2005: 192–194).

In a similar manner, Lev 5:14–26 sets forth the ritual activities for guilt (אשם) offerings.[11] In the rest of pentateuchal ritual law, these offerings are then frequently prescribed without detailed explanation (Lev 7:1–5; 8:2; 9:2; 12:6; 14:12, 19; 15:15; 19:22; Num 6:11; 15:22–31), so that the prescriptions for the חטאת and אשם offerings in relation to ritual impurities seem to presuppose the more detailed explanations of the procedures in Leviticus 4–5.

When the חטאת or אשם offering is made in connection with moral guilt, the sacrifice is performed as a necessary pre-condition for forgiveness (סלח – Lev 4:20, 26, 31, 35; 5:10, 13, 16, 18, 26; 19:22). In these contexts, the forgiveness of sins is conceived as a divine prerogative, as the reception of forgiveness is consistently described by means of a *nip'al* construction (נִסְלַח) which never takes a human agent of forgiveness.[12] Thus, the priest performs atonement for sins (וְכִפֶּר עָלָיו הַכֹּהֵן מֵחַטָּאתוֹ), but forgiveness is granted by God (Lev 4:20, 26, 31, 35; 5:10; 13).

At the same time, though forgiveness is a divine prerogative, it is predicated upon proper cultic sacrifice, which serves as the concrete expression of the practitioner's orientation toward God.[13] Indeed, those who neglect cultic observance face divine condemnation (Lev 20:3; Lev 23:29–30; Num 15:30–31; Num 19:13, 20). Hence, the divine prerogative to forgive does not negate the importance of cultic sacrifice within the levitical system. Rather, the divine initiative in forgiveness ensures that the cultic observance of the Israelites does not devolve into an empty external ritual. The sacrifices are not efficacious *ex opere operato*; they must be accompanied by a penitent heart.

Accordingly, the prescribed rites of the purification offering are symbolic expressions of the act of repentance. In the transferal of ownership which takes place through the presentation of the offering and the laying of the offerer's hands upon the sacrificial animal, the worshiper physically demonstrates the renunciation of his sins.[14] The guilt and contamination of the offerer is then transferred from the sinner to the animal (Lev 4:15, 24, 29) and then to the sanctuary through the application of the animal's blood to the sancta (Lev 4:16–18, 25,

11 An ostensible tension exists between Lev 5:1–6, 20–26, which prescribe offerings for sins committed knowingly, and Num 15:30–31, where the guilt of "high-handed" sins cannot be expiated through sacrifice. Milgrom (1975: 195–200) suggests that the act of confession serves to bring inexpiable sins down to the level of expiable, inadvertent sins (cf. Lev 5:1–4; 16:21; 26:40; Num 5:6f.), so that Num 15:30–31 applies only to the case of unrepentant sinners. Alternatively, Gane (2005: 209–213) argues that the defiant sins of Num 15:30–31 are a subcategory of intentional sins, so that Lev 5 refers to "non-defiant deliberate sins," whereas Num 15:30–31 refers to particularly defiant offenses.

12 Gane (2005: 51, 125).

13 Gane (2005: 50, 80); Sklar (2008: 21–22).

14 Zohar (1988: 612–616).

30).[15] As Zohar observes, "In bringing before God the disowned sin-contamination, objectified and invested in the blood of the חטאת, the sinner is exhibiting his regret and dissociation from the sin, seeking forgiveness...The experience of repentance is not detached from the ceremony: it is embodied in the ritual form itself."[16] Contamination is transferred from the community or individual into the sanctuary, so that forgiveness (סלח) might be received on account of the atonement (כפר) accomplished for the offerers. In other words, faith and repentance expressed in cultic sacrifice establish the necessary preconditions for forgiveness to be granted by God.[17]

On the Day of Atonement, the direction of the transference of sin and ritual impurity reverses, as the sanctuary is purged of the defilement accumulated throughout the year (Lev 16:16, 33). Through the blood manipulations during the Day of Atonement ritual, the contamination of sin and ritual impurity is removed first from the inner-sanctum (Lev 16:11–16) and then from the outer-sanctum (16:18–20). Then, the contamination is cast out of the community through the live-goat ritual, in which the sins of Israel are confessed over the goat, and the goat is sent away into the wilderness (16:21–22). In this way, the Day of Atonement ritual uniquely spans the least holy (i.e., the wilderness) and most holy spatial locations (i.e., the holy of holies) in Israelite religion.[18] The annual ritual is to be observed as a day of solemnity, as the Israelites are to rest from work and humble themselves before God (16:29–31).

The Day of Atonement completes the כפר process for the Israelites. While the purification offerings throughout the year effect atonement (כפר) leading to *forgiveness* (סלח) of sin (singular – חטאת), the Day of Atonement ritual uniquely effects atonement (כפר) leading to the *cleansing* (טהר) of sins (plural – חטאת; Lev 16:30). This same cleansing (טהר) is accomplished for ritual impurities through

15 The transference of contamination which takes place in the ritual is demonstrated by the impurity of the blood of the animal once the offering has been presented and sacrificed by the offerer. This can be seen in Lev 6:20–21, where the blood is capable of contaminating garments or vessels prior to its contact with the altar. See Gane (2005: 168–179). For an alternative interpretation of the laying on of hands and of the blood rites as acts of involvement, see Gese (1981: 104–109).

16 Zohar (1988: 614–615); see also Chmiel (1993: 63).

17 Even if one understands the ritual acts in terms of involvement and identification rather than transference of sin and guilt, the prescribed ritual would still reflect the interconnectedness of cultic atonement, a faithful disposition toward God, and divine forgiveness. For by identifying with the sacrificial animal through the laying on of hands, the worshipers would be acknowledging the need for atonement in order to "experience full community with the divine presence" (see Gese [1981: 109]).

18 Gane (2005: 219).

washings, periods of separation, and cultic sacrifices throughout the year (Lev 11:32–15:28), yet it is only accomplished with relation to moral guilt on the Day of Atonement. "Therefore," as Gane concludes, "on the Day of Atonement the people reach the טהר stage of כפר with regard to their sins that is equivalent to the טהר stage reached earlier in the year with regard to their ritual impurities."[19] In this way, the Day of Atonement ritual results in the complete cleansing of the sanctuary and community of all moral and ritual impurity that cannot ultimately be tolerated by a holy God, thereby vindicating the Lord's temporary toleration of the contamination of sin among his people and within his sanctuary which accrues throughout the year.[20]

Summary

Within the levitical system, then, the removal of sins from the Israelites is accomplished through a two-stage process. First, sin is transferred from the Israelites to the sacrificial animals and into the sanctuary through the blood manipulations of the purification offerings. The sacrificial atonement performed at this stage leads to forgiveness (סלח), as the Lord provisionally bears the sin in his sanctuary. Then, in the second stage of the process, the sin is removed from the sanctuary and cast out of the community on the Day of Atonement. This annual ritual results in the total purification of the sanctuary (Lev 16:16, 33) and consummates the cleansing (טהר) of the people from their sin (Lev 16:30). Most importantly, repentance, sacrifice, and forgiveness are interwoven in the levitical cult, such that cultic observance serves as an indispensable expression of a penitent disposition toward God, and forgiveness in turn is predicated upon sacrificial atonement.

Accordingly, the Deuteronomic record places the statutes concerning the establishment of the sanctuary and the maintenance of its cult at the forefront of the Lord's commands for the Israelites as they enter the land (Deut 12:1–28). And when Moses enjoins the Israelites to turn back to God should they ever succumb to idolatry and thereby suffer the punishment of exile, the concept of repentance is closely paired with the ingathering of the people and a renewed obedience to all the commands that the Lord has given to Moses (Deut 30:1–10).[21] In this manner, Israel's national destiny is linked to its cultic practice, and the experience of

19 Gane (2005: 230–231).
20 Gane (2005: 300–301).
21 Jason (2007: 28).

repentance and renewal of divine blessing also entail the purification of cultic practice.[22]

2. The Centrality of Cultic Conceptions within Early Judaism

The pattern of cultic sacrifice established in pentateuchal ritual law then serves as the foundation for cultic observance within early Judaism. Repentance is set within a framework of ritual, and sacrifice is understood as an opportunity to express remorse for sins and to seek forgiveness.[23] Indeed, atonement, divine forgiveness, and faithful obedience stand at the center of post-exilic Judaism until the destruction of the temple in 70 CE, and the relationship between cultic observance and conceptions of Torah faithfulness become increasingly intertwined in reaction to Hellenistic pressures toward cultural accommodation.[24] This is the case not only within Palestinian Judaism, where the temple cult in Jerusalem serves as the center of religious life, but it also holds true even within diaspora Judaism, where distance from Jerusalem does not preclude temple devotion and retention of the same basic pattern of religion.

The Importance of the Temple Cult in Palestinian Judaism

The prominence of the sacrificial system and the inter-relationship between penitence, sacrifice, and divine favor for Palestinian Judaism is so clearly established that it is hardly necessary to recount the evidence in detail here.[25] A few examples will suffice: The book of *Jubilees* attaches an elevated importance to cultic observance in its retelling of the story of the patriarchs. Hence, Abraham is said to have directed Isaac to remain faithful to the covenant by offering appropriate sacrifices to the Lord (*Jub.* 21:2–9), and even Adam is characterized in priestly language drawn from the realm of the temple cult (*Jub.* 3:27, 30–31; cf. Exod 30:7–8; 20:26).[26] In a similar manner, the central significance of the cul-

22 Thus, in 2 Kings 23, Josiah's reforms, which consist of the purification of cultic practice and celebration of the Passover ritual, are summarized with the terminology of repentance, as the king is praised for "turning to the Lord" in accordance with the Law of Moses (שוב – 2 Kgs 23:25). See Jason (2007: 31).

23 Sanders (1992: 252–253).

24 Sung (1993: 152–154).

25 See, for example, Sanders (1977: 157–180, 298–305, 338–341, 379–380, 397–398); Grabbe (2000: 129–147).

26 For the connection in Jubilees between the temple cult and the primordial garden, see van Ruiten (1999: 219).

tic system can also be seen in 1 Maccabees, where the edict which incites the Maccabean revolt principally concerns the cessation of proper sacrifice and the desecration of the sanctuary through unlawful sacrifices (1 Macc 1:44–47). Indeed, the notion of cultic sacrifice is so central to Palestinian Jewish conceptions of piety that Josephus can remark, "To think of forsaking those sacrifices, is, to every Jew plainly impossible, who are still more ready to lose their lives than to stop that divine worship which they have been wont to pay to God" (*A.J.* 15.248).[27] Similarly, Josephus' *Contra Apionem*, composed at the very end of the first century, describes the ministry of the temple in the timeless present, so that the ministry of the priests in the temple remains central to his conception of religion years after the temple has been destroyed (2.102–109).[28]

The Centrality of the Temple and Jerusalem for Diaspora Judaism

Beyond Palestine, where distance from the temple would have presented an obstacle to regular participation in cultic worship as prescribed within pentateuchal ritual law, the central significance of cultic worship remains remarkably resilient within Jewish thought and practice.[29] Jews living outside of Palestine expressed their devotion to the temple through pilgrimages and the sending of offerings and the half-shekel tax to Jerusalem,[30] and first century synagogues seem not to have replaced the temple cult through the teaching of Torah.[31] Instead, cultic conceptions of worship retain their importance outside Palestine, even if at times the language of the cult is also appropriated to non-cultic expressions of piety within diaspora Judaism.

---

27 Sanders (1985: 64). This in a work composed over twenty years after the temple's destruction.

28 See Bauckham (2008: 243). A similar manner of speaking with reference to the temple cult is also found in early Christian literature of the same period (cf. 1 Clem 41:2).

29 Note especially Gruen (2002: 232–252).

30 On the importance of pilgrimage, consider Philo, *Spec.* 1.69; Acts 2:1–12; 8:26–40; Josephus, *B.J.* 2.280; *A.J.* 20.49–53. Regarding the diaspora's financial support for the temple, note Cicero *Flac.* 66–68; Philo *Spec.* 1.77–78; Josephus, *A.J.* 14.110–113; 16.163; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.5.1. See Barclay (1996: 417–421); Gruen (2002: 243–247); Pearce (2004: 30).

31 The role of the synagogue in the first century is a matter of considerable debate. Hüttenmeister demonstrates that use of the synagogue adapted gradually over time, and the increasingly religious function of the synagogue as a surrogate for the temple seems to occur at a relatively late stage of development (see Hüttenmeister [1999: 357–370]). Alternatively, for an argument that the synagogue from its beginnings arose as a replacement of the temple, see Siegert (1999: 335–347).

Philo offers an illuminating test-case in this regard. As an Alexandrian Jew known for his allegorical approach to the scriptures, Philo would ostensibly be a likely candidate to spiritualize pentateuchal ritual law in order to accommodate his observance of Torah to his diaspora context. Instead, Philo maintains the basic pattern of religion established within levitical law and objects to an overly spiritualized interpretation of the sacrificial statutes.[32] In *Spec.* 1.234 – 238, for example, Philo discusses the requirements for purification offerings found in Lev 4 – 5, and Philo's summary of the offerings to be made by those who sin intentionally is particularly noteworthy. The passage begins by emphasizing the necessity of repentance: The one who sins intentionally, upon feeling remorse for his sin, "shall come and openly confess the sin which he has committed, and implore pardon" (*Spec.* 1.235). The penitent sinner will receive pardon, so long as his repentance is proven by his behavior (1.236). More specifically, the sinner who receives pardon is the one who makes proper restitution for his sin by repaying what he owes to the one whom he has offended (1.236) and by offering the requisite sacrifice at the temple (1.237).

In this passage, then, the forgiveness of sins is predicated upon both repentance and cultic sacrifice. In fact, with Philo the connection between repentance and cultic sacrifice is actually made more obvious in comparison to the passage from Leviticus interpreted in *Spec.* 1.234 – 238, for Philo explicitly mentions repentance (μετάνοια – 1.236), whereas the terminology of repentance does not actually appear in Lev 5:20 – 26 (6:1 – 7 LXX). Similarly, Philo elsewhere situates repentance within the realm of the levitical cult (*Sacr.* 132) and interprets the offering περὶ ἁμαρτίας[33] as the prescribed expression of repentance for those who have sinned (*Mut.* 233 – 235).[34] Moreover, for Philo, the temple is an imperishable institution of cosmic significance (*Spec.* 1.76; *Mos.* 2.71 – 105),[35] and those who live in the diaspora participate in its worship through their generous contributions (*Legat.* 156 – 57, 216).[36] Hence, even in the diaspora, devotion to the tem-

32 See Nikiprowetzky (1967: 109 – 116).

33 Philo conforms to the LXX in his usage of sacrificial terminology, translating the חטאת as θυσία περὶ ἁμαρτίας and the אשם as θυσία περὶ πλημμελείας (Laporte [1989: 36]).

34 Nave (2002: 86 – 87).

35 The centrality of Jerusalem and the temple within early Jewish cosmology is well-attested within both Palestinian and diaspora sources (e. g., *Sib. Or.* 5:247 – 252; *Jub.* 8:19; *1 En.* 26:1; *Let. Aris.* 83 – 84). See Chester (1991: 59 – 60). In particular, Jewish apocalypticism reflects a keen interest in the heavenly temple and its liturgy (4Q405 94). Indeed, heaven itself is concieved as a celestial temple in several apocalyptic sources (*1 En.* 9:1; 12:4; 15:3; 4Q405 1 i 41 – 43; *T. Levi* 5:1), and the activity of angels is conceived in priestly terms (*T. Levi* 3:5 – 6). See Rowland (2009: 29 – 30); Barnard (2012: 56 – 60).

36 Calabi (2004: 108).

ple cult is a vital expression of Jewish piety, and the cultic system is perceived as a divinely ordained means of approaching the divine.[37]

Furthermore, Philo does not spiritualize the pentanteuchal ritual law so that it no longer refers to literal sacrifices, but instead he seeks to provide an interpretation of the spiritual significance of the physical cultic offerings.[38] In his discussion of Aaron's ordination in *Mos.* 2.147–149, for instance, Philo explains that the requirement of a sin offering at the ordination of the priests signifies the universal human propensity toward sin as well as the need to propitiate the divinity through prayers and sacrifices (*Mos.* 2.147). Likewise, in *Spec.* 1.198–211, Philo provides an allegorical interpretation of the spiritual significance of various aspects of the burnt offering. The gender of the animal, the pouring of its blood, and the division of the animal's limbs each signify truths about humanity and nature. Still, the offering remains a physical offering.

Indeed, Philo discusses the various levitical sacrifices at length, describing the prescribed rites for the sacrifices and differentiating between the various conditions and requirements which pertain to each type of offering.[39] Moreover, he specifically derides those who appeal to the spiritual symbolism and significance of the Mosaic prescriptions in order to neglect the literal observance of the ritual law (*Migr.* 89–93).[40] In fact, in this passage, Philo's argument appeals especially to the inviolability of the temple service as the example which most clearly proves that the spiritual significance of the Mosaic statutes by no means annuls the obligation for their physical enactment (*Migr.* 92). If one were to attend only to the figurative meaning of the law, then one would even neglect the holy rites concerning the temple, an absurdity which to Philo conclusively demonstrates the necessity of the physical observance of the pentateuchal law.

37 Philo's attention to the temple cult in Jerusalem is all the more striking when one considers that he fails ever to mention the temple at Leontopolis, which one might have expected Philo to have utilized given its proximity to Alexandria. See Rowland (1991: 178).

38 For a categorization of Philo's symbolic interpretations of the sacrifices, see Laporte (1989: 38–39).

39 See Calabi (2004: 106–108).

40 Nikiprowetzky (1967: 115).

Cultic Worship as a Locus for Repentance and Forgiveness

As the example of Philo demonstrates, within the early Jewish pattern of religion, cultic sacrifice "provides the occasion for repentance and confession of sin."[41] Indeed, though the whole universe is truly the temple of God, the physical temple in Jerusalem exists for the very purpose of providing people with a setting to express their gratitude for their good fortunes through sacrifices and to seek pardon and forgiveness for their sins (*Spec.* 1.66 – 67). Moreover, the oneness of the temple reflects the oneness of God, and people are required to come to the temple with their sacrifices even from the ends of the earth because the physical journey to the temple is an outward test and demonstration of the worshiper's disposition toward God. If sacrifices were permitted in the home, then the act of sacrifice would not as clearly demonstrate the piety of the worshiper. The act of travel to the temple safeguards the piety of the worshiper, since only those with a right disposition toward God would leave their country, family, and friends in order to undertake a pilgrimage to the temple (*Spec.* 1.68 – 70). Hence, cultic worship at the Jerusalem temple is conceived as an important locus for the expression of repentance and reception of divine forgiveness.[42]

Summary

A comprehensive analysis of the pattern of religion within early Judaism lies far beyond the purview of the present analysis. My more modest aim has been to offer a cursory sketch of the relationship between cultic sacrifice, repentance, and divine forgiveness within the priestly pattern of religion, and then to suggest that both the fundamental importance of the temple cult and the priestly connection between sacrifice, repentance, and forgiveness are retained and perhaps even amplified within early Judaism. Even in the diaspora, where one might expect a dissolution of the bond between repentance, divine forgiveness, and a cultic orientation toward worship, the cultic system is conceived as a divinely mandated means of expressing one's penitent disposition toward God and seeking forgiveness for sins. If even Philo, a diaspora Jew inclined toward allegorical readings of scripture, remains fundamentally conservative in his acceptance of the basic pattern of religion set forth within pentateuchal ritual law, then one can be reasonably confident that a cultic conception of worship was rather prevalent across the various strands of tradition within early Judaism.

---

41 Sanders (1992: 252). On the cultic expression of repentance in Philo, see Nave (2002: 86 – 87).

42 Other sources which reflect the cultic domain of repentance and divine forgiveness include Tob 13:6 – 13; Jdt 5:18 – 19; *Sib. Or.* 1:167 – 169; 3:624 – 628. See Jason (2007: 56 – 72).

This is not to deny the extent to which attitudes varied toward the administration of the temple cult. Certain sources do preserve a somewhat negative assessment of the administration of the temple. In Strabo's statements about the history of Judea, for example, the priesthood is characterized as superstitious and tyrannical (*Geogr.* 16.2.34–37). Additionally, *Sibylline Oracle* 4 contains certain passages which decry a preoccupation with the physical temple and its implements (vv. 6–11,27–30). Even here, however, the extent to which these sources are fundamentally opposed to cultic temple worship *per se* remains questionable.[43]

For the most part, a cultic conception of worship is shared throughout early Judaism, and the disputes between the various factions within Judaism concerning the proper functioning of the temple cult actually underscore the importance of the temple as the preferred center of early Jewish religious life. That the Qumran community, for example, seems to have withdrawn from participation in the temple cult in objection to its improper administration at the very least reveals how seriously matters of cultic worship were taken among Qumran's inhabitants.[44] Hence, despite their objection to the existing scheme of cultic worship, the community in the desert nevertheless looked forward to the eschatological restoration of the temple (11QT 29:7–10), an eschatological expectation which was quite common within early Judaism.[45] Likewise, the emphasis upon the heavenly temple within Jewish apocalypticism may imply a measure of discontentment with the earthly temple, yet the intense interest in a celestial temple itself reflects the centrality of cultic concerns within this strand of Jewish

43 In the case of Strabo, one should note both that Strabo is not Jewish and that a positive view of the temple is still implied by the characterization of Moses as a priest who established legitimate sacrifices and a fixed place of worship. With *Sibylline Oracle* 4, the negative statements concerning the administration of the cult are tempered by positive statements about "the great temple of God" (*Sib. Or.* 4:115–129) and by the possibility that the eruption of Vesuvius was a punishment for the destruction of the temple (4:130). See Carleton Paget (1994: 189–193).

44 On the Qumran community's objection to the temple service, see Schiffman (1999: 269–272). On this matter, one must also bear in mind that the broader movement of Enochic Judaism, of which the Qumran community appears to have been a radicalized sect, appears to have participated in the sanctuary and offered sacrifices (Josephus, *A.J.* 18.19; *B.J.* 1.78, 2.562–567). See Boccaccini (1998: 183–185).

45 On the widespread hope for the eschatological renewal of the temple and restoration of Jerusalem as a cultic center, see Chance (1988: 5–16); Chester (1991: 40–41). *Pseudo-Philo* may be an exception, though even here the end of the temple coincides with the end of the present world order, which in its own way highlights the importance of the temple cult within early Judaism (see Hayward [1996: 166–167]).

tradition.[46] Though differing attitudes toward the temple cult's legitimate administration certainly existed, the very ubiquity of such concerns attests to the central significance of cultic worship throughout early Judaism.[47]

3. Possible Indications of Anti-Cultic Conceptions of Worship within Jewish Tradition

This is the proper perspective from which to consider the possible indications of a trend toward an internalized form of non-cultic worship within certain strands of Jewish tradition. In a once-common scholarly paradigm, priestly worship is conceived as an expression of lifeless ritualism which is set over against the internalized expressions of worship in the Psalms and the ethical proclamation of the prophets.[48] As a result, the temple cult is viewed either as an early, underdeveloped precursor or else as a later, calcified corruption of the pure ethical religion of pious Israel. Consequently, either early Judaism is made a legalistic foil for the proclamation of the early Christian movement,[49] or, in constructions more sympathetic toward early Judaism, the proclamation of early Christianity is understood solely against the background of those strands of Jewish tradition which are perceived as anti-cultic.[50] Could the non-literal use of cultic language and the apparent critiques of sacrifice within Jewish tradition function as precursors to the allegedly non-cultic proclamation of the early Christian movement?

---

46 Note, for example, the way in which the heavenly temple within Jewish apocalypticism draws upon the imagery of the eschatological temple in Ezek 40–48 (cf. *1 En.* 14:10–15; *T. Levi* 3:4). In one sense, this imagery can be interpreted as an expression of discontentment with the present earthly temple. On the other hand, visions of the heavenly temple attest to the fundamentally cultic framework within which Jewish apocalypticism conceives of deity and cosmology. See Barnard (2012: 59–60).

47 Indeed, the various factions of Judaism cooperated to maintain cultic temple worship all the way through the Jewish revolt. Pilgrimages to the temple continued right up to the temple's destruction in 70 C.E., and the coins of the period reflect the centrality of the temple and the major Jewish festivals, even at the time of the Bar Cochba revolt (e. g., Meshorer 199–201). See Goodman (1987: 178–179).

48 The negative appraisal of priestly religion in comparison with the biblical prophets can be traced to the influence of Wellhausen and Weber. See Childs (1992: 174–176); Klawans (2006: 75–82); Klawans (2008: 90–94).

49 The long tradition of such an approach is expounded quite ably in Sanders (1977: 33–59).

50 Note, for example, Barrett (1991: 357, 365–366); Bayer (1998: 263–264); Taylor (1999: 712–721). Girard (1986: 102–105) also arrives at the same conclusion by an entirely different route.

Extensions of Cultic Imagery

The language of the temple cult is applied to non-cultic expressions of Jewish piety within many sources in early Judaism. In Sir 35:1–4 (ET: 35:3–7), obedience to the law is equated with the presentation of offerings. Kindness is considered an offering of flour, the giving of alms a thank offering. Turning from unrighteousness is even characterized as an act of atonement (ἐξιλασμός – Sir 35:3 [ET: v. 5]).[51] Likewise, the apocryphal Prayer of Azariah petitions the Lord to accept the contrition of the men in the fiery furnace in lieu of animal sacrifices (Pr Azar 15–17).[52] Such examples could easily be multiplied,[53] and the Hebrew Scriptures themselves, particularly the Psalms, also make use of cultic imagery in a similar manner.[54] Thus, extensions of cultic imagery beyond the literal temple cult appear quite frequently with reference to the relationship between God and his people within Jewish tradition.

Far from an anti-sacrificial spiritualization or internalization of the temple cult, however, such applications of cultic imagery actually function as implicit acknowledgement of the efficacy of priestly worship. As Klawans observes, "To turn sacrificial metaphors into 'spiritualizations' *of* sacrifice is to misread them. These metaphors are, rather, *borrowings from* sacrifice. Sacrificial metaphors operate on the assumption of the efficacy and meaning of sacrificial rituals, and hope to appropriate some of that meaning and apply it to something else."[55] Similarly, the ascription of temple holiness to either the synagogue or the in-group of a particular community is not a critique of the temple cult or a replacement of it, but a recognition of its efficacy.[56] When the imagery of the

51 Note, however, that these metaphorical usages of sacrificial terminology are followed immediately by affirmations of the efficacy of the sacrifices of the righteous (Sir 35:5–6 [ET: v. 8–9]), which in turn are followed by exhortations to give literal, physical offerings to God (Sir 35:7–11 [ET: v. 10–15]). Also, the priesthood and the temple are central to the praise of Simon in Sir 50:5–21.

52 Azariah's request implies that if it had been possible for the men to express their inner disposition toward God through the appropriate means of cultic worship, the men would certainly have brought the requisite offerings. Hence, this extension of cultic imagery clearly entails an implicit acknowledgment of the efficacy of the cult.

53 Consider, for example, the use of cultic imagery within the Qumran community. In passages such as 4QFlor; 1QT 8:1–16; 9:3–5, the stipulations of cultic law are given a metaphorical interpretation, so that the community's piety serves as a fulfillment of cultic law, and their existence is conceived in terms of the temple.

54 Thus, the Psalmist employs cultic imagery in his petition for the inward removal of his sin in Ps 51:2, 7, and the self-offering of the Isaianic servant is conceived as an אשם offering (Isa 53:10).

55 Klawans (2002: 13).

56 Klawans (2002: 14).

cult is extended beyond the confines of the temple, such appropriations of priestly terminology can be understood as indications of how deeply rooted cultic conceptions of worship are within Jewish tradition.

Apparent Critiques of Sacrifice

If the use of cultic language beyond the literal temple cult does not represent an implicit critique of cultic conceptions of worship, then perhaps a more serious indication of a possible tendency toward anti-cultic conceptions of worship may be found in the apparent critiques of sacrifice within Jewish tradition. For example, comparative statements within Jewish tradition occasionally appear to characterize expressions of cultic worship as superfluous in view of the central significance of ethical piety. In Jdt 16:16, for instance, Judith sings, "For every sacrifice as a fragrant offering is a small thing, and the fat of all whole burnt offerings to you is a very little thing; but whoever fears the Lord is great forever."[57] This statement certainly affirms the priority of reverence toward God over ritual conformity. However, given the hymnic context of the passage, Judith's expression is better understood as a poetic, hyperbolic reference to the precedence of the interior versus the exterior as opposed to a dogmatic rejection of the levitical ritual system.[58] Indeed, after Judith's hymn has ended, the very next passage records the cultic worship performed by Judith and the people in Jerusalem (Jdt 16:18 – 20). Thus, such poetic juxtapositions of sacrifice and moral piety do not necessarily denote a rejection of cultic worship.

Similarly, some passages within the literature of early Judaism summarize the law according to the two great commandments to love the Lord (Deut 6:4 – 9) and to love one's neighbor as one's self (Lev 19:18; cf. *Let. Aris.* 131; Josephus, *B.J.* 2.139; Philo, *Spec.* 1.299; 2.63).[59] Such passages undoubtedly epitomize the law in ethical terms. Nonetheless, such summaries need not imply that the cultic system is unnecessary, for the sources in which these summaries are found also articulate a clear devotion to the temple cult. Rather, these summa-

57 Note additionally the comparison of sacrifice and moral obedience in 1 Sam 15:22 – 24; Mic 6:6 – 8.

58 Likewise, given the liturgical context of the Psalms, those passages which state that God does not require cultic sacrifice in order to forgive sins (Ps 40:6 – 12; 51:16 – 17) are better understood as epitomizing expressions which underscore the divine prerogative in forgiveness rather than outright repudiations of the cultic institution. See Hahn (1983: 54 – 58); Courtman (1995: 48 – 52); Grabbe (2000: 139, 143 – 144). Note also the similar points made concerning the *Psalms of Solomon* in Sanders (1977: 397 – 398).

59 Cf. Mark 12:29 – 31; Matt 22:37 – 39; Lk 10:27; Rom 13:9; Gal 5:14.

ries of the law offer an example of how the concept of cultic sacrifice can be presupposed without being explicitly mentioned in discussions regarding the requirements of the law, since the necessity of cultic observance was recognized by all within the cultural context of such discussions.[60] Thus, the summarization of the law in ethical terms ought not to be understood as a critique of cultic conceptions of worship.

Finally, the apparent critique of sacrifice within the prophetic tradition also does not represent a fundamental opposition to the pentateuchal ritual system.[61] Rather, the biblical prophets were well acquainted with repetitive symbolic actions, as their message was often accompanied by visible activities that concretely embodied their prophetic appeal (Hos 1:2; Isa 20:1–6; Jer 27:1–15).[62] It would therefore be unlikely that the prophets would have found an intrinsic deficiency in the cultic sacrificial system simply because it prescribed symbolic ritual behaviors. Many of the prophets either served as priests or performed sacrifices themselves (Jer 1:1; Ezek 1:1–3; Exod 24:4–8; 1 Sam 3:1; 7:10; 9:14; 1 Kgs 18:30–39), so that the prophetic critique of cultic sacrifice must not be understood as a renunciation of levitical ritual.[63]

In fact, many passages which appear to present a direct prophetic rejection of levitical ritual actually connect their critique of sacrifice to economic exploitation, so that the prophetic critique is not directed against the ritual system in itself, but against the impropriety of presenting what is stolen or gained through extortion as an offering to the Lord.[64] Hence, Samuel's denunciation of Saul in 1 Sam 15:22–23 – "Has the Lord as great delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices, as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Surely, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to heed than the fat of rams" – is the prophetic response to Saul's attempt to present what did not properly belong to him (i.e., the spoils of war which were devoted to the ban) as an offering to the Lord. Likewise, the prophetic critique of

60 As Sanders (1992: 259) observes, "Epitomes are not logically precise summaries, and we should not expect too much of them. They aim at catching the spirit of the law, not at summarizing all of its parts."

61 This generalization is not to deny elements of diversity among the biblical prophets and their heirs within early Judaism. Each prophet brought a particular message for a specific time in the nation's history, and the aspirations of the biblical prophets were by no means uniform. However, in so far as an apparent critique of cultic sacrifice can be traced throughout much of the prophetic tradition, the effort to summarize a general prophetic attitude toward the pentateuchal ritual system is justified.

62 Klawans (2006: 83).

63 The relationship between Torah faithfulness, atonement, and divine forgiveness is particularly heightened within the post-exilic prophets (cf. Ezek 37:23–28). See Sung (1993: 38–39).

64 Klawans (2006: 84–87); see also Eidevall (2011: 54–55).

sacrifice in Mal 1:10 – "Oh, that someone among you would shut the temple doors, so that you would not kindle fire on my altar *at no cost* (חנם – cf. 2 Sam 24:24)! I have no pleasure in you, says the LORD of hosts, and I will not accept an offering from your hands" – is set within a striking indictment of those who have brought sacrifices which are not rightly owned by the offerers (Mal 1:13), or which were not properly costly to the offerers (Mal 1:8, 14).

A similar connection between the prophetic indictment of sacrifice and the vice of theft or economic exploitation can be found in Amos 5:10 – 23; Isa 1:11 – 17; Jer 6:13 – 20.[65] As Klawans concludes, "The prophets' 'rejection' of sacrifice was deeply connected to their belief that Israel was economically rotten to the core ... One who has taken unjustly from the poor cannot properly *give* anything, and therefore the 'sacrifice' offered by such a person is anathema."[66] For the prophets, proper sacrifice necessitates integrity on the part of the worshipers, yet this hardly differs from the link between faith and sacrifice within other strands of Jewish tradition, and it need not imply that the prophets were opposed to the pentateuchal ritual system.[67] After all, Torah faithfulness and a right disposition toward God function as a necessary prerequisite for cultic efficacy within the priestly tradition itself, so that the attitude of the worshiper is paramount in order for cultic ritual to be enacted properly.

In addition, the prophetic critique of sacrifice must also be considered in relation to the biblical understanding that the state of the sanctuary reflects the condition of the covenant relationship between the Lord and his people.[68] The people are commanded in the OT to preserve the sanctity of the sanctuary (Lev 19:30; 26:2). Moral failures (Lev 16:16; 20:3), idolatry (Jer 7:30; 19:13; 32:34), and breaches in ritual (Lev 15:31; 21:12, 23; 22:3 – 9; Num 19:13, 20) result in the defilement of the sanctuary.[69] Likewise, the desolation of the sanctuary is connected to the disobedience of the nation, as the divine presence is removed from the sanctuary as a result of the depravity of the people (Lev 26:31; cf. 26:28; Ezek 8:1 – 11:25). The sanctuary thus serves as the reflection of the nation's rela-

65 Within early Judaism, Sirach also shares in this emphatic condemnation of the corruption of the sacrifices through economic exploitation. Sir 34:20 (ET: v. 24), for example, states, "Like one who kills a son before his father's eyes is the person who offers a sacrifice from the property of the poor." See also Sir 35:11 (ET: v. 14 – 15). Likewise, CD 8.13 – 14 reinforces the principle that an offering must come from what is rightfully owned by the offerer, in continuity with the prophetic critique of sacrifices acquired through extortion.

66 Klawans (2006: 87).

67 See also Lucas (1995: 70 – 72).

68 For the covenantal framework within which the OT call to repentance and appeal for divine forgiveness is expressed, see Sung (1993: 53 – 55).

69 Sklar (2008: 24 – 27).

tionship with God. Consequently, the prophetic charge regarding the inadequacy of Israel's cultic observance and the defilement of the sanctuary must be understood primarily as a negative assessment of the condition of the divine-human relationship between God and Israel.[70] This negative judgment is not an indictment of the levitical ritual system in favor of a purely internal, ethical religion. The prophetic pronouncement is rather a call for the nation to return to God through proper cultic observance, which is inseparable from concrete expressions of love toward God and toward one's neighbor (cf. Lev 19:18–30).

This connection between repentance, sacrifice, and renewed blessing in the prophets is confirmed by those passages within biblical prophetic literature which anticipate the restoration of the cult as a result of the repentance of the nation. Jer 17:24–27, for instance, assures that the sacrifices will flourish if the people of Jerusalem will listen to the word of the Lord and observe the Sabbath. In a similar manner, a renewed blessing upon the cult is connected to an appeal for repentance in Joel 2:12–14, and Mal 3:7–18 expresses the call to repentance in terms of a renewed commitment to the proper maintenance of the cult.[71] Furthermore, the eschatological expectations of the prophets entail the renewal and purification of the temple cult (Isa 2:1–4; 60:13; Ezek 40–48; Mal 3:1–4). Hence, the connection between repentance, sacrifice, and the experience of divine favor is retained in the biblical prophets. Prophetic emphasis is surely placed upon the necessity of ethical reform, yet this is entirely in keeping with the priestly link between cultic observance and right relationship with one's neighbors (Lev 19:18–30). The ostensible prophetic critique of sacrifice is not a rejection of the priestly pattern of religion, but a warning against any disconnect between sacrifice and soul, cult and character.[72]

70 Klawans (2006: 93).

71 Milgrom (1975: 204). Note also the renewal of temple worship in Ps 51:17–19.

72 Though the biblical critique of sacrifice is articulated within a framework in which the necessity of the cultic system is still upheld, one might suppose that anti-cultic strands of prophetic thought naturally would have provided scriptural source material as the rabbis sought to conceptualize a non-cultic expression of their faith following the destruction of the temple. Surprisingly, however, rabbinic literature actually tends to downplay the biblical critique of sacrifice. As Sanders (1977: 163) notes, "One could go through passage after passage which in the Bible seems to bear an anti-cultic meaning without finding one which the Rabbis used in such a way." Moreover, the 18 Benedictions express the hope of an eschatological renewal of the temple cult (see Benedictions 14, 17).

4. Summary

The burden of the present analysis thus far has been to demonstrate the centrality of a cultic conception of worship throughout mainstream Jewish tradition to prepare the way for a comparison with the pattern of proclamation in the apostolic kerygma in Acts. Within the cultic conception of worship in early Judaism, a fundamental pattern exists within which an act of atonement, accompanied by a properly penitent disposition toward God, serves as a prerequisite for divine forgiveness.

As much as possible, Jews during the Second Temple period sought to maintain this pattern through the administration of the temple cult with its physical sacrifices. Even in the diaspora, devotion to the Jerusalem temple remained important, and the Day of Atonement was a significant annual event even for those who could not make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem.[73] Undeniably, some Jewish sources isolated from the Jerusalem temple either geographically (i. e., the diaspora – Pr Azar 15 – 17), ideologically (i. e., the Qumran community), or temporally (i. e., the rabbis) seem to have considered certain temporary substitutions for the temple cult as a response to their distance from the Jerusalem temple and the impossibility of properly administering the physical sacrifices. However, these substitutions for the physical sacrifices are themselves conceived in cultic terms. The community itself becomes a temple, personal piety becomes a cultic offering, or repentance itself functions as a means of atonement. Thus, a fundamentally cultic conception of worship is retained and creatively extended beyond the realm of the Jerusalem temple. Moreover, those Jews who for one reason or another are unable to participate in the Jerusalem temple cult in the present dispensation nonetheless look forward to the eventual restoration of the temple as the center of eschatological worship.

Therefore, even when the terminology of the temple cult is employed in a non-literal manner within certain strands of Jewish tradition, it is important to recognize that the basic pattern of religion still persists. The cult is not abandoned; it is extended to a new context, which actually presupposes the efficacy of the physical sacrificial cult when rightly administered. Indeed, extensions of sacrificial imagery are developed by nearly all early Jewish authors who are not able to offer physical sacrifices, which shows how central a cultic conception of worship is to the pattern of religion within early Judaism.[74] As such, the require-

73 On the importance of the Day of Atonement in the diaspora, see Barclay (1996: 416).

74 Matters of divine forgiveness and atonement feature less prominently within Jewish wisdom tradition, where discussions of guilt and reconciliation focus primarily upon human-to-human interactions. The scarcity of references to the cultic pattern of religion in such cases owes primar-

ment of cultic atonement, whether conceived literally or metaphorically, stands as a requisite condition related to the notions of repentance and divine forgiveness within early Judaism.

III. The Pattern of Proclamation in Luke-Acts

As the early Christian movement emerged from within early Judaism, its proclamation was shaped by the attempt to situate Jesus' life, teaching, death, and resurrection within the traditional pattern of religion. Accordingly, it is hardly surprising that Jesus' death is understood in cultic terms throughout diverse layers of NT tradition, as can be seen quite clearly in the institution of the Lord's supper (Mark 14:22 – 25; Matt 26:26 – 29; Luke 22:15 – 20; 1 Cor 11:23 – 26) and the description of Jesus as a sacrificial lamb without blemish (1 Pet 1:19). In fact, within at least some strands of early Christian tradition, the continuation of cultic observance became obsolete in light of the once-for-all nature of Jesus' priestly work. Accordingly, Hebrews argues for the finality and superiority of Jesus' sacrificial death (Heb 9:23 – 10:15), and the heavenly Jerusalem in Revelation has no need of a restored temple (Rev 21:22).[75] Likewise, while Paul can apply cultic language metaphorically to refer to the community of believers as a temple (1 Cor 3:17) or to the piety of the believer as an act of sacrifice (Rom 12:1), he also understands the death of Jesus as the decisive event which serves as the divine provision for sin (περὶ ἁμαρτίας – Rom 8:3; also Rom 3:25). Thus, across many layers of NT tradition outside of Luke-Acts, Jesus' death is understood in cultic terms as an act of atonement which enables restored access to God for sinful humanity.

The connection between the forgiveness of sins and a cultic conception of worship is therefore common to both early Jewish and early Christian tradition. An act of atonement in one form or another is understood as a necessary prerequisite to the forgiveness of sins, which is appropriated by the individual through repentance and faith. In this regard, the frequent refrain that Luke has avoided any notion of atonement within his soteriological framework is actually a rather radical proposition. If the Lukan understanding of repentance and divine forgiveness is completely divorced from any conception of cultic atonement, then

---

ily to the tradition's distinctive interest in practical concerns and human affairs. Similarly, the relative absence of cultic discussions within certain apocalyptic works simply reflects the eschatological focus of the apocalyptic visionaries, who nonetheless retain a fundamentally positive attitude toward the cult. See Sung (1993: 71 – 76, 154).

75 Klawans (2006: 242 – 243).

Lukan soteriology truly is a strange anomaly, a *Fremdkörper*, within the religious context of Luke's day.

In reality, Lukan soteriology is not so foreign to its surrounding context. As previous chapters have shown, cultic categories are applied to the death of Jesus at multiple points in Luke's gospel. At the last supper, Jesus interprets his own death as an act of atonement. Upon the cross, Jesus' prayer of forgiveness echoes the prescriptions for the אשם offering for sins committed in ignorance (Luke 23:34; cf. Lev 5:17–18). Moreover, Jesus' assurance of paradise to the penitent criminal and the accompanying symbol of the torn veil together illustrate the restored access to God which is accomplished through Jesus' atoning death. These cultic dimensions of Luke's presentation of the death of Jesus are in keeping with the broader trend within the early Christian movement, which in turn reflects the centrality of a cultic conception of worship within the context in which the movement was born.[76]

Furthermore, Luke offers little critique of the prevalent pattern of religion. Instead, Luke-Acts provides indications of a relative respect for and reverence toward the Jewish law and the Jerusalem temple. As such, the basic pattern of proclamation within the post-resurrection kerygma in Luke-Acts would appear to fit comfortably within the framework of atonement, repentance, and divine forgiveness within early Jewish and Christian tradition. To support these claims, the second part of this chapter will examine Luke's relatively amenable attitude toward the institutions of Judaism and then evaluate the pattern of the apostolic kerygma in light of its Jewish-Christian context.

1. Luke's Attitude toward the Institutions of Judaism

While the Lukan portrait of Judaism and the Jewish people is undeniably complex, a number of considerations support the notion that Luke-Acts reflects a generally conservative approach toward the Jewish pattern of religion and the Jerusalem temple. For instance, Luke's redaction of the synoptic tradition shows a consistent tendency to omit elements which could be taken as critical of the pattern of religion within early Judaism.[77] Thus, in Luke's account of Jesus' teaching on the greatest commandment, the lawyer does not set the love of God and neighbor over against expressions of cultic worship (Luke 10:27; cf. Mark 12:33–34). In

76 On the continuity between Lukan soteriology and other strands of NT tradition, see van Zyl (2005: 152–153).

77 See Jervell (1972: 137–140).

Mark, by contrast, the lawyer asserts that such love is greater than all burnt offerings and sacrifices, a judgment affirmed by the Markan Jesus himself. Likewise, the Matthean quotations of Hos 6:6 are nowhere to be found in Luke's gospel (Matt 9:13; 12:5–7; cf. Luke 5:32; 6:3–5). Luke does not preserve Jesus' claim of superiority over the temple (Matt 12:6; cf. Luke 6:1–5), and Luke also omits the incident in which Jesus curses the fig tree upon his entry into Jerusalem, which in Mark can plausibly be read as a judgment against the temple (cf. Mark 11:12–14; Matt 21:18–22).[78]

In the temple-clearing incident, Luke omits Mark 11:16, which may allude to the obstruction of sacrificial worship (Luke 19:45–46),[79] and Luke omits the clear allusion to Isa 5:2 and the Lord's judgment against Israel in his parable of the wicked tenants (Luke 20:9–10; cf. Mark 12:1; Matt 21:33; Isa 5:2–7). Luke also omits Mark 7:1–23, a lengthy passage in which Jesus is presented as bringing an end to ritual law (Luke 11:37–41; cf. Matt 15:1–20).[80] Like Matthew, Luke's statements about the destruction of the temple only come after multiple laments over the lack of repentance by the Jerusalem leaders (Luke 13:34–35; 19:41–44; 21:5–6; Matt 23:37–39; 24:1–2; cf. Mark 13:1).[81] Finally, in the passion narrative, Luke does not preserve the allegation about Jesus' threat to destroy and rebuild the temple (Luke 22:66–71; 23:35–39; cf. Mark 14:58; Matt 26:61; John 2:19). Instead, this saying is attributed to Stephen by false witnesses in Acts 6:14.[82] Luke's redaction of the synoptic tradition thus excises much that could be taken as a challenge to the priestly pattern of religion within early Judaism.[83]

Perhaps equally as striking as the Lukan redaction of the synoptic tradition is the way that the Lukan infancy narrative situates the life of Jesus within the history of Israel. The story of Jesus is firmly rooted in a Jewish context, a world centered upon the Jerusalem temple and governed by Israel's scriptures. Even the very language of the infancy narratives is steeped in the style of the

78 Consider Telford (1980).

79 Chance (1988: 56–58).

80 Loader (2002: 321–322). Indeed, Luke's "great omission" of Mark 6:45–8:26 may relate to his avoidance of the Markan perspective toward Jewish dietary regulation (see Pettem [1996: 46–53]).

81 On the Lukan redaction of Jesus' statements about the temple, see Weinert (1982: 69–74).

82 Bachmann (1999: 548).

83 While the Lukan Jesus certainly addresses matters of ritual purity and Torah faithfulness in his conflicts with the Jewish authorities (Lk 6:1–11; 11:37–41; 13:14–16; 16:16–18; 18:9–14), his criticism in relation to Jewish law and the temple is directed against abuses or misinterpretations of the divine ordinances rather than against the institutions themselves. For a nuanced reading of the Lukan Jesus' attitude toward the Law, see Wilson (2005: 27–58).

LXX.[84] The infant Jesus is presented in the temple in accordance with the Law of Moses, and as a child Jesus participates in the Passover pilgrimage to Jerusalem with his parents (Luke 2:22–52). The temple is portrayed as the locale of the presence of God (Luke 1:8–23), and characters such as Zechariah, Elizabeth, Joseph, Mary, Simeon, and Anna are depicted as faithful Jews whose piety has been met by divine favor.[85] As Carras observes, "[The characters in the infancy narrative] represent a Judaism that was Torah observant, Temple based, purity oriented, prophetic-covenantal formulated, and directed under the plan and intention of God."[86] Luke's characterization of such Jewish piety is wholly positive, and the function of the infancy narrative is to establish that the life of Jesus comes as a fulfillment of the eschatological hopes of pious Israelites.[87]

In the body of Luke's gospel, Jesus affirms the authority of the Law and the Prophets (Luke 16:16–18),[88] and he encourages the observance of ritual law even as he emphasizes the weightier matters of justice and love (Luke 11:42).[89] Upon his entry into Jerusalem, the temple becomes the location for Jesus' daily ministry of teaching (Luke 19:47; cf. Mark 11:18–19).[90] Even in Acts the temple continues to function as a center for the worship of the early Christian community (Acts 2:46–47; 3:1; 21:26; 22:17; 24:18).[91] Certainly Luke preserves Jesus' prediction of the destruction of the temple, yet this judgment against the temple is clearly connected to Jerusalem's rejection of Jesus as the messiah (Luke 13:34–35; 19:41–44; 21:5–6).[92]

Stephen's quotation of Isa 66:1–2 in Acts 7:48–50 surely affirms that no earthly building is adequate as a dwelling place for God, yet Solomon himself

84 See Drury (1976: 46–66).

85 Note the prevalence of ἔλεος in the infancy narrative (Lk 1:50, 54, 72, 78). See Gerber (2004: 82–89).

86 Carras (1999: 705).

87 See Loader (2002: 300–302); Bauckham (2008: 328–352). Note also the emphasis upon promise and fulfillment in the infancy canticles (Farris (1985: 152–154)).

88 Loader (2002: 337).

89 Bovon (2003: 61); Wilson (2005: 13–27).

90 Chance (1988: 58).

91 Green (1994: 508–509). Elliott (1991: 219–220) rightly notes that the temple increasingly functions as a place of conflict in Luke-Acts. However, the centrality of the temple within conflicts between the Jewish establishment and Jesus and his followers need not denote a fundamental opposition between Jesus and the Jewish pattern of religion. Instead, the temple focus of Jewish-Christian conflict in Luke-Acts underscores the importance of the temple for both parties, as Luke portrays the experience of Jesus and his followers as the eschatological fulfillment of the salvation sought through the temple cult.

92 *Pace* Ruzer (2008: 183–190). See Chance (1988: 116–117).

said as much in his dedication of the first temple (cf. 1 Kgs 8:27).[93] Certainly Stephen's quotation seems to relativize the significance of the temple within the broader plan of salvation history. However, this need not be taken as a criticism of the temple *per se*, as though the very construction of the temple were a mistake.[94] Likewise, Stephen's preceding statement, in Acts 7:47, is not necessarily meant to contrast the temple with the tabernacle as the locus of the divine presence. The δέ at the beginning of the verse is a coordinating connective,[95] and both the tabernacle and the temple in Stephen's speech are seen in continuity as successive stages in the fulfillment of God's promise to Abraham that the patriarch's descendants would worship God "in this place" (cf. Acts 7:7).[96] Hence, while Stephen's statements speak to the limitations of any earthly dwelling place for the divine presence, they do not necessarily reflect a negative perspective toward the temple as an institution.[97]

Summary

As a whole, then, Luke-Acts offers a number of indications which suggest a basic reverence toward the institutions of Judaism and the Jerusalem temple.[98] Undeniably, the Lukan Jesus and his followers are depicted in conflict quite frequently with many Jewish people in Luke and Acts.[99] However, Luke's redaction of the

93 Sylva (1987: 265 – 266).

94 Certainly the term χειροποίητος in verse 48 may call to mind the condemnation of idolatry in the OT, where the word has a thoroughly negative connotation (cf. Lev 26:1, 30; Isa 2:18; 10:11; 16:12; 19:1; 21:9; 31:7; 46:6; Dan 5:4, 23; 6:28). However, the contrastive ἀλλά and the plural form of χειροποίητος in Acts 7:48 suggest that Stephen is not singling out the temple for special criticism. Rather, Acts 7:48 appears to refer more generally to the inadequacy of any manmade structure to contain the divine presence. In its context, then, the allusive use of χειροποίητος may be intended to indict Stephen's opponents for their idolatrous devotion to the temple building rather than to the one for whom it exists, the God whose work they are now resisting (cf. 7:51). This is not a criticism of the temple *per se*, but rather a judgment against those who would express devotion to the temple while opposing God's present work (Walton [2004: 140 – 143]).

95 By contrast, note the use of ἀλλά to begin verse 48 (Bachmann [1999: 552 – 553]).

96 Larsson (1993: 389 – 394); Bachmann (1999: 550 – 552).

97 An extensive bibliography for the negative reading of Stephen's speech, along with a critique of this perspective, can be found in Sylva (1987: 262 – 265).

98 Here we part with those interpreters who contend that Luke-Acts is anti-semitic (e. g., Sanders [1987]).

99 One must distinguish between the church's relationship with the *Jewish people* in Acts, which is portrayed in a complex manner, and the church's relationship with the institutions of *Judaism*, which I would suggest is portrayed in Luke-Acts in a more positive light. For a

synoptic tradition has removed much of the material which could potentially be read as critical of the Jewish law and the temple, and Luke has crafted his account in such a way that the holy city and its temple are central to the activities of Jesus and his followers. The Lukan Jesus is presented at the temple as an infant and learns at the temple as a child, and his journey to Jerusalem and its temple dominates the body of Luke's gospel. Indeed, the gospel begins and ends at the temple, and in Acts the temple serves as the launching point for the apostolic mission. Even as the message of the gospel steadily makes its way from Jerusalem to the ends of the earth, the narrator keeps coming back to the holy city as the center of the early Christian movement (Acts 8:14; 9:23–30; 11:1–18; 15:1–35; 21:15–26).[100]

The centrality of Jerusalem and the temple within the narrative of Luke-Acts, along with the conservative attitude of the Lukan Jesus toward the law, should alert us to the likelihood of a continuity between Lukan soteriology and the common pattern of religion within early Judaism. The Lukan Jesus and his earliest followers are shown to be Torah-faithful Jews devoted to the temple as a place of worship. If the proclamation of the early Christian movement is then articulated according to the categories and patterns of early Judaism, this will hardly come as a surprise. At the same time, Luke's attitude toward the temple need not be set against a cultic understanding of Jesus' death as the decisive act of atonement accomplishing the forgiveness of sins and establishing a new covenant relationship between God and his people. Rather, as the following analysis shall show, the post-Easter availability of divine forgiveness is indissolubly connected to God's work in the death and resurrection of Jesus.

2. The Post-Resurrection Kerygma in Luke-Acts

Corresponding to Luke's portrayal of the institutions of Judaism and the Jerusalem temple, a basic correspondence exists between the pattern of proclamation within the post-resurrection kerygma in Luke-Acts and the fundamental pattern of religion within early Judaism. In Luke 24:46–48, the pattern for the apostolic kerygma is established by the risen Lord at the beginning of his final instruction to the disciples:

---

treatment of this topic which aligns generally with my own perspective, see Tannehill (1985: 69–85).

100 Drury (1976: 52–53); Bauckham (1995: 417–427); Johnson (2011: 20–22).

οὕτως γέγραπται παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, [47] καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἰερουσαλὴμ [48] ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων.

A series of three infinitive clauses links the suffering and resurrection of Christ with the proclamation of repentance in Christ's name for the forgiveness of sins for all nations.[101] The close relationship between event and proclamation is underscored by the unbroken succession of parallel clauses. In this way, the proclamation outlined in 24:47 is conceived as but another link in the chain of scripturally mandated elements for the ministry of the messiah. Just as scripture has ordained for the messiah to suffer and to be raised on the third day, so too the universal proclamation of repentance and forgiveness has been established within scripture.[102]

At the same time, the apostolic proclamation of repentance and its intended outcome and scope are obviously of a different nature from the events summarized in 24:46. While the proclamation to the nations has yet to occur, the suffering and resurrection of the messiah have already taken place. Whereas the death and resurrection of Christ are single events fulfilled in the experience of a divinely appointed individual, the preaching envisioned in 24:47 is an ongoing task whose fulfillment cannot be measured in such a straightforward manner. Furthermore, though Jesus clearly establishes the scriptural necessity of his suffering and resurrection throughout Luke's gospel (Luke 9:22, 44; 18:31–34), this is the first explicit declaration of the scriptural necessity of the apostolic proclamation to all nations.

Hence, although Jesus' statement in Luke 24:46–47 clearly establishes a unity between Jesus' suffering and resurrection and the proclamation of repentance for forgiveness, the nature of that unity is somewhat ambiguous, particularly since the infinitive clauses are connected by simple coordinating conjunctions which leave undetermined the logical relationship between suffering, resurrection, and the proclamation of repentance for forgiveness of sins. However, the relationship between atonement, repentance, and divine forgiveness within the common pattern of religion in early Jewish tradition may help illuminate the nature of the unity between event and proclamation in Luke 24:46–47.

101 At Lk 24:47, instead of the preposition εἰς before ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, some manuscripts attest to another καί. However, a scribe is more likely to have mistakenly replicated the καί from the preceding clauses than to have replaced a καί with εἰς, and the external evidence slightly favors the preposition rather than the conjunction (Metzger [1994: 161]).

102 Dupont (1960: 139–140); Dillon (1978: 208–209).

Certainly the indeterminate nature of the ties which connect the sequence of event and proclamation in Luke 24:46 – 47 must be acknowledged. Nevertheless, one cannot help but notice the correspondence between the framework of the apostolic kerygma and the basic outline of early Jewish thought regarding the bond between divine forgiveness, repentance, and acts of atonement. According to the common pattern, an act of atonement, accompanied by repentance on the part of the worshiper, serves as a necessary precondition for divine forgiveness. Usually the act of atonement entails the death of a sacrificial animal, though occasionally the language of atonement is extended figuratively to acts of devotion beyond the realm of the cult. In the Lukan passage, Jesus' suffering, previously presented as an act of atonement, is followed in sequence by a reference to the resurrection and then by the concepts of repentance and divine forgiveness. With the exception of the mention of the resurrection, the series corresponds precisely to the pattern common to early Judaism.

Given the way in which the appearances of the risen Lord have proven throughout Luke 24 to be the decisive turning point for the epistemological transformation of Jesus' followers regarding the passion, the pairing of suffering and resurrection within the kerygmatic outline in 24:46 – 47 is by no means coincidental. Within Lukan thought, the suffering of the messiah can apparently only be understood by those who attest to the authenticity of the resurrection. Hence, the men at Emmaus, whose hope that Jesus would be Israel's redeemer has been threatened by his violent death, have their despair turn to enthusiasm upon recognizing the risen Jesus in the breaking of bread. Likewise, it is the resurrected Jesus who opens the eyes of the disciples in 24:45 so that they can understand what had previously been incomprehensible, namely that the suffering of Jesus functions as an integral component of the divinely ordained vocation of the messiah.

From the Lukan perspective, then, the meaning of Jesus' death is only perceptible for the disciples in light of the reality of his resurrection, and thus death and resurrection are presented as an indissoluble pair in the post-resurrection pattern of proclamation.[103] The combination of Jesus' death and resurrection within the apostolic kerygma reflects the unity of those two events,[104] with the fact of the resurrection serving as a hermeneutical key that makes the function

103 Horton (2009: 17 – 37).

104 See Thompson (2011: 99). The same connection between the perception of the soteriological outcome of Jesus' death and the reality of the resurrection is found also in Pauline thought (cf. 1 Cor 15:14 – 17), where the liberation from sin accomplished through Jesus' death is predicated upon the fact of Jesus' resurrection (Wolter [2009: 28, 32 – 33]).

of Jesus' death within the divine plan of salvation comprehensible to Jesus' followers.[105]

Considering the close unity between death and resurrection within Lukan thought, the inclusion of the resurrection within the Lukan pattern of proclamation does not negate the continuity between the apostolic kerygma and the pattern of religion within early Judaism. In the framework of Lukan soteriology, the death of Jesus is conceived in cultic terms as an act of atonement whose role in the divine plan of salvation is made comprehensible by the resurrection.[106] When these events are then followed immediately in the apostolic kerygma by the preaching of repentance and the offer of divine forgiveness for all nations, one might suppose, in view of the correspondence with the Jewish pattern of religion sketched above, that the availability of divine forgiveness to the penitent individual is predicated upon the death and resurrection of Jesus, in keeping with the general pattern in which divine forgiveness is predicated upon acts of atonement and expressions of repentance.

Table 10 – Comparison of Lukan Proclamation and Jewish Pattern of Religion

Pattern of Apostolic Kerygma (Luke 24:46–47)	Pattern of Religion in Early Judaism
Death and Resurrection → Repentance → Forgiveness	Act of Atonement → Repentance → Forgiveness

This sequence, in which the proclamation of the death and resurrection of Jesus is followed by the call to repentance and an accompanying offer of forgiveness, is also consistently replicated at several points in the proclamation of the apos-

105 Luke never spells out precisely how the resurrection allows the disciples to recognize the link between Jesus' suffering and his christological vocation, yet the connection between Jesus' resurrection and the inauguration of the era of eschatological salvation in the speeches of Acts may offer a hint as to the logic of the unity between Jesus' death and resurrection. The forgiveness of sins and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit as God's presence among his people might be seen to represent a fulfillment of Israel's new covenant expectations, and in Acts the reception of these blessings is inaugurated by the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus (cf. Acts 2:36–39; 5:30–31; 10:40–43; 13:38–41; 17:30–31; 26:23). One might therefore infer a link between Jesus' death, on the one hand, as the sacrifice which initiates the new covenant, and Jesus' resurrection, on the other, as that event which assures the reception of the new covenant blessings. For an exposition of the soteriological dimensions of the resurrection in Acts, see Wright (2003: 451–457).

106 The present proposal need not imply that the resurrection does not also function in other ways within Lukan thought, especially in relation to the demonstration of Jesus' christological identity.

tles in the book of Acts. At the end of his Pentecost sermon, for example, Peter's declaration of Jesus' death (Acts 2:23) and his lengthy scriptural exposition of the resurrection (2:24 – 36) culminate in a call to repentance and the offer of forgiveness (Acts 2:37 – 38). The basic outline of Luke 24:46 – 47 is retained and expanded with a christological apologetic, so that divine forgiveness and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit are conceived as eschatological blessings made available through the death and resurrection of the messiah.

In Acts 3:18 – 21, the basic pattern of proclamation remains the same. In verse 18, Peter interprets the suffering of Jesus as a fulfillment of scriptural expectations for the messiah. The people and their rulers acted in ignorance in their rejection of Jesus (3:17), yet this proved to be the means by which God fulfilled the expectation of the prophets for a suffering messiah (ἐπλήρωσεν οὕτως – 3:18). This interpretation of Jesus' death as a fulfillment of scripture is followed immediately by an exhortation to repentance and an offer of the removal of sins as a precondition for eschatological blessing in 3:19 – 21.[107] Thus, Peter's proclamation in this passage conforms to the established pattern, as the exhortation to repentance and the offer of the removal of sins follows closely upon the reference to Jesus' experience of suffering.

In subsequent speeches, the pattern of proclamation established by Jesus in Luke 24:46 – 47 is retained again and again, as the proclamation of Peter and Paul consistently attaches the exhortation to repentance and the offer of forgiveness to the declaration of Jesus' death and resurrection. Thus, in his self-defense before the Jewish council in Acts 5:30 – 31, Peter proclaims the death and resurrection of Jesus and asserts that God has exalted Jesus at his right hand in order to grant repentance to Israel and the forgiveness of sins. In Peter's sermon to Cornelius, forgiveness of sins is predicated upon belief in Jesus, whose life and death and resurrection make up the content of Peter's proclamation (Acts 10:34 – 43). Likewise, Paul's paradigmatic sermon at Pisidian Antioch moves from the death (13:27 – 29) and resurrection (13:30 – 37) to the proclamation of the forgiveness of sins through belief in Jesus (13:38 – 39). Paul's scriptural exposition of the christological implications of the resurrection undeniably results in a measure of distance between the description of Jesus' death and Paul's call for response, yet the fundamental pattern of proclamation remains the same. Conversely, when Paul is speaking solely to Gentiles at Athens, the usual pattern is broken, as neither the death of Jesus nor the forgiveness of sins is mentioned.

107 In fact, the inferential conjunction οὖν in 3:19 grounds Peter's call to repentance in Jesus' fulfillment of scripture through suffering.

Even at Athens, however, the call to repentance is grounded in the resurrection, which serves for Paul as an assurance of the judgment to come (Acts 17:30 – 31).

Many of these sermons in Acts are directed toward different audiences within the story-world of the narrative. Accordingly, the nature of the response demanded in some sermons differs from the response expected in others. In the early Jerusalem sermons, the call to repentance relates particularly to the rejection and condemnation of Jesus.[108] In later sermons, the call to response is conceived more generally in terms of belief in the messiah who was put to death and then raised and exalted to the right hand of God. Nonetheless, across the various sermons of Acts, the basic pattern of proclamation established by the risen Lord in Luke 24:44 – 47 is essentially retained and filled in with various scriptural proofs.[109] The call to repentance and faith and the offer of forgiveness are consistently rooted in the proclamation of the death and resurrection of Jesus. The adaptation of the usual pattern in Acts 17 serves as the exception which proves the rule, as here the lone sermon to an audience unacquainted with the Jewish pattern of religion turns from the general pattern of the apostolic kerygma in favor of a sermon contextualized for Paul's Athenian audience.

Just as the necessity of cultic observance could be presupposed in Jewish summaries of the law without being explicitly mentioned,[110] it is reasonable to expect that the role of cultic sacrifice as a prerequisite to divine forgiveness could be presupposed in the early Christian kerygma to audiences familiar with the basic Jewish pattern of religion. Indeed, this would have been a shared assumption within discussions between Jews and Christians in the first century, and Luke's Christian readership would surely have been aware of this fundamental pattern of belief pervasive throughout their religious milieu.[111] Perhaps for this reason, the cultic interpretation of the death of Jesus is not explicitly mentioned within the call to repentance and offer of divine forgiveness in the apostolic kerygma. While Luke establishes a cultic interpretation of the death of Jesus in his description of the event itself, perhaps he feels no need to belabor this interpretation in his presentation of the post-resurrection proclamation. Instead, the apostolic kerygma simply recounts the facts of Jesus' death and resurrection

108 Nave (2002: 201 – 202).

109 In Paul's self-defense before Agrippa, the usual pattern is reversed, as conversion and the forgiveness of sins is mentioned before Paul's summary of the death and resurrection of Jesus (Acts 26:18, 23). The reversal results from the fact that Paul is recounting his calling, and as such he describes his commission to the Gentiles before summarizing his missionary proclamation.

110 See above, p. 172 – 173.

111 On the question of the implied readers' familiarity with Judaism, see Tyson (1992: 33 – 38).

and then proceeds to the call for repentance leading to the forgiveness of sins. For Luke's Christian readership, which is familiar with the cultic interpretation of Jesus' death in Luke's gospel, the continuity between the apostolic pattern of proclamation and the early Jewish pattern of religion may be sufficient to confirm the function of the death of Jesus within the framework of Lukan soteriology.[112]

On the other hand, much like many voices within early Judaism, the early Christian movement is likely to have stressed the importance of a right disposition toward God in order to receive the forgiveness of sins; hence the centrality of the theme of repentance and faith within the evangelistic sermons of Acts.[113] This call to repentance and the concomitant promise of forgiveness need not imply that cultic sacrifice is superfluous. Rather, the apostolic promise of forgiveness may well be predicated upon the effective atonement accomplished by the sacrificial death of Jesus.

Accordingly, it is notable that the forgiveness or removal of sins is only mentioned in the apostolic sermons that also refer to the death of Jesus (Acts 2:38; 3:18 – 19; 5:31; 10:43; 13:38; 26:18 – 23; cf. 28:23 – 28). Indeed, on the three occasions in which Paul refers only to the resurrection and not to the death of Jesus (Acts 17:22 – 31; 23:6 – 10; 24:10 – 21), the apostle also makes no reference to the forgiveness or removal of sins.[114] In terms of their content, then, the speeches of Acts could be said to correspond to the dictum set forth by the author of Hebrews: "Without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness of sins" (Heb 9:22). In this respect, Lukan soteriology is also in continuity with the common pattern of religion in early Judaism.

Additionally, the conformity of the apostolic pattern of proclamation to the general framework of Jewish tradition stands as another aspect of Luke's emphasis upon the salvation-historical continuity between the OT, the experiences of Jesus, and the birth and expansion of the early church. From the beginning of his gospel, Luke consistently shows how Jesus has come as the fulfillment of scriptural expectations, and the experience of the early church and expansion of the apostolic mission is depicted in eschatological terms as the fulfillment

112 Recall also that the sermons in Acts are presented as condensed summaries of longer messages. The narrator reminds the reader of this fact (cf. Acts 2:40), and one can reasonably suppose that Luke's Christian audience would have sought to work out the implicit logic of the kerygma in light of their familiarity with Luke's gospel and possibly their own acquaintance with apostolic teaching.

113 See Bovon (2006: 295 – 296); also Nave (2002: 29 – 30).

114 Paul also neglects to mention both the death of Jesus and the forgiveness of sins in his short appeal to the people at Lystra in Acts 14:15 – 17.

of the long-awaited prophetic hope for salvation. Within such a framework of prophecy and fulfillment, the similarities between the apostolic pattern of proclamation and the Jewish pattern of religion further highlight the continuity between the ancestral religion and the eschatological salvation wrought by Jesus.

IV. Conclusion

This chapter has been an exercise in contextualization in two respects. On the one hand, I have sought to situate the saving death of Jesus within the broader framework of Lukan soteriology. Simultaneously, I have attempted to understand the character of Lukan soteriology in light of the surrounding context of Jewish tradition in the first century. The present examination has suggested that the cultic interpretation of Jesus' death which is established at the last supper and illustrated at the crucifixion scene appears to be presupposed within subsequent references to Jesus' death following his resurrection. This hypothesis is supported by the correspondence between the post-resurrection pattern of proclamation and the common pattern of religion within early Judaism, where an act of atonement serves as a requisite condition for the offer of divine forgiveness to the penitent individual. Thus, in Acts the offer of forgiveness invariably appears within speeches that also proclaim the death of Jesus. In this manner, the place of the death of Jesus within the soteriological framework of Luke may correspond quite well to the general pattern of religion in early Judaism. Certainly the correlation between the apostolic kerygma and the Jewish pattern of religion does not in itself prove that the former is dependent upon the latter, and the provisional results of the present analysis will require further examination. Still, the correspondence between the apostolic kerygma and the pattern of religion within early Judaism at the very least must cause us to question whether the forgiveness of sins could be conceived by Luke in entirely non-cultic terms, even if the atoning interpretation of Jesus' death is not expounded in the evangelistic messages of Acts.

Ironically, if the conclusions of the present chapter can be maintained, then in a sense scholarship on the Lukan cross will have come full circle. For, one will recall that the roots of a minimalist interpretation of the Lukan cross originate from an attempt within the Tübingen school to recognize a certain kind of continuity between Lukan soteriology and early Judaism. Appropriating F.C. Baur's *Tendenzkritik* to their study of the book of Acts, Schneckenburger and Zeller believe that Acts is dominated by an attempt to reconcile law-free Pauline Christi-

anity with the Jewish Christianity of the apostolic church.[115] Luke allegedly abandons the Pauline gospel of the cross in order to appease a strong Jewish contingent within the church in the second century. According to this reconstruction, the continuity between Lukan soteriology and the Jewish pattern of religion lies in their common rejection of justification by faith, and it is this continuity which enables the recognition of Luke's distinctive – and, in the appraisal of the Tübingen tradition, deficient – soteriological perspective.

Of course, the Tübingen interpretation of Lukan soteriology is rooted in a caricature of early Judaism in which the Pauline gospel of grace is set against the foil of the legalistic religion of the Pharisees and Jewish Christianity. A more nuanced understanding of early Jewish belief and practice has arisen out of the new perspective on Judaism, and hence the old caricature can no longer be maintained. In reality, Luke's soteriology does show a continuity with the early Jewish pattern of religion, yet the continuity is just the opposite of what the Tübingen minimalists assume. These early interpreters expunge any notion of atonement from Lukan soteriology in order to declare that Lukan soteriology is too Jewish. In fact, it is precisely by recognizing the atoning nature of the Lukan cross that one can appreciate the continuity between Lukan soteriology and the Jewish pattern of religion, as in each case divine forgiveness is offered as a gracious gift to the penitent worshiper upon the completion of an act of atonement. The contours of Lukan soteriology as it is reflected in the apostolic kerygma do appear to be Jewish, yet this ought to serve as a confirmation rather than a challenge to the soteriological significance of the cross in Lukan thought.

115 Schneckenburger (1841: 130 – 131); Zeller (1854: 297 – 299, 327 – 329).

Chapter 7 – Conclusion

This work will not be the final word on the Lukan cross. I have approached the topic from a panoramic perspective, believing that a broad consideration of the many passion references throughout Luke-Acts can help address some of the perennial exegetical issues pertaining to Luke's view of the death of Jesus. More exhaustively detailed text-critical and exegetical work on particular passages would surely supplement the present analysis, and the considerations of the final chapter are but a first step in a comparative study that merits a more sustained treatment of its own. Additionally, the parenetic and ecclesiological dimensions of the Lukan cross remain a promising avenue for further investigation. The present work has called attention to the parenetic appeal to the blood of Jesus in Paul's speech to the Ephesian elders, but one might also explore the distinctive way in which the cross is connected to the Lukan conception of faithful discipleship and the characterization of the Christian mission in Acts.[1] If for Luke Jesus' suffering is crucial for the salvation of the people of God, then one might anticipate that the cross would have an abiding significance for the ongoing life of the individual believer and the corporate Christian community.

In certain respects, the present work has confirmed aspects of the more optimistic appraisals of the Lukan cross within the history of scholarship. The soteriological interpretations of the cross at the last supper and in Acts 20:28 have been affirmed as important expressions of Luke's own theological perspective, and the omissions and silences which factor so heavily into minimalist perspectives toward the cross have been explained on other grounds. I have argued that the passion narrative reflects a sustained interest in the intrinsic soteriological significance of the crucifixion, and I have also concluded that the apostolic proclamation may well presuppose a central role for the passion within Lukan soteriology.

---

1 Barrett (1979) has noted how Luke's cross-centered conception of discipleship is exemplified through the faithful suffering of the leaders of the Christian movement throughout Acts, as the narrator depicts the persecution of the Christian movement in language and imagery that recalls Jesus' own experience of suffering. Additionally, one might explore how the passion narrative contrasts the failure and distance of Jesus' disciples with perceptive and faithful responses to Jesus' suffering from other characters at the crucifixion scene. By employing the terminology of discipleship in this context, Luke underscores the importance of a proper perspective toward the suffering of Jesus in order to be his follower. Finally, if Rowe (2009: 173) is correct that in Acts, "ecclesiology is public christology," then the experience of the church is likely to conform to the pattern of the passion of Jesus, since Jesus' tragic destiny is central to his christological identity from the Lukan perspective.

In one important respect, however, this analysis has parted with the conventional path to a robust assessment of the place of the cross in Lukan thought. The most common route to a maximalist appraisal of the Lukan cross has traditionally been through an emphasis upon the importance of Isaiah 53 for Lukan soteriology, yet I have found that Luke's use of Isaiah 53 is primarily christological rather than soteriological. While soteriological implications likely follow from Luke's use of Isaiah 53, Luke cites the fourth servant song in contexts which emphasize the christological fulfillment of scripture, and Luke does not quote from those portions of Isaiah 53 that expound the soteriological significance of the Isaianic servant's suffering. Instead, Luke's own development of the intrinsic soteriological significance of the cross draws more upon his salvation-historical perspective than upon any single christological category, including Isaiah 53.

This is not to say that Luke is uninterested in Jesus' fulfillment of scriptural expectations for a suffering messiah. To the contrary, Luke is concerned to show that all scripture attests to the tragic destiny of the messiah, and therefore Luke moves with fluidity between christological categories in his depiction of the rejection and death of Jesus, be they Isaianic, Davidic, Mosaic, or Adamic. In fact, one of the significant discoveries of the present work has been the extent to which an awareness of Luke's sustained christological interest with reference to the passion helps to address many of the most persistent soteriological debates related to the Lukan cross. Thus, the concealment of the connection between Jesus' christological identity and his fate of suffering helps to account for the omission of the synoptic ransom saying and the brevity of the quotation of Isa 53:12 in Luke 22:37. Likewise, the placement of most of the post-resurrection passion references within a broader christological apologetic may be at least part of the reason why the majority of the passion references in Acts do not overtly develop a soteriological interpretation of Jesus' death.

The cross stands at the nexus of Lukan christology and soteriology, functioning both as an indispensable marker of Jesus' messianic identity and as an indispensable mechanism of atonement within the divine plan of salvation. To attend adequately to either of these facets of the Lukan cross, one must attend to both.

Appendix 1 – Pre-Passion References to Jesus' Death & Synoptic Parallels

Possible Proleptic References to Jesus' Rejection, Suffering, and/or Death	*Possible Synoptic Parallels*
Luke 2:29–35 – Simeon's Oracles	*No synoptic parallel*
Luke 4:16–30 – Rejection at Nazareth	Mark 6:1–6; Matt 13:53–58
Luke 5:33–35 – Removal of the Bridegroom	Mark 2:18–20; Matt 9:14–15
Luke 6:6–11 – Reaction of scribes and Pharisees to Sabbath healing	Mark 3:1–6; Matt 12:9–14
Luke 7:31–35 – Jesus as 'glutton and drunkard'	Matt 11:16–19
Luke 9:22 – First passion prediction	Mark 8:31–33; Matt 16:21–23
Luke 9:23 – Call to take up cross to follow Jesus	Mark 8:34; Matt 10:38; 16:24
Luke 9:28–36 – Discussion of Jesus' ἔξοδος at Transfiguration	Mark 9:2–10; Matt 17:1–9
Luke 9:43–45 – Second passion prediction	Mark 9:31–32; Matt 17:22–23
Luke 11:29–32 – Sign of Jonah	Matt 12:38–42
Luke 12:49–51 – A baptism to undergo	*No precise parallel*; cf. Mark 10:38; also Matt 10:34 for Luke 12:51
Luke 13:31–35 – Warning about Herod, lament for Jerusalem	*No synoptic parallel for Luke 13:31–33*; Matt 23:37–39 for Luke 13:34–35
Luke 14:27 – Bearing cross as criterion of discipleship	Mark 8:34; Matt 10:38; 16:24
Luke 17:25 – Prediction of rejection of the Son of Man	*No synoptic parallel*
Luke 18:31–34 – Third passion prediction	Mark 10:32–34; Matt 20:17–19
Luke 20:9–20 – Parable of the wicked tenants	Mark 12:1–12; Matt 21:33–46

Appendix 2 – Retrospective References to the Passion in Acts

Reference	*Scriptural Background*
Acts 1:16 – 20	Ps 69:25; 109:8
Acts 2:22 – 23, 36	–
Acts 3:13 – 18	Isaiah 53
Acts 4:10 – 12	Ps 118:22
Acts 4:24 – 28	Ps 2:1 – 2
Acts 5:30 – 31	Deut 21:23
Acts 7:51 – 52	Exod 33:3 – 5; Deut 9:6, 12 – 13; Possibly Isaiah 53
Acts 8:32 – 35	Isa 53:7 – 8
Acts 10:39	Deut 21:23
Acts 13:27 – 29	Deut 21:23
Acts 17:2 – 3	Summary statement
Acts 20:28	–
Acts 26:22 – 23	Summary statement

Bibliography

Ahn, Yong Sung. 2006. *The Reign of God and Rome in Luke's Passion Narrative: An East Asian Global Perspective*. Leiden: Brill.

Aitken, Ellen B. 2004. *Jesus' Death in Early Christian Memory: The Poetics of the Passion*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Aland, Kurt. 1967. "Die Bedeutung des P75 für den Text des Neuen Testaments: Ein Beitrag zur Frage der 'Western non-interpolations'," Pages 155–172 in *Studien zur Überlieferung des Neuen Testaments und seines Textes*. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter.

Albl, Martin C. 1999. *And Scripture Cannot Be Broken: The Form and Function of the Early Christian Testimonia*. Leiden: Brill.

Anderson, Janice C. 1994. *Matthew's Narrative Web: Over, and Over, and Over Again*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.

Baawobr, Richard K. 2007. "Opening a Narrative Programme: Luke 4.16–30 and the Black *bagr* Narrative." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 30 (1): 29–53.

Bachmann, Michael. 1999. "Die Stephanusepisode (Apg 6,1–8,3): Ihre Bedeutung für die lukanische Sicht des Jerusalemischen Tempels und des Judentums," Pages 545–562 in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Edited by Joseph Verheyden. Louvain: Louvain University Press.

Baker, Mark D. and Joel B. Green. 2000. *Recovering the Scandal of the Cross: Atonement in New Testament & Contemporary Contexts*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity.

Barclay, John M. G. 1996. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan, 323 BCE–117 CE*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Barnard, Jody A. 2012. *The Mysticism of Hebrews: Exploring the Role of Jewish Apocalyptic Mysticism in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Barrett, Charles Kingsley. 1977. "Paul's Address to the Ephesian Elders," Pages 107–121 in *God's Christ and His People: Studies in Honour of Nils Alstrup Dahl*. Edited by Jacob Jervell and Wayne A. Meeks. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Barrett, Charles Kingsley. 1979. "Theologia Crucis – in Acts," Pages 73–84 in *Theologia Crucis – Signum Crucis*. Edited by Carl Andresen and Günter Klein. Tübingen: Mohr.

Barrett, Charles Kingsley. 1991. "Attitudes to the Temple in the Acts of the Apostles," Pages 345–367 in *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel*. Edited by William Horbury. Sheffield: JSOT.

Barrett, Charles Kingsley. 1994. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Bartsch, Hans W. 1964. "Die Bedeutung des Sterbens Jesu nach den Synoptikern." *Theologische Zeitschrift* 20 (2): 87–102.

Bauckham, Richard J. 1995. "James and the Jerusalem Church," Pages 415–480 in *The Book of Acts in its Palestinian Setting*. Edited by Richard J. Bauckham. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Bauckham, Richard J. 1996. "Kerygmatic Summaries in the Speeches of Acts," Pages 185–217 in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts*. Edited by Ben Witherington, III. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bauckham, Richard J. 2008. "Josephus' Account of the Temple in *Contra Apionem* 2.102–109," Pages 221–243 in *The Jewish World around the New Testament*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Bauckham, Richard J. 2008. "The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts," Pages 325–370 in *The Jewish World around the New Testament*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Baur, Ferdinand C. 1836. "Über Zweck und Veranlassung des Römerbriefs und die damit zusammenhängenden Verhältnisse der römischen Gemeinde." *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie* 9 (3): 59–178.

Baur, Ferdinand C. 1838. *Über den Ursprung des Episcopats in der christlichen Kirche*. Tübingen: Ludwig Friedrich Fues.

Baur, Ferdinand C. 1873. *Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ: His Life and Works, His Epistles and Teachings: A Contribution to a Critical History of Primitive Christianity*. Translated by Allan Menzies. 2d ed. London: Williams & Norgate. Translation of *Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi*. 2d ed. Leipzig: Fues, 1866 [1845].

Bayer, Hans F. 1998. "The Preaching of Peter in Acts," Pages 257–274 in *Witness to the Gospel*. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Beauchamp, Paul. 1989. "Lecture et relectures du quatrième chant du Serviteur: d'Isaïe à Jean," Pages 325–355 in *The Book of Isaiah*. Edited by Jacques Vermeylen. Louvain: Louvain University Press.

Beck, Brian E. 1981. "Imitatio Christi and the Lucan Passion Narrative," Pages 28–47 in *Suffering and Martyrdom in the New Testament*. Edited by William Horbury and Brian McNeil. London: Cambridge University Press.

Beck, Norman A. 1970. "The Last Supper as an Efficacious Symbolic Act." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 89 (2): 192–198.

Benoit, Pierre. 1975. "Jésus et le Serviteur de Dieu," Pages 112–140 in *Jésus aux origines de la christologie*. Edited by Jacques Dupont. Louvain: Louvain University Press.

Beuken, Willem A. M. 1989. "Servant and Herald of Good Tidings: Isaiah 61 as an Interpretation of Isaiah 40–55," Pages 411–442 in *The Book of Isaiah*. Edited by Jacques Vermeylen. Louvain: Louvain University Press.

Bieringer, R. 1992. "Traditions-geschichtlicher Ursprung und theologische Bedeutung der ὑπέρ-Aussagen im Neuen Testament," Pages 219–248 in *The Four Gospels 1992*. Edited by F. van Segbroeck, Christopher M. Tuckett, G. van Belle, and Joseph Verheyden. 3 vols. Vol. 1. Louvain: Peeters.

Billings, Bradly S. 2006. "The Disputed Words in the Lukan Institution Narrative (Luke 22:19b–20): A Sociological Answer to a Textual Problem." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 125 (3): 507–526.

Billings, Bradly S. 2006. *Do This in Remembrance of Me: The Disputed Words in the Lukan Institution Narrative (Luke 22.19b–20): An Historico-Exegetical, Theological, and Sociological Analysis*. London: T&T Clark.

Bird, Michael F. 2007. "The Unity of Luke-Acts in Recent Discussion." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 29 (4): 425–448.

Blackburn, Barry. 1991. *Theios Aner and the Markan Miracle Traditions: A Critique of the Theios Aner Concept as an Interpretative Background of the Miracle Traditions Used by Mark*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Boccaccini, Gabriele. 1998. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Bock, Darrell L. 1987. *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology*. Sheffield: JSOT.

Bock, Darrell L. 2007. *Acts*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Bock, Darrell L. 2012. "Isaiah 53 in Acts 8," Pages 133–144 in *The Gospel According to Isaiah 53: Encountering the Suffering Servant in Jewish and Christian Theology*. Edited by Darrell L. Bock and Mitch Glaser. Grand Rapids: Kregel.

Bons, Eberhard. 1994. "Das Sterbewort Jesu nach Lk 23:46 und sein alttestamentlicher Hintergrund." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 38 (1): 93–101.

Bornkamm, Günther. 1971. *Paul*. New York: Harper & Row.

Böttrich, Christfried. 2005. "Proexistenz im Leben und Sterben: Jesu Tod bei Lukas," Pages 413–436 in *Deutungen des Todes Jesu im Neuen Testament*. Edited by Jörg Frey and Jens Schröter. Tübingen: Mohr.

Bousset, Wilhelm. 1970. *Kyrios Christos: A History of the Belief in Christ from the Beginnings of Christianity to Irenaeus*. Translated by John E. Steely. Nashville: Abingdon. Translation of *Kyrios Christos: Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913.

Bovon, François. 2002. *Luke: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1–9:50*. Translated by Christine M. Thomas. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Bovon, François. 2003. "The Law in Luke-Acts," Pages 59–73 in *Studies in Early Christianity*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Bovon, François. 2003. "The Lukan Story of the Passion of Jesus (Luke 22–23)," Pages 74–105 in *Studies in Early Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.

Bovon, François. 2006. *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-Five Years of Research (1950–2005)*. 2d rev. ed. Waco: Baylor University Press.

Bovon, François. 2012. *Luke 3: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 19:28–24:53*. Translated by James Crouch. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Brawley, Robert L. 1995. *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Brown, Raymond E. 1977. *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in Matthew and Luke*. London: Geoffrey Chapman.

Brown, Raymond E. 1994. *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave: A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels*. 2 vols. Vol. 1. London: Geoffrey Chapman.

Brown, Raymond E. 1998. *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave: A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels*. 2 vols. Vol. 2. London: Doubleday.

Brown, Schuyler. 1969. *Apostasy and Perseverance in the Theology of Luke*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.

Brunson, Andrew C. 2003. *Psalm 118 in the Gospel of John*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Buckwalter, H. Douglas. 1996. *The Character and Purpose of Luke's Christology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Büchele, Anton. 1978. *Der Tod Jesu im Lukasevangelium: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Lk 23*. Frankfurt am Main: Knecht.

Bultmann, Rudolf. 1955. *Theology of the New Testament*. 2 vols. Vol. 2. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. London: SCM. Translation of *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1953.

Bultmann, Rudolf. 1963. *The History of the Synoptic Tradition*. Translated by John Marsh. Oxford: Blackwell. Translation of *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*. 2d ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1958 [1921].

Cadbury, Henry J. 1927. *The Making of Luke-Acts*. New York: Macmillan.

Calabi, Francesca. 2004. "Les sacrifices et leur signification symbolique chez Philon d'Alexandrie," Pages 97–117 in *"Car c'est l'amour qui me plaît, non le sacrifice …"*. Edited by Eberhard Bons. Leiden: Brill.

Carleton Paget, James. 1994. *The Epistle of Barnabas: Outlook and Background*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Carpinelli, Francis G. 1999. "'Do This as My Memorial' (Luke 22:19): Lucan Soteriology of Atonement." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 61 (1): 74–91.

Carras, George P. 1997. "A Pentateuchal Echo in Jesus' Prayer on the Cross: Intertextuality between Numbers 15,22–31 and Luke 23,34a," Pages 605–616 in *The Scriptures in the Gospels*. Edited by Christopher M. Tuckett. Louvain: Louvain University Press.

Carras, George P. 1999. "Observant Jews in the Story of Luke and Acts: Paul, Jesus and other Jews," Pages 693–708 in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Edited by Joseph Verheyden. Louvain: Louvain University Press.

Carroll, John T. 1990. "Luke's Crucifixion Scene," Pages 108–124 in *Reimaging the Death of the Lukan Jesus*. Edited by Dennis D. Sylva. Frankfurt am Main: Hain.

Carroll, John T. and Joel B. Green. 1995. *The Death of Jesus in Early Christianity*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

Chance, J. Bradley. 1988. *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts*. Macon: Mercer.

Chapman, David W. 2005. "Crucifixion, Bodily Suspension, and Jewish Interpretations of the Hebrew Bible in Antiquity," Pages 37–48 in *Beyond the Jordan: Studies in Honor of W. Harold Mare*. Edited by Glenn A. Carnagey, Sr. Eugene: Wipf & Stock.

Chapman, David W. 2008. *Ancient Jewish and Christian Perceptions of Crucifixion*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Chester, Andrew. 1991. "The Sibyl and the Temple," Pages 37–69 in *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple Presented to Ernst Bammel*. Edited by William Horbury. Sheffield: JSOT.

Childs, Brevard S. 1992. *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments*. London: SCM.

Chilton, Bruce D. 1994. *A Feast of Meanings: Eucharistic Theologies from Jesus through Johannine Circles*. Leiden: Brill.

Chmiel, Jerzy. 1993. "The Semiotics of Repentance and Atonement in the Old Testament." *Analecta Cracoviensia* 25: 61–69.

Clivaz, Claire. 2010. *L'ange et la sueur de sang (Lc 22, 43–44): Ou comment on pourrait bien encore écrire l'histoire*. Louvain: Peeters.

Cohn-Sherbok, Dan. 1981. "A Jewish Note on ΤΟ ΠΟΤΗΡΙΟΝ ΤΗΣ ΕΥΛΟΓΙΑΣ." *New Testament Studies* 27 (05): 704–709.

Conzelmann, Hans. 1960. *The Theology of St. Luke*. New York: Harper & Brothers. Translation of *Die Mitte der Zeit*. 2d ed. Tübingen: Mohr, 1957 [1954].

Conzelmann, Hans. 1966. "Luke's Place in the Development of Early Christianity," Pages 298–316 in *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon.

Conzelmann, Hans. 1987. *Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. Translated by James Limburg, A. Thomas Kraabel and Donald H. Juel. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Cosgrove, Charles H. 1984. "The Divine Δεῖ in Luke-Acts: Investigations into the Lukan Understanding of God's Providence." *Novum Testamentum* 26 (2): 168–190.

Courtman, Nigel B. 1995. "Sacrifice in the Psalms," Pages 41–58 in *Sacrifice in the Bible*. Edited by Roger T. Beckwith and Martin J. Selman. Carlisle: Paternoster.

Creed, John M. 1930. *The Gospel according to St. Luke: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices*. London: Macmillan & Co.

Crockett, Larrimore C. 1969. "Luke 4:25–27 and Jewish-gentile relations in Luke-Acts." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 (2): 177–183.

Crump, David. 1992. *Jesus the Intercessor: Prayer and Christology in Luke-Acts*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Dahl, Nils A. 1969. "The Atonement – An Adequate Reward for the Akedah (Ro 8:32)," Pages 15–29 in *Neotestamentica et Semitica: Studies in Honour of Matthew Black*. Edited by E. Earle Ellis and Max Wilcox. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

De Jonge, Marinus. 1991. *Jesus, the Servant-Messiah*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

De Wette, Wilhelm M. L. and Franz Overbeck. 1870. *Kurze Erklärung der Apostelgeschichte*. 4th rev. ed. Leipzig: Hirzel.

Decock, Paul B. 2002. "The Breaking of Bread in Luke 24." *Neotestamentica* 36: 39–56.

Delling, Gerhard. 1957. "ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΑ ΒΑΠΤΙΣΘΗΝΑΙ." *Novum Testamentum* 2 (2): 92–115.

Delobel, Joël. 1997. "Luke 23:34a: A Perpetual Text-Critical Crux?," Pages 25–36 in *Sayings of Jesus: Canonical and Non-Canonical*. Edited by William L. Petersen, Johan S. Vos and Henk J. De Jonge. Leiden: Brill.

DeVine, Charles F. 1947. "The 'Blood of God' in Acts 20:28." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 9 (4): 381–408.

Dibelius, Martin. 1934. *From Tradition to Gospel*. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. London: Ivor Nicholson & Watson. Translation of *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*. 2d ed. Tübingen: Mohr, 1933 [1919].

Dillon, Richard J. 1978. *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word: Tradition and Composition in Luke 24*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.

Dillon, Richard J. 2007. "Simeon as a Lukan spokesman (Lk 2,29–35)," Pages 189–217 in *"Il Verbo di Dio è vivo": Studi sul Nuovo Testamento in Onore del Cardinale Albert Vanhoye*. Edited by José Enrique Aguilar Chiu and Albert Vanhoye. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.

Doble, Peter. 1996. *The Paradox of Salvation: Luke's Theology of the Cross*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dodd, Charles H. 1936. *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Dolfe, Karl G. 1990. "The Greek Word of 'Blood' and the Interpretation of Acts 20:28." *Svensk exegetisk årsbok* 55: 64–70.

Dowd, Sharyn and Elizabeth S. Malbon. 2006. "The Significance of Jesus' Death in Mark: Narrative Context and Authorial Audience." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 125 (2): 271–297.

Drury, John. 1976. *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd.

Du Plessis, Isak J. 1994. "The Saving Significance of Jesus and His Death on the Cross in Luke's Gospel – Focussing on Luke 22:19b–20." *Neotestamentica* 28 (2): 523–540.

Dupont, Jacques. 1960. "Le salut des gentils et la signification théologique du livre des Actes." *New Testament Studies* 6 (2): 132–155.

Dupont, Jacques. 1962. *Le discours de Milet: Testament pastoral de saint Paul*. Paris: Cerf.

Edwards, Sarah A. 1976. "P75 under the Magnifying Glass." *Novum Testamentum* 18 (3): 190–212.

Ehrman, Bart D. 1993. *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Eidevall, Göran. 2011. "The Role of Sacrificial Language in Prophetic Rhetoric," Pages 49 – 61 in *Ritual and Metaphor: Sacrifice in the Bible*. Edited by Christian Eberhart. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Elgvin, Torleif. 1997. "The Messiah who was Cursed on the Tree." *Themelios* 22: 14 – 21.

Elliott, John H. 1991. "Temple versus Household in Luke-Acts: A Contrast in Social Institutions," Pages 211 – 240 in *The Social World of Luke-Acts*. Edited by Jerome H. Neyrey. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

Epp, Eldon J. 2009. "The Disputed Words of the Eucharistic Institution (Luke 22,19b–20): The Long and Short of the Matter." *Biblica* 90 (3): 407 – 416.

Eubank, Nathan. 2010. "A Disconcerting Prayer: On the Originality of Luke 23:34a." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 129 (3): 521 – 536.

Fabien, Patrick. 2010. "Qu'est-ce qu'interpréter (Actes 8,26 – 35)?," Pages 439 – 452 in *Intrigue dans le récit biblique*. Edited by Anne Pasquier, Daniel Marguerat and André Wénin. Louvain: Peeters.

Farris, Stephen. 1985. *The Hymns of Luke's Infancy Narratives: Their Origin, Meaning and Significance*. Sheffield: JSOT.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1962. "Papyrus Bodmer XIV: Some Features of Our Oldest Text of Luke." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 24 (2): 170 – 179.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1978. "Crucifixion in Ancient Palestine, Qumran Literature, and the New Testament." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 40 (4): 493 – 513.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1981. *The Gospel according to Luke (I–IX)*. 2 vols. Vol. 1. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1985. *The Gospel according to Luke (X–XXIV)*. 2 vols. Vol. 2. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1989. "'Today You Shall Be with Me in Paradise' (Luke 23:43)." Pages 203 – 233 in *Luke the Theologian: Aspects of His Teaching*. New York: Paulist.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1998. *The Acts of the Apostles*. New York: Doubleday.

Flender, Helmut. 1967. *St. Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History*. Translated by Reginald H. Fuller and Ilse Fuller. London: SPCK. Translation of *Heil und Geschichte in der Theologie des Lukas*. Munich: Chr. Kaiser, 1965.

Ford, J. Massyngberde. 1983. "Reconciliation and Forgiveness in Luke's Gospel," Pages 80 – 98 in *Political Issues in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Richard J. Cassidy and Philip J. Scharper. Maryknoll: Orbis.

Fowler, Robert M. 1985. "Who is 'the Reader' in Reader-Response Criticism?" *Semeia* 31: 5 – 23.

France, R. T. 1971. *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity.

Franklin, Eric. 1975. *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts*. Philadelphia: Westminster.

Frei, Hans W. 1974. *The Eclipse of Biblical Narrative: A Study in Eighteenth and Nineteenth Century Hermeneutics*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Frein, Brigid C. 1993. "The Literary and Theological Significance of Misunderstanding in the Gospel of Luke." *Biblica* 74 (3): 328 – 348.

Gane, Roy E. 2005. *Cult and Character: Purification Offerings, Day of Atonement, and Theodicy*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

Gasque, W. Ward. 1975. *A History of the Criticism of the Acts of the Apostles*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Gaventa, Beverly Roberts. 2004. "Theology and Ecclesiology in the Miletus Speech: Reflections on Content and Context." *New Testament Studies* 50 (1): 36–52.

Genette, Gérard. 1986. *Narrative Discourse*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Genz, Rouven. 2015. *Jesaja 53 als theologische Mitte der Apostelgeschichte. Studien zu ihrer Christologie und Ekklesiologie im Anschluss an Apg 8,26–40*. Tübingen: Mohr.

George, Augustin. 1973. "Le sens de la mort de Jésus pour Luc." *Revue Biblique* 80 (2): 186–217.

Gerber, Daniel. 2004. "Les emplois d' Ἔλεος en Luc-Actes," Pages 81–95 in *"Car c'est l'amour qui me plaît, non le sacrifice..."*. Edited by Eberhard Bons. Leiden: Brill.

Gerber, Daniel. 2008. *'Il vous est né un Sauveur': la construction du sens sotériologique de la venue de Jésus en Luc-Actes*. Geneva: Labor et Fides.

Gese, Hartmut. 1981. "The Atonement," Pages 93–116 in *Essays on Biblical Theology*. Translated by Keith Crim. Minneapolis: Augsburg.

Gese, Hartmut. 1981. "The Origin of the Lord's Supper," Pages 117–140 in *Essays on Biblical Theology*. Translated by Keith Crim. Minneapolis: Augsburg.

Giesen, Heinz. 2005. "'Noch heute wirst du mit mir im Paradies sein' (Lk 23,43): zur individuellen Eschatologie im lukanischen Doppelwerk," Pages 151–177 in *"Licht zur Erleuchtung der Heiden und Herrlichkeit für dein Volk Israel"*. Edited by Christoph G. Müller. Hamburg: Philo.

Giles, Kevin. 1985. "Luke's Use of the Term Ekklēsia with Special Reference to Acts 20:28 and 9:31." *New Testament Studies* 31 (1): 135–142.

Gillman, John. 2002. "The Emmaus Story in Luke-Acts Revisited," in *Resurrection in the New Testament*. Edited by R. Bieringer, V. Koperski and B. Lataire. Louvain: Peeters.

Girard, René. 1986. *The Scapegoat*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Glöckner, Richard. 1975. *Die Verkündigung des Heils beim Evangelisten Lukas*. Mainz: Matthias-Grünewald.

Goodman, Martin. 1987. *The Ruling Class of Judaea: The Origins of the Jewish Revolt against Rome A.D. 66–70*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goulder, Michael. 2000. "The Anointed," Pages 66–74 in *The Old Testament in the New Testament: Essays in Honour of J. L. North*. Edited by Steve Moyise. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.

Grabbe, Lester L. 2000. *Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period: Belief and Practice from the Exile to Yavneh*. London: Routledge.

Grassi, Joseph A. 1964. "Emmaus Revisited (Luke 24:13–35 and Acts 8:26–40)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 26 (4): 463–467.

Grayston, Kenneth. 1990. *Dying, We Live: A New Enquiry into the Death of Christ in the New Testament*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Green, Joel B. 1986. "Jesus on the Mount of Olives (Luke 22:39–46): Tradition and Theology." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* (26): 29–48.

Green, Joel B. 1988. *The Death of Jesus: Tradition and Interpretation in the Passion Narrative*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Green, Joel B. 1990. "The Death of Jesus, God's Servant," Pages 1–28 in *Reimaging the Death of the Lukan Jesus*. Edited by Dennis D. Sylva. Frankfurt am Main: Hain.

Green, Joel B. 1994. "The Demise of the Temple as 'Culture Center' in Luke-Acts: An Exploration of the Rending of the Temple Veil (Luke 23:44–49)." *Revue Biblique* 101 (4): 495–515.

Green, Joel B. 1998. Review of *The Paradox of Salvation: Luke's Theology of the Cross*, by Peter Doble. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 117 (1): 140–142.

Grelot, Pierre. 1967. "Aujourd'hui tu seras avec moi dans le paradis, Luc 23:43." *Revue Biblique* 74 (2): 194–214.

Gruen, Erich S. 2002. *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Guillaume, Jean Marie. 1979. *Luc interprète des anciennes traditions sur la résurrection de Jésus*. Paris: Gabalda.

Gurtner, Daniel M. 2006. *The Torn Veil: Matthew's Exposition of the Death of Jesus*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haenchen, Ernst. 1971. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hagene, Sylvia. 2003. *Zeiten der Wiederherstellung: Studien zur lukanischen Geschichtstheologie als Soteriologie*. Münster: Aschendorff.

Hahn, Ferdinand. 1983. "Das Verständnis des Opfers im Neuen Testament," Pages 51–91 in *Das Opfer Jesu Christi und seine Gegenwart in der Kirche: Klärungen zum Opfercharakter des Herrenmahles*. Edited by Karl Lehmann and Edmund Schlink. Frieburg: Herder.

Harris, Horton. 1975. *The Tübingen School*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hayward, C. T. R. 1996. *The Jewish Temple: A Non-Biblical Sourcebook*. London: Routledge.

Head, Peter M. 1993. "Christology and Textual Transmission: Reverential Alterations in the Synoptic Gospels." *Novum Testamentum* 35 (2): 105–129.

Heil, John P. 1989. "Reader-Response and the Irony of Jesus before the Sanhedrin in Luke 22:66–71." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 51 (2): 271–284.

Heiligenthal, Roman. 1995. "Wehrlosigkeit oder Selbstschutz? Aspekte zum Verständnis des lukanischen Schwertwortes." *New Testament Studies* 41 (1): 39–58.

Hill, David. 1971. "Rejection of Jesus at Nazareth (Luke 4:16–30)." *Novum Testamentum* 13 (3): 161–180.

Hofius, Otfried. 1989. "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlparadosis: Erwägungen zu 1 Kor 11,23b–25," Pages 203–240 in *Paulusstudien*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Holladay, Carl R. 1977. *Theios Aner in Hellenistic-Judaism: A critique of the use of this category in New Testament Christology*. Missoula: Scholars Press.

Holmås, Geir O. 2011. *Prayer and Vindication in Luke-Acts: The Theme of Prayer within the Context of the Legitimating and Edifying Objective of the Lukan Narrative*. London: T&T Clark.

Holtzmann, Heinrich J. 1863. *Die synoptischen Evangelien: ihr Ursprung und geschichtlicher Charakter*. Leipzig: W. Engelmann.

Hooker, Morna D. 1959. *Jesus and the Servant: The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament*. London: SPCK.

Horbury, William. 2006. "British New Testament Study in its International Setting, 1902–2002," Pages 142–220 in *Herodian Judaism and New Testament Study*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Horton, Dennis J. 2009. *Death and Resurrection: The Shape and Function of a Literary Motif in the Book of Acts*. Eugene: Pickwick.

Hüttenmeister, Frowald G. 1999. "Die Synagoge: Ihre Entwicklung von einer multifunktionalen Einrichtung zum reinen Kultbau," Pages 357–370 in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel = Community without temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange, Peter Pilhofer and Kathrin Ehlers. Tübingen: Mohr.

Hurtado, Larry W. 2003. *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Iser, Wolfgang. 1974. *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Jason, Mark A. 2007. "Penitents of the Desert: An Investigation into the Function of Repentance in the Qumran Community." PhD diss., University of Aberdeen.

Jeremias, Joachim. 1966. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. Translated by Norman Perrin. London: SCM. Translation of *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu*. 3d ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1960.

Jervell, Jacob. 1972. *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Augsburg.

Jervell, Jacob. 1998. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Jipp, Joshua W. 2010. "Luke's Scriptural Suffering Messiah: A Search for Precedent, a Search for Identity." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 72 (2): 255–274.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. 1991. *The Gospel of Luke*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. 1992. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. 1999. "The Christology of Luke-Acts," Pages 49–65 in *Who Do You Say that I Am?* Edited by Mark A. Powell and David R. Bauer. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Johnson, Luke Timothy. 2011. *Prophetic Jesus, Prophetic Church: The Challenge of Luke-Acts to Contemporary Christians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Jones, Donald L. 1984. "The Title 'Servant' in Luke-Acts," Pages 148–165 in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*. Edited by Charles H. Talbert. New York: Crossroad.

Jülicher, Adolf. 1904. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. Translated by Janet Penrose Ward. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. Translation of *Einleitung in das neue Testament*. 2d ed. Tübingen: Mohr, 1901 [1894].

Karris, Robert J. 1985. *Luke: Artist and Theologian*. New York: Paulist.

Karris, Robert J. 1986. "Luke 23:47 and the Lucan View of Jesus' Death." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 105 (1): 65–74.

Käsemann, Ernst. 1971. "The Saving Significance of the Death of Jesus in Paul," Pages 32–59 in *Perspectives on Paul*. Translated by Margaret Kohl. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Keck, Leander E. 1986. "Toward the Renewal of New Testament Christology." *New Testament Studies* 32 (03): 362–377.

Kenny, Anthony J. P. 1957. "Transfiguration and the Agony in the Garden." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 19 (4): 444–452.

Kimbell, John. 2014. *The Atonement in Lukan Theology*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.

Kister, Menahem. 2010. "The Tree of Life and the Turning Sword: Jewish Biblical Interpretation, Symbols, and Theological Patterns and their Christian Counterparts," Pages 138–155 in *Paradise in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Views*. Edited by Markus N. A. Bockmuehl and Guy G. Stroumsa. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Klawans, Jonathan. 2001. "Was Jesus' Last Supper a Seder?" *Biblical Archaeology Review* 17 (5): 24–33.

Klawans, Jonathan. 2002. "Interpreting the Last Supper: Sacrifice, Spiritualization, and Anti-Sacrifice." *New Testament Studies* 48 (1): 1–17.

Klawans, Jonathan. 2006. *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Klawans, Jonathan. 2008. "Methodology and Ideology in the Study of Priestly Ritual," Pages 84–95 in *Perspectives on Purity and Purification in the Bible*. Edited by Baruch J. Schwartz, David P. Wright, Jeffrey Stackert and Naphtali S. Meshel. London: T & T Clark.

Kloppenborg, John S. 1992. "Exitus Clari Viri: The Death of Jesus in Luke." *Toronto Journal of Theology* 8 (1): 106–120.

Kodell, Jerome. 1979. "Luke's Theology of the Death of Jesus," Pages 221–230 in *Sin, Salvation and the Spirit*. Edited by Daniel Durken. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical.

Koenig, John. 2000. *The Feast of the World's Redemption: Eucharistic Origins and Christian Mission*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity.

Koet, Bart J. 1992. "Simeons Worte (Lk 2,29–32.34c-35) und Israels Geschick," Pages 1549–1569 in *The Four Gospels 1992*. Edited by F. van Segbroeck, Christopher M. Tuckett, G. van Belle, and Joseph Verheyden. 3 vols. Vol. 2. Louvain: Peeters.

Kosmala, Hans. 1960. "'Das tut zu meinem Gedächtnis'." *Novum Testamentum* 4 (2): 81–94.

Kurz, William S. 1985. "Luke 22:14–38 and Greco-Roman and Biblical Farewell Addresses." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104 (2): 251–268.

Kurz, William S. 1993. *Reading Luke-Acts: Dynamics of Biblical Narrative*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox.

Lambrecht, J. 1979. "Paul's Farewell-Address at Miletus (Acts 20,17–38)," Pages 307–337 in *Les Actes des Apôtres: Traditions, Rédaction, Théologie*. Edited by Jacob Kremer. Louvain: Louvain University Press.

Lampe, G. W. H. 1984. "The Two Swords (Lk 22:35–38)," Pages 335–351 in *Jesus and the Politics of his Day*. Edited by Ernst Bammel and C. F. D. Moule. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Laporte, Jean. 1989. "Sacrifice and Forgiveness in Philo of Alexandria." *Studia Philonica Annual* 1: 34–42.

Larkin, William J. 1977. "Luke's Use of the Old Testament as a Key to his Soteriology." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 20 (4): 325–335.

Larkin, William J. 1979. "The Old Testament Background of Luke 22:43–44." *New Testament Studies* 25 (2): 250–254.

Larsson, Edvin. 1993. "Temple-Criticism and the Jewish Heritage: Some Reflexions on Acts 6–7." *New Testament Studies* 39 (3): 379–395.

Lemcio, Eugene E. 1991. *The Past of Jesus in the Gospels*. Cambridge University Press.

Léon-Dufour, Xavier. 1987. *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread: The Witness of the New Testament*. New York: Paulist.

Lewis, Carrie L. 2005. "Narrative insights into the crucifixion of Jesus in Luke (23:33–43)." *Currents in Theology and Mission* 32 (5): 355–365.

Lichtenberger, Hermann. 1995. "Alter Bund und neuer Bund." *New Testament Studies* 41 (3): 400–414.

Lichtenberger, Hermann. 1996. "'Bund' in der Abendmahlsüberlieferung," Pages 217–228 in *Bund und Tora*. Edited by Friedrich Avemarie and Hermann Lichtenberger. Tübingen: Mohr.

Lieu, Judith. 1997. *The Gospel of Luke*. Peterborough: Epworth.
Lindars, Barnabas. 1961. *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations*. London: SCM Press.
Lindemann, Andreas. 2009. "Paulus und die Rede in Milet (Apg 20,17–38)," Pages 175–205 in *Reception of Paulinism in Acts*. Edited by Daniel Marguerat. Louvain: Peeters.
Lindijer, Coert H. 1978. "Two Creative Encounters in the Work of Luke (Lk 24:13–35 and Acts 8:26–40)," Pages 77–85 in *Miscellanea Neotestamentica*. Edited by T. Baarda, A. F. J. Klijn and W. C. Van Unnik. Leiden: Brill.
Litwak, Kenneth D. 2012. "The Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts: Luke's Scriptural Story of the 'Things Accomplished among Us'," Pages 147–169 in *Issues in Luke-Acts*. Edited by S. Adams and M. Pahl. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias.
Loader, William R. G. 2002. *Jesus' Attitude towards the Law: A Study of the Gospels*. 3d ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
Lucas, Ernest. 1995. "Sacrifice in the Prophets," Pages 59–74 in *Sacrifice in the Bible*. Edited by Roger T. Beckwith and Martin J. Selman. Carlisle: Paternoster.
Macaskill, Grant. 2010. "Paradise in the New Testament," Pages 64–81 in *Paradise in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Views*. Edited by Markus N. A. Bockmuehl and Guy G. Stroumsa. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Maccoby, Hyam. 1999. *Ritual and Morality: The Ritual Purity System and its Place in Judaism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Maclean, Jennifer Berenson. 2007. "Barabbas, the Scapegoat Ritual, and the Development of the Passion Narrative." *Harvard Theological Review* 100 (3): 309–334.
Mainville, Odette. 2005. "De Jésus à l'Église: étude rédactionnelle de Luc 24." *New Testament Studies* 51 (2): 192–211.
Mallen, Peter. 2008. *The Reading and Transformation of Isaiah in Luke-Acts*. London: T&T Clark.
Marguerat, Daniel. 1993. "La mort d'Ananias et Saphira (Ac 5:1–11) dans la stratégie narrative de Luc." *New Testament Studies* 39 (2): 209–226.
Marguerat, Daniel. 2001. "Luc-Actes: La résurrection à l'oeuvre dans l'histoire," Pages 195–214 in *Résurrection: L'àpres-mort dans la monde ancient et le Nouveau Testament*. Edited by Odette Mainville and Daniel Marguerat. Montreal: Labor et Fides.
Marguerat, Daniel. 2007. *Les Actes des Apôtres 1–12*. 2 vols. Vol. 1. Geneva: Labor et Fides.
Marshall, I. Howard. 1971. *Luke: Historian and Theologian*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
Marshall, I. Howard. 1978. *The Gospel of Luke*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
Marshall, I. Howard. 2011. "The Place of Acts 20:28 in Luke's Theology of the Cross," in *Reading Acts Today*. Edited by Thomas E. Phillips, Lloyd Pietersen, F. Scott Spencer and Steve Walton. London: T&T Clark.
Martin, Michael W. 2005. "Defending the 'Western non-Interpolations': The Case for an Anti-Separationist Tendenz in the Longer Alexandrian Readings." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 124 (2): 269–294.
Martin, Ralph P. 1976. "Salvation and Discipleship in Luke's Gospel." *Interpretation* 30 (4): 366–380.
Matera, Frank J. 1985. "The Death of Jesus according to Luke: A Question of Sources." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 47 (3): 469–485.
Matera, Frank J. 1986. *Passion Narratives and Gospel Theologies: Interpreting the Synoptics through their Passion Stories*. New York: Paulist.

Matera, Frank J. 1993. "Jesus' Journey to Jerusalem (Luke 9.51–19.46): A Conflict with Israel." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* (51): 57–77.

Matson, Mark A. 2001. *In Dialogue with Another Gospel? The Influence of the Fourth Gospel on the Passion Narrative of the Gospel of Luke*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Matthews, Shelly. 2009. "Clemency as Cruelty: Forgiveness and Force in the Dying Prayers of Jesus and Stephen." *Biblical Interpretation* 17 (1–2): 118–146.

McCarthy, Dennis J. 1969. "The Symbolism of Blood and Sacrifice." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 (2): 166–176.

McCarthy, Dennis J. 1973. "Further Notes on the Symbolism of Blood and Sacrifice." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 92 (2): 205–210.

McKnight, Edgar V. 1988. *Postmodern Use of the Bible: The Emergence of Reader-Oriented Criticism*. Nashville: Abingdon.

McKnight, Scot. 2006. *Jesus and His Death: Historiography, the Historical Jesus, and Atonement Theory*. Waco: Baylor University Press.

Ménard, Jacques E. 1957. "Pais Theou as Messianic Title in the Book of Acts." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 19 (1): 83–92.

Meshorer, Yaʿaḳov. 1967. *Jewish Coins of the Second Temple Period*. Translated by I. H. Levine. Tel Aviv: Am Hassefer.

Metzger, Bruce M. 1994. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: German Bible Society.

Meynet, Roland. 1988. *L'évangile selon Saint Luc: Analyse rhétorique*. Paris: Cerf.

Milgrom, Jacob. 1975. "The Priestly Doctrine of Repentance." *Revue Biblique* 82 (2): 186–205.

Minear, Paul S. 1964. "A Note on Luke 22:36." *Novum Testamentum* 7 (2): 128–134.

Minear, Paul S. 1970. "Some Glimpses of Luke's Sacramental Theology." *Worship* 44 (6): 322–331.

Mittmann-Richert, Ulrike. 2008. *Der Sühnetod des Gottesknechts: Jesaja 53 im Lukasevangelium*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Moessner, David P. 1982. "Jesus and the 'Wilderness Generation': The Death of the Prophet like Moses according to Luke." *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 21: 319–340.

Moessner, David P. 1989. *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Moessner, David P. 1990. "'The Christ Must Suffer,' The Church Must Suffer: Rethinking the Theology of the Cross in Luke-Acts." *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* (29): 165–195.

Moo, Douglas J. 1983. *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives*. Sheffield: Almond.

Moore, Stephen D. 1989. *Literary Criticism and the Gospels: The Theoretical Challenge*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Morris, Leon. 1965. *The Cross in the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Moule, C. F. D. 1966. "Christology of Acts," Pages 159–185 in *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon.

Nave, Guy D. 2002. *The Role and Function of Repentance in Luke-Acts*. Leiden: Brill.

Neagoe, Alexandru. 2002. *The Trial of the Gospel: An Apologetic Reading of Luke's Trial Narratives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Neirynck, Frans. 1999. "Luke 4:16–30 and the Unity of Luke-Acts," Pages 357–395 in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Edited by Joseph Verheyden. Louvain: Louvain University Press.

Neyrey, Jerome H. 1985. *The Passion according to Luke: A Redaction Study of Luke's Soteriology*. New York: Paulist.

Nielsen, Anders E. 2000. *Until it is Fulfilled: Lukan Eschatology according to Luke 22 and Acts 20*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Nikiprowetzky, Valentin. 1967. "La spiritualisation des sacrifices et le culte sacrificiel au temple de Jerusalem chez Philon d'Alexandrie." *Semitica* 17: 96–110.

Nolland, John. 1989. *Luke*. 3 vols. Waco: Thomas Nelson.

O'Toole, Robert F. 1987. "Luke's Message in Luke 9:1–50." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 49 (1): 74–89.

O'Toole, Robert F. 2000. "How does Luke Portray Jesus as Servant of YHWH?". *Biblica* 81 (3): 328–346.

Pao, David W. 2000. *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Park, H. D. 2007. *Finding Herem? A Study of Luke-Acts in the Light of Herem*. London: T&T Clark.

Park, Sejin. 2008. *Pentecost and Sinai: The Festival of Weeks as a Celebration of the Sinai Event*. New York: T & T Clark.

Parker, David C. 1992. *Codex Bezae: An Early Christian Manuscript and its Text*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parker, David C. 1997. *The Living Text of the Gospels*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Parsons, Mikeal C. 1998. "Isaiah 53 in Acts 8: A Reply to Professor Morna Hooker," in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins*. Edited by William H. Bellinger and William R. Farmer. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity.

Patella, Michael. 1999. *The Death of Jesus: The Diabolical Force and the Ministering Angel: Luke 23:44–49*. Paris: Gabalda.

Pearce, Sarah. 2004. "Jerusalem as 'Mother-City' in the Writings of Philo of Alexandria," Pages 19–36 in *Negotiating Diaspora: Jewish Strategies in the Roman Empire*. Edited by John M. G. Barclay. London: T&T Clark.

Perrot, Charles. 1982. "Emmaüs ou la Rencontre du Seigneur (Lc 24,13–35)," Pages 159–166 in *La Pâque du Christ, Mystère de Salut*. Edited by Etienne Charpentier, Martin Benzerath, Aloyse Schmid and Jacques Guillet. Paris: Cerf.

Perry, Menakhem. 1979. "Literary Dynamics: How the Order of a Text Creates Its Meanings [With an Analysis of Faulkner's "A Rose for Emily"]." *Poetics Today* 1/2: 35–64, 311–361.

Pervo, Richard I. 2008. *Acts: A Commentary*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Pesch, Rudolf. 1978. *Das Abendmahl und Jesu Todesverständnis*. Vienna: Herder.

Petersen, Norman R. 1978. *Literary Criticism for New Testament Critics*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Peterson, David. 2004. "Atonement Theology in Luke-Acts: Some Methodological Reflections," Pages 56–71 in *The New Testament in its First Century Setting*. Edited by Peter J. Williams, Andrew D. Clark, Peter M. Head and David Instone-Brewer. Cambridge: Eerdmans.

Pettem, Michael. 1996. "Luke's Great Omission and His View of the Law." *New Testament Studies* 42 (1): 35–54.

Petzer, Jacobus H. 1984. "Luke 22:19b–20 and the structure of the passage." *Novum Testamentum* 26 (3): 249–252.

Petzer, Jacobus H. 1995. "The Latin Version of the New Testament." Pages 113–130 in *The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the* Status Quaestionis. Edited by Bart D. Ehrman and Michael W. Holmes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Petzer, Kobus. 1991. “Style and Text in the Lucan Narrative of the Institution of the Lord’s Supper (Luke 22:19b–20).” *New Testament Studies* 37 (1): 113–129.
Pilgrim, Walter E. 1971. “The Death of Christ in Lukan Soteriology.” PhD diss., Princeton Theological Seminary.
Plevnik, Joseph. 1991. “Son of Man Seated at the Right Hand of God : Luke 22:69 in Lucan Christology.” *Biblica* 72 (3): 331–347.
Poirier, John C. 2007. “Jesus as an Elijianic Figure in Luke 4:16–30.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 71 (2): 349–363.
Pokorný, Petr. 1998. *Theologie der lukanischen Schriften*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
Powell, Mark A. 1990. *What is Narrative Criticism?* Minneapolis: Fortress.
Quesnel, Michel. 2001. “Paul prédicateur dans les Actes des Apôtres.” *New Testament Studies* 47 (4): 469–481.
Radl, Walter. 1999. “Die Beziehungen der Vorgeschichte zur Apostelgeschichte: Dargestellt an Lk 2:22–39,” Pages 297–312 in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Edited by Joseph Verheyden. Louvain: Louvain University Press.
Rese, Martin. 1975. “Zur Problematik von Kurz und Langtext in Luk 22:17 ff.” *New Testament Studies* 22 (1): 15–31.
Richard, Earl J. 1990. “Jesus’ Passion and Death in Acts,” Pages 125–152 in *Reimaging the Death of the Lukan Jesus*. Edited by Dennis D. Sylva. Frankfurt am Main: Hain.
Robinson, J. A. T. 1962. “The One Baptism,” Pages 158–175 in *Twelve New Testament Studies*. London: SCM.
Robinson, James M. and Helmut Koester. 1971. *Trajectories through early Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
Robinson, William Childs. 1962. “The Way of the Lord: A Study of History and Eschatology in the Gospel of Luke.” PhD diss., University of Basel.
Roloff, Jürgen. 1972. “Anfänge der soteriologischen Deutung des Todes Jesu (Mk 10:45 und Lk 22:27).” *New Testament Studies* 19 (1): 38–64.
Roloff, Jürgen. 1985. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
Rosica, Thomas M. 1994. “The Road to Emmaus and the Road to Gaza: Luke 24:13–35 and Acts 8:26–40.” *Worship* 68 (2): 117–131.
Routledge, Robin L. 2002. “Passover and Last Supper.” *Tyndale Bulletin* 53 (2): 203–221.
Rowe, C. Kavin. 2006. *Early Narrative Christology: The Lord in the Gospel of Luke*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
Rowe, C. Kavin. 2009. *World Upside Down: Reading Acts in the Graeco-Roman Age*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Rowland, Christopher. 1991. “The Second Temple: Focus of Ideological Struggle?,” Pages 175–198 in *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel*. Edited by William Horbury. Sheffield: JSOT.
Rowland, Christopher. 2009. “Apocalypticism: The Disclosure of Heavenly Knowledge,” Pages 13–31 in *The Mystery of God: Early Jewish Mysticism and the New Testament*. Edited by Pieter W. van der Horst and Peter J. Tomson. Leiden: Brill.
Royse, James R. 2008. *Scribal Habits in Early Greek New Testament Papyri*. Leiden: Brill.
Rusam, Dietrich. 2007. “Die Passionsgeschichte des Lukas als Kontextualisierung von Psalm 22,” Pages 77–110 in *Psalm 22 und die Passionsgeschichten der Evangelien*. Edited by Dieter Sänger. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.

Ruzer, Serge. 2008. "Jesus' Crucifixion in Luke and Acts: The Search for a Meaning vis-à-vis the Biblical Pattern of Persecuted Prophet," Pages 173–191 in *Judaistik und neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*. Edited by Berndt Schaller, Lutz Doering, Hans-Günther Waubke and Florian Wilk. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Sanders, E. P. 1977. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. London: SCM.

Sanders, E. P. 1985. *Jesus and Judaism*. London: SCM.

Sanders, E. P. 1992. *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE–66 CE*. London: SCM.

Sanders, Jack T. 1987. *The Jews in Luke-Acts*. London: SCM.

Sanders, James A. 1975. "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4," Pages 75–106 in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults*. Edited by Jacob Neusner. Leiden: Brill.

Scaer, Peter J. 2005. *The Lukan Passion and the Praiseworthy Death*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix.

Schaberg, Jane. 1985. "Daniel 7,12 and the New Testament passion-resurrection predictions." *New Testament Studies* 31 (2): 208–222.

Scheffler, Eben. 1993. *Suffering in Luke's Gospel*. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag.

Schiffman, Lawrance H. 1999. "Community Without Temple: The Qumran Community's Withdrawal from the Jerusalem Temple," Pages 267–284 in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel = Community without temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange, Peter Pilhofer and Kathrin Ehlers. Tübingen: Mohr.

Schlosser, Jacques. 1982. "La genèse de Luc 22:25–27." *Revue Biblique* 89 (1): 52–70.

Schmid, Ulrich. 1999. "Eklektische Textkonstitution als theologische Rekonstruktion: Zur Heilsbedeutung des Todes Jesu bei Lukas (Lk 22,15–20 und Apg 20,28)," Pages 577–584 in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Edited by Joseph Verheyden. Louvain: Louvain University Press.

Schmid, Ulrich. 2008. "Scribes and Variants: Sociology and Typology," Pages 1–23 in *Textual Variation: Theological and Social Tendencies? Papers from the Fifth Birmingham Colloquium on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*. Edited by D. C. Parker and H. Houghton. Piscataway: Gorgias.

Schneckenburger, Matthias. 1841. *Über den Zweck der Apostelgeschichte*. Bern: Fischer.

Schneider, Gerhard. 1988. "Das Verfahren gegen Jesus in der Sicht des dritten Evangeliums (Lk 22,54–23,25): Redaktionskritik und historische Rückfrage," Pages 111–130 in *Der Prozess gegen Jesus*. Edited by Karl Kertelge. Freiburg: Herder.

Schürmann, Heinz. 1951. "Lk 22:19b–20 als ursprüngliche Textüberlieferung." *Biblica* 31 (3): 364–392.

Schürmann, Heinz. 1953. *Der Paschamahlbericht: Lk 22,(7–14)15–18: I Teil einer quellenkritischen Untersuchung des lukanischen Abendmahlsberichtes Lk 22,7–38*. Münster: Aschendorff.

Schürmann, Heinz. 1955. *Der Einsetzungsbericht: Lk 22,19–20: II Teil einer quellenkritischen Untersuchung des lukanischen Abendmahlsberichtes Lk 22,7–38*. Münster: Aschendorff.

Schürmann, Heinz. 1968. "Das Testament des Paulus für die Kirche, Apg 20, 18–35," Pages 310–340 in *Traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den synoptischen Evangelien*. Dusseldorf: Patmos.

Schweitzer, Albert. 1925. *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God: The Secret of Jesus' Messiahship and Passion*. London: Adams & Charles Black. Reprint of *The Mystery of*

the Kingdom of God. Translated by Walter Lowrie. London: Adams & Charles Black, 1901. Translation of *Das Messianitäts- und Leidensgeheimnis*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1901 [1901].

Schweitzer, Albert. 1926. *The Quest of the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study of its Progress from Reimarus to Wrede*. Translated by William Montgomery. 2d ed. London: Adam & Charles Black. Reprint of *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*. Translated by William Montgomery, with preface by Francis Crawford Burkitt. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1911. Translation of *Von Reimarus zu Wrede: Eine Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1906 [1906].

Schwemer, Anna Maria. 2001. "Der Auferstandene und die Emmausjünger," in *Auferstehung – Resurrection*. Edited by Friedrich Avemarie and Hermann Lichtenberger. Tübingen: Mohr.

Seccombe, David. 1981. "Luke and Isaiah." *New Testament Studies* 27 (02): 252 – 259.

Sellner, Hans J. 2007. *Das Heil Gottes: Studien zur Soteriologie des lukanischen Doppelwerks*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Senior, Donald. 1990. *The Passion of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical.

Siegert, Folker. 1999. "Die Synagoge und das Postulat eines unblutigen Opfers," Pages 335 – 356 in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel = Community without temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange, Peter Pilhofer and Kathrin Ehlers. Tübingen: Mohr.

Siker, Jeffrey S. 1992. "'First to the Gentiles': A Literary Analysis of Luke 4:16 – 30." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111 (1): 73 – 90.

Sklar, Jay. 2005. *Sin, Impurity, Sacrifice, Atonement: The Priestly Conceptions*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix.

Sklar, Jay. 2008. "Sin and Impurity: Atoned or Purified? Yes!," Pages 18 – 31 in *Perspectives on Purity and Purification in the Bible*. Edited by Baruch J. Schwartz, David P. Wright, Jeffrey Stackert and Naphtali S. Meshel. London: T & T Clark.

Snodgrass, Klyne. 1972. "Western Non-Interpolations." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 91 (3): 369 – 379.

Soards, Marion L. 1987. *The Passion according to Luke: The Special Material of Luke 22*. Sheffield: JSOT.

Soards, Marion L. 1990. "A Literary Analysis of the Origin and Purpose of Luke's Account of the Mockery of Jesus," Pages 86 – 93 in *New Views on Luke and Acts*. Edited by Earl Richard. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical.

Soards, Marion L. 1990. "Luke 2:22 – 40." *Interpretation* 44 (4): 400 – 405.

Soards, Marion L. 1994. *The Speeches in Acts*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox

Sterling, Gregory E. 2001. "Mors Philosophi: The Death of Jesus in Luke." *Harvard Theological Review* 94 (4): 383 – 402.

Strauss, Mark L. 1995. *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology*. Sheffield Academic.

Stuhlmacher, Peter. 2004. "Isaiah 53 in the Gospels and Acts," Pages 147 – 162 in *The Suffering Servant*. Edited by Bernd Janowski and Peter Stuhlmacher. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Sung, Chong Hyon. 1993. *Vergebung der Sünden: Jesu Praxis der Sündenvergebung nach den Synoptikern und ihre Voraussetzungen im Alten Testament und frühen Judentum*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Sylva, Dennis D. 1986. "The Temple Curtain and Jesus' Death in the Gospel of Luke." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 105 (2): 239 – 250.

Sylva, Dennis D. 1987. "The Meaning and Function of Acts 7:46–50." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106 (2): 261–275.

Székely, János. 2008. *Structure and Theology of the Lucan 'Itinerarium' (Lk 9,51–19,28)*. Budapest: Szent Jeromos Katolikus Bibliatársulat.

Talbert, Charles H. 1983. "Martyrdom in Luke-Acts and the Lukan Social Ethic," Pages 99–110 in *Political Issues in Luke-Acts*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis.

Tannehill, Robert C. 1972. "The Mission of Jesus according to Luke 4:16–30," Pages 51–75 in *Jesus in Nazareth*. Edited by Walther Eltester. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Tannehill, Robert C. 1985. "Israel in Luke-Acts: A Tragic Story." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104 (1): 69–85.

Tannehill, Robert C. 1986. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*. 2 vols. Vol. 1. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Tannehill, Robert C. 1990. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*. 2 vols. Vol. 2. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Tannehill, Robert C. 1991. "The Functions of Peter's Mission Speeches in the Narrative of Acts." *New Testament Studies* 37 (3): 400–414.

Taylor, Nicholas H. 1999. "Luke-Acts and the Temple," Pages 709–721 in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Edited by Joseph Verheyden. Louvain: Louvain University Press.

Taylor, Vincent. 1971. *The Passion Narrative of St. Luke: A Critical and Historical Investigation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Telford, William R. 1980. *The Barren Temple and the Withered Tree: A Redaction-Critical Analysis of the Cursing of the Fig-Tree Pericope in Mark's Gospel and its Relation to the Cleansing of the Temple Tradition*. Sheffield: JSOT.

Theobald, Michael. 2006. "Paschamahl und Eucharistiefeier: Zur heilsgeschichtlichen Relevanz der Abendmahlsszenerie bei Lukas (Lk 22:14–38)," Pages 133–180 in *"Für alle Zeiten zur Erinnerung" (Jos 4,7)*. Edited by Michael Theobald and Rudolf Hoppe. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.

Thompson, Alan J. 2011. *The Acts of the Risen Lord Jesus: Luke's Account of God's Unfolding Plan*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity.

Tiede, David L. 1988. "'Glory to thy people Israel': Luke-Acts and the Jews," Pages 21–34 in *Luke-Acts and the Jewish people*. Edited by Joseph B. Tyson. Minneapolis: Augsburg.

Tooman, William J. 2011. *Gog of Magog: Reuse of Scripture and Compositional Technique in Ezekiel 38–39*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Turner, Max. 1996. *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.

Tyson, Joseph B. 1986. *The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

Tyson, Joseph B. 1992. *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts*. Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press.

Untergaßmair, Franz G. 1980. *Kreuzweg und Kreuzigung Jesu: Ein Beitrag zur lukanischen Redaktionsgeschichte und zur Frage nach der lukanischen "Kreuzestheologie"*. Paderborn: Schöningh.

van Henten, Jan Willem. 1997. *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People: A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees*. Leiden: Brill.

van Henten, Jan Willem. 2005. "Jewish Martyrdom and Jesus' Death," Pages 139–168 in *Deutungen des Todes Jesu im Neuen Testament*. Edited by Jörg Frey and Jens Schröter. Tübingen: Mohr.

van Ruiten, J. T. 1999. "Visions of the Temple in the Book of Jubilees," Pages 215–227 in *Gemeinde ohne Tempel = Community without temple: Zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Edited by Beate Ego, Armin Lange, Peter Pilhofer and Kathrin Ehlers. Tübingen: Mohr.

van Zyl, Hermie C. 2005. "The Soteriology of Acts: Restoration to Life," Pages 133–160 in *Salvation in the New Testament: Perspectives on Soteriology*. Edited by Jan G. van der Watt. Leiden: Brill.

Vanhoye, Albert. 1992. "L'intérêt de Luc pour la prophétie en Lc 1,76; 4,16–30 et 22,60–65," Pages 1529–1548 in *The Four Gospels 1992*. Edited by F. van Segbroeck, Christopher M. Tuckett, G. van Belle and Joseph Verheyden. 3 vols. Vol. 2. Louvain: Peeters.

Vaughan, Curtis. 1975. "The Simeon Incident: An Interpretation of Luke 2:25–35," Pages 13–26 in *New Testament Studies*. Edited by Huber L. Drumwright and Curtis Vaughan. Waco: Baylor University Press.

Vielhauer, Philipp. 1966. "On the 'Paulinism' of Acts," Pages 33–50 in *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Translated by William Childs Robinson and Victor P. Furnish. Nashville: Abingdon. Translation of "Zum 'Paulinismus' der Apostelgeschichte." *Evangelische Theologie* 10 (1950/51): 1–15.

Vööbus, Arthur. 1969. "New Approach to the Problem of the Shorter and Longer Text in Luke." *New Testament Studies* 15 (4): 457–463.

Walaskay, Paul W. 1975. "The Trial and Death of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 94 (1): 81–93.

Walton, Steve. 2000. *Leadership and Lifestyle: The Portrait of Paul in the Miletus Speech and 1 Thessalonians*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Walton, Steve. 2004. "A Tale of Two Perspectives? The Place of the Temple in Acts," Pages 135–149 in *Heaven on Earth: The Temple in Biblical Theology*. Edited by T. D. Alexander and Simon Gathercole. Carlisle: Paternoster.

Wasserberg, Günter. 1998. *Aus Israels Mitte – Heil für die Welt: Eine narrativ-exegetische Studie zur Theologie des Lukas*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Weatherly, Jon A. 1994. *Jewish Responsibility for the Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.

Weinert, Francis D. 1982. "Luke, the Temple and Jesus' Saying about Jerusalem's Abandoned House (Luke 13:34–35)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 44 (1): 68–76.

Weiss, Johannes. 1971. *Jesus' Proclamation of the Kingdom of God*. Translated by Richard H. Hiers and David L. Holland. London: SCM. Translation of *Die Predigt Jesu von Reich Gottes*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1892.

Weiss, Johannes and Rudolf Knopf. 1937. *The History of Primitive Christianity*. Translated by Frederick C. Grant. London: Macmillan. Translation of *Das Urchristentum*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1917.

Weisse, Christian Hermann. 1838. *Die evangelische Geschichte: kritisch und philosophisch bearbeitet*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel.

Weisse, Christian Hermann. 1856. *Die Evangelienfrage in ihrem gegenwärtigen Stadium*. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel.

Wenham, David. 1995. "How Jesus Understood the Last Supper: A Parable in Action." *Themelios* 20: 11–16.

Weren, Wilhelmus J. C. 1981. "The Lord's Supper: An Inquiry into the Coherence in Lk 22:14–38," in *Fides Sacramenti – Sacramentum Fidei*. Edited by Hansjörg Maur. Assen: Van Gorcum.

Weren, Wilhelmus J. C. 1989. "Psalm 2 in Luke-Acts: An Intertextual Study," Pages 189–203 in *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings*. Edited by Sipke Draisma. Kampen, Netherlands: J H Kok.

Westcott, Brooke Foss and Fenton John Anthony Hort. 1881. *The New Testament in the original Greek: Introduction and Appendix*. Cambridge: Macmillan.

Whitlark, Jason and Mikeal C. Parsons. 2006. "The 'Seven' Last Words: A Numerical Motivation for the Insertion of Luke 23.34a." *New Testament Studies* 52 (2): 188–204.

Wilcox, Max. 1977. "Upon the Tree: Deut 21:22–23 in the New Testament." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 96 (1): 85–99.

Wilson, Benjamin R. 2013 a. "'Upon a Tree' Again and Again: Redundancy and Deuteronomy 21:23 in Acts." *Neotestamentica* 47 (1): 47–67.

Wilson, Benjamin R. 2013 b. "Taking up and Raising, Fixing and Loosing: A Chiastic Wordplay in Acts2.23b-24." *New Testament Studies* 59 (3): 457–460.

Wilson, S. G. 2005. *Luke and the Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wisse, Frederik. 1989. "The Nature and Purpose of Redactional Changes in Early Christian Texts: The Canonical Gospels," Pages 39–53 in *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century*. Edited by William L. Petersen. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Wolter, Michael. 2006. "The Theology of the Cross and the Quest for a Doctrinal Norm," Pages 263–285 in *The Nature of New Testament Theology: Essays in Honour of Robert Morgan*. Edited by Christopher Rowland and Christopher M. Tuckett. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wolter, Michael. 2008. *Das Lukasevangelium*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Wolter, Michael. 2009. "Jesu Tod und Sündenvergebung bei Lukas und Paulus," Pages 15–35 in *Reception of Paulinism in Acts*. Edited by Daniel Marguerat. Leuven: Peeters.

Wright, N. T. 2003. *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. London: SPCK.

Zehnle, Richard. 1969. "Salvific Character of Jesus' Death in Lucan Soteriology." *Theological Studies* 30 (3): 420–444.

Zeller, Eduard. 1854. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Stuttgart: Mäcken.

Zohar, Noam. 1988. "Repentance and Purification: The Significance and Semantics of חטאת in the Pentateuch." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 107 (4): 609–618.

Subject index