APPENDIX

CRITICAL NOTES ON THE VTS

CN 1. *The word order and number of 'parable': Mt 21:33, Mk 12:1, Lk 20:9, GT 45:1a*

Each version of the VTS has a brief prose introduction:[1] The object-imperative word order in Mt ἄλλην παραβολὴν ἀκούσατε suggests some Greek stylization. In a similar way, Mark's plural ἐν παραβολαῖς λαλεῖν is non-Hebraic as a parable introduction. Also, Mark has the adverbial phrase 'in parables' in front of the infinitive, which is a common Greek word order, and the plural is the same feature that turns up in the LXX for a singular מָשָׁל at Psalm 78:2 (LXX 77:2)[2]. The singular is always used in rabbinic literature when introducing a parable.

CN 2. *The Hebraic collocation 'to say a parable' and its word order*

Luke's collocation "to say this parable" fits known Hebrew practice. In the Hebrew Bible parables are used with נָשָׂא "lifted" (LXX [ἀνα]-λαβεῖν), מָשַׁל "parabled" (LXX εἰπεῖν παραβολήν), and דִּבֶּר "spoken" (LXX λαλῆσαι), never as the object of אָמַר (probably by accident). In rabbinic literature parables also occur with אָמַר "said", like Luke. Cf. מָשְׁלוּ מָשָׁל "they parabled a parable" *Mekhilta*, (*Yithro BeHodesh* 5), and ר׳ יוסי הגלילי אוֹמֵר מָשָׁל "Rav Yose the Galili was saying a parable" *Mekhilta*, (*BeshalaH*, *ViyHi* 1).[3] Luke's Greek is closer to potential underlying Hebrew structures in vocabulary choice, singular grammatical form, and word order of "say+parable-this". This example could be an

---

[1] Thomas began with his typically terse "He said."

[2] A Hebrew text to Ben Sira 38:33 ἐν παραβολαῖς is no longer extant. In Ben Sira 47:17 we have ἐν ᾠδαῖς καὶ παροιμίαις καὶ παραβολαῖς for Hebrew בשיר מָשָׁל חידה . In addition to the plural noun, Mark's continuative aspect on the verb λαλεῖν may point to the whole series of discussions in Mark 12 beyond the VTS.

[3] However, Luke's phrase does not qualify as a "non-Septuagintalism" because εἰπεῖν παραβολήν "to say a parable" occurs 7xx in the LXX (2 Sam [= 2 Kgd] 23:3, Ezek 12:23, 16:44, 17:2, 18:3, 21:5 [LXX 20:49], 24:3) where the verb למשל "to parable, make a simile" occurs in Hebrew.

accident, but it is probably not an imitation of the LXX. Such an analysis would be too subtle and insipid, especially in light of the non-Hebraic word order of "to the people", in front of the infinitive πρὸς τὸν λαὸν λέγειν τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην. In conjunction with the rest of this verse (including the discussion on ἄρξασθαι + infinitive below) and the VTS, it would be best to view this verse as a reflection of a non-Marcan source. This stands out when compared to distinctly more Grecian forms of this verse in Mark and Matthew.

CN 3. *Audience and setting, teaching the people in the temple*

The parable's audience is different in Luke and in Mark-Matthew. Luke situates this parable as teaching in the temple (Lk 20.1 with an ἐγένετο construction[4]) and as πρὸς τὸν λαόν "to the people". Mark and Matthew have the parable spoken directly to the authorities. Thus, in Matthew and Mark the VTS is spoken directly to "them", to the "chief priests (+Mark 'to the scribes') and to the elders" mentioned at the beginning of the previous pericope (Mt 21:23, Mk 11:27).

Luke and Matthew have a minor agreement in the word διδάσκειν 'to be teaching' (Mt 21:23, Lk 20:1). This is a significant agreement, since Mark has Jesus walking and only mentions Jesus teaching somewhat awkwardly at Mark 12.35, several pericope and 41 verses later. There is corroboration beyond this minor agreement that suggests that this sequence of stories circulated with an explicit teaching setting at the beginning. The setting in Luke is probably coming from a pre-synoptic source, as the long notes below on "ἄρξασθαι + infinitive" and on "ἐγένετο + time phrase + finite verb" will show. The evidence of another source may then be coupled with the minor agreement with Matthew on 'teaching'. It would appear that the minor agreement on 'teaching' came from a tradition that was shared by Matthew and Luke[5] and was not an accidental, parallel rewriting of Mark by two separate writers.

---

[4] See below, §3.C, for extended comments on two subsets of ἐγένετο constructions. These are frequently and mistakenly attributed to Luke himself, but only by ignoring the clear stylistic differentiations between the gospel and Acts. Only ἐγένετο with main verb infinitives are truly Lucan, like Luke 3.21–23, and 1 Acts 4.5, 9.3, 9.32, 9.37, 9.43, 10.25, 11.26, 14.1 and 2 Acts 16.16, 19.1, 21.1, 21.5, 22.6, 22.17, 27.44, 28.8, 28.17. What is overlooked or hidden is that the Hebraic structure (ἐγένετο + finite verb) occurs 33 times in the gospel, once in 1Acts, and *never* in 2Acts.

[5] Mark may also have known of the teaching setting for this parable. If so, then he

CN 4. *Excursus on ἄρξασθαι, or who was re-writing whom?*

Most important in this introduction to the parable is a distinctive idiom in Mark and Luke, ἄρξασθαι + infinitive. This is rightly called "pleonastic" since neither author is interested in only the beginning of the telling.

A careful analysis of ἄρξασθαι[6] + infinitive needs to be performed that does not assume a particular solution to the synoptic problem. The results for this particular idiom are surprising. In Mark, ἄρξασθαι + infinitive is one of Mark's stylistic characteristics. However, comparison with 2nd Acts below shows that ἄρξασθαι + infinitive is not typical as Luke's own style. In the gospel ἄρξασθαι is one of the characteristics of Luke's sources.[7] Furthermore, quite unpredictably for a theory that Mark was Luke's source, only 3 of Luke's 27 examples are shared with Mark. While Luke was picking up this non-Lucan idiom from somewhere, he did not simply accept his ἄρξασθαι + infinitive examples from Mark.

The idiom becomes helpful for understanding editorial techniques of Mark and Luke. Assuming some kind literary interdependence, at least one of them rejected most of the ἄρξασθαι + infinitive examples in his source, only to use it elsewhere rather conspicuously. Who is rewriting whom? The evidence in this note points to Mark as the strange rewriter. Luke, then, is likely preserving sources with his ἄρξασθαι, but those are not from Mark.

There is a fairly long history of discussion in the literature because ἄρξασθαι has sometimes been thought to reflect Semitic influence.[8]

---

has dramatized the encounter between Jesus and the high priests by having the parable told directly to them rather than about them.

[6] The aorist infinitive is closest to a 'base' form for this word and will be used as a citation form here. See further, R. Buth, "Perception and Aspect, Greek Lexicography and Grammar: Helping Students to Think in Greek" (forthcoming in a festschrift for Frederick Danker, c. 2004).

[7] Contra F.J.G. Collison, "Linguistic Usages in the Gospel of Luke", (PhD Dissertation, Southern Methodist University, 1977), 39–40, 369. Unfortunately, Collison did not use 2 Acts as a control on his Lucanisms. Instead, he performed literary analyses on the gospel and analyzed his results.

[8] The raising of the question can be readily understood from a glance at NT statistics. Paul uses the word once (2 Cor 3.1) and Peter once (1 Pet 4.17). Yet it occurs 71 times in the gospels and 10 times in Acts. The distribution is Matthew 13xx, Mark 26xx, Luke 31xx, John 1xx, 1 Acts [1.1–15.35] 7xx, 2 Acts [15.36–28.31] 3xx. These statistics do not appreciably change for the more specific idiom ἄρξασθαι + infinitive: Matt 12xx, Mark 26xx, Luke 27xx, Acts 6xx. The four losses in Luke (3:23, 23:5, 24:27, 24:47) tend

One notices the potentially 'excessive' uses like Luke 4.21 "he began to say", where a simple εἶπεν or ἔλεγεν would have sufficed. The eye-catching item for this study is the statistical drop for ἄρξασθαι + infinitive from the Gospel of Luke, 27xx, to Acts 6xx.

Semitic explanations are difficult to establish because the word is Greek, after all, and the most that can be shown is an abnormal frequency[9]. J.W. Hunkin long ago showed that the idioms involved can occur in normal Greek, but he did not adequately explain the high frequencies in the Gospels or the drop-off in Acts.[10]

Comments on ἄρξασθαι like Nigel Turner's (1976:46) cannot be left unchallenged: "The use of *begin* in Luke-Acts is hardly superfluous enough to suggest the influence of *shari*." This is misleading in four directions: (a) As will be seen below, Josephus, a polished Jewish Greek writer has a much lower incidence. (b) Turner hides the gospel-to-Acts incongruity and the relatively high incidence in the gospel by lumping Luke and Acts together. (c) He only relates to Aramaic שְׁרִי 'he began',[11] yet does not demonstrate a high relative frequency for it. (d) Finally,

---

to exhibit "more Grecian" word order and/or vocabulary choice and occur in uniquely Lucan sections. (Luke 24:27 has an attractive "Hebraization" in the Western text that should not be accepted as the 'original' text of Luke. It may testify to good material from something like Luke's source that sometimes shows up in later traditions).

[9] A difference in frequency between Greek on the one hand and Hebrew or Aramaic on the other is partially expected because of the difference in grammatical aspect between Greek and Semitic languages. Greek requires the marking of an aspectual choice on almost every verb, as for example choosing between an aorist or continuative infinitive, or between an aorist or imperfect indicative past. Neither Hebrew nor Aramaic were as sensitive to aspect as Greek and frequently told narratives as simple pasts without the frequent aspectual stylizing in Greek between imperfect and aorist verbs. The word "begin" lexicalizes one facet of the aspectual spectrum and it would be reasonable to find it more frequently in Semitic narrative than in Greek where Greek grammatical structures can cover aspect.

[10] J.W. Hunkin, "'Pleonastic' ἄρχομαι in the NT," JTS 25 (1924): 390–402.

[11] Nigel Turner is a Greek scholar and should not be blamed for assuming a uniquely Aramaic provinance for the idiom ἄρξασθαι + infinitive. That distinction belongs to the general history of NT scholarship. Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, 1–16, is probably the most influential in this regard, though he did include Hebrew in his study. Howard, p. 455 (quoted below) rejects any Hebrew consideration, and Sparks 1943:131–132 calls ἄρξασθαι + infinitive "characteristically Aramaic". More recently, M. Black, *AAGA*, 3rd edition, 1967:125–126 has discussed ἄρξασθαι + infinitive in exclusively Aramaic terms: "Aramaic influence", "due to Aramaic", occasionally tempered with 'Semitism'. Joseph Fitzmyer, *Luke* (Anchor Bible) 1981:116–117 lists an example of the phrase in a section devoted exclusively to Aramaic: "Aramaic influence in the Greek of the Lucan Gospel can be seen in the following items … 'began to speak' (pleonastic)".

Turner does not explain the significance of the sharp drop from 27xx in the Gospel to 6xx in Acts for ἄρξασθαι + infinitive (or 31xx in the Gospel to 10xx in Acts for all ἄρξασθαι).

Some confirmation of a potential Semitic background for ἄρξασθαι comes from the LXX. For example, 1 Maccabees, most probably a translation from Hebrew, has 9xx, while 2 Maccabees, most probably an original Greek composition, has only 2xx.[12]

---

[12] [What follows is a brief history of the idiom.] We also need to correct an occasional misinterpretation of the data. W. Howard discussed ἤρξα(ν)το with the infinitive and concluded:

> This cannot be called a Hebraism, for though it is found fairly often in the LXX a glance at H-R [Hatch-Redpath—RB/BK] shows that it has no fixed Hebrew original. Sometimes it represents a word with a definite meaning (e.g. Hiph. of יאל), often the Hiph. of חָלַל [For clarity, חָלַל is a rare poetic word meaning "was stabbed". הֵחֵל means "he began", which has a homonymic root ח.ל.ל.—RB/BK], sometimes (e.g., Gen 2.3) it is without warrant in the Hebrew, and occurs quite freely in books without a Hebrew source. (Howard, 455.)

Such a comment is misleading. For example, finding ἄρξασθαι in books outside the Hebrew canon like Tobit (8xx) and 1 Maccabees (9xx) does not argue against a Hebrew influence, to the contrary [The question of Hebrew for *Tobit* is complicated. However, the lack of narrative τότε argues for Hebrew over Aramaic as the original language, as well as certain forms like the infinitive absolutes (as substitutes for finite verbs) found in the Hebrew *Tobit* fragments at Qumran. (For infinitive absolutes see 4Q200 2.2 וסבול 4.3, ואמור 5.2, ונפוץ 5.4, וחרוק 6.4, וכתוב.) See also, R. Buth, "Edayin/TOTE, an Anatomy of a Semitism in Jewish Greek," *Maarav* 5–6 (1990): 33–48.] The statistics for 1 Maccabees are further strengthened by the contrast with 2 Maccabees (originally written in Greek), where ἄρξασθαι only occurs 2xx in 2 Maccabees. As for a regular equivalence, the normal Hebrew word for 'begin' in literary Hebrew is הֵחֵל and of the 53 examples in the Bible, 48xx are translated with ἄρξασθαι and 5xx with ἐνάρξασθαι. That is 100 % for the ἄρξασθαι root in the direction Hebrew to Greek.

The more appropriate question is the state of affairs in Qumran and Mishnaic Hebrew, since 53 examples in the whole the Hebrew Bible do not fully explain the higher frequencies in the Gospels. Tobit's 8 examples is suggestive of the frequencies in our gospels. If Tobit were expanded to a book the length of Luke, one would project 20 occurrences for Tobit. A look at a popular midrash from later times adds support that 'begin' was part of a popular Hebrew style. In *Bereshit Rabba* there are 77xx of התחיל 'he began', the Mishnaic equivalent of הֵחֵל. *Shemot Rabba* goes even further with 110 examples for a text about 4.5 times the length of Luke, or about 25 examples in a length comparable to Luke. While no one is suggesting that a post-tannaitic work like *Bereshit Rabba* or *Shemot Rabba* demonstrates a first-century Hebrew style, to ignore the evidence would be to remove a useful check on our fragmentary first-century situation. [A further qualification comes in the kind of Hebrew. Notice *Shemot Rabba* par. 44: והתחילו מקבלין התורה ואומרים "and they began accepting the Tora and saying". This is idiomatically pleonastic. In addition, this later Mishnaic Hebrew regularly uses a participle for this construction rather than an infinitive. Our Qumran Hebrew, extra-canonical LXX translations like *Tobit*, and Gospels all reflect *an older "literary Hebrew" style of "begin + infinitive"*. Incidentally, the same dialect development

264   APPENDIX

The literary Hebrew and Aramaic use of (הֵחֵל שָׁרִי) + infinitive apparently grew in the late second temple period. This may have been the result of sensitivities to grammatical aspect that were augmented by many people becoming trilingual with Greek.

Having brought forward suggestions of a Semitic background to ἄρξασθαι in the gospels, we need to look in another direction to temper the impressions. Josephus has a significant number of ἄρξασθαι 'to begin'. For example, in the *Jewish War*, Books 1–3, Josephus has 26 occurrences of ἄρξασθαι in approximately 10,000 lines of text. This would approximate 8 or 9 occurrences in a book as short as Luke's gospel. H. St. J. Thackeray was especially impressed with the examples in books 1–13 of the *Antiquities*. See, for example, *Antiquities* 7.380 τὸν θεὸν εὐλογεῖν ἤρξατο "he began to bless God" [note Greek inverted word order "to bless he began"!], *Antiquities* 8.27 λέγειν ἤρξατο "he began to say" [note Greek inverted word order], and *Antiquities* 8.27 ἤρξατο λέγειν "he began to say" [note word order "he began to say"]. Thackeray suggested that "to begin" may reflect Aramaic influence on Josephus' own, unaided style, much like Mark.[13] If so, it may be better to speak of an element of Jewish Greek for the increased use since *Antiquities* is not direct translation and this ἄρξασθαι style is not limited to a single author. All of this evidence leads us to look more closely at our gospel texts with ἄρξασθαι.

Matthew has 12 examples of ἄρξασθαι + infinitive, plus Mt 20.8 without the infinitive.[14] Seven of these are in triple tradition of which six

---

occurs in Aramaic. Qumran Aramaic follows the pattern of 'begin' + the infinitive, while later non-targumic, rabbinic Aramaic texts use a participial complement like rabbinic Hebrew.] Tobit is enough to show that this pleonastic ἄρξασθαι style is likely a feature of late second-temple literary Hebrew.

Qumran provides further examples, though most of the texts do not have quite the frequency to match Luke or Mark. The *Genesis Apocryphon* in Aramaic provides 4 examples of שָׁרִי 'he began' (12.13, 15, 19.18, 21.15). A section in the Enoch literature, however, has a plethora of שָׁרִי, judging from translations and a few fragments at Qumran (4Q 202 ii 18, iii 5, 4Q204 fg. 4.3, 7, corresponding to 1 Enoch 89). The *War Scroll* in Hebrew has five examples of הֵחֵל (1.1, 9.1, 16.8, 16,11, 17.14). As much as these texts support a Semitic background to the Gospels they also reveal the fragmentary nature of our contemporary evidence.

[13] H. St. J. Thackeray, "An Unrecorded 'Aramaism' in Josephus", JTS 30 (1929): 361–370.

[14] Triple tradition contexts have:

– the uniquely Matthean 4.17 (with ἀπὸ τότε, strongly Matthean and suggesting that this is a Matthean editorial change);

– 6 examples parallel with Mark, (Matt 12.1 // Mark 2.23, 16.21 // Mark 8.31,

are directly parallel and shared with Mark and none of these are shared with Luke. In double tradition with Luke, Matthew only parallels Luke's ἄρξασθαι + infinitive 2 out of 8 times.

One may conclude from the above that ἄρξασθαι and the "more Semitic ἤρξατο + infinitive" is not a distinctly Matthean feature. Unique Matthean examples of the "more Semitic ἤρξατο + infinitive" only occur once at 11.20. This means that the six shared examples with Mark in triple tradition are probably either coming from Mark or from a shared source with Mark. Likewise, the two shared occurrences with Luke are likely either coming from Luke or a shared source with Luke.

Mark has 26 examples of ἄρξασθαι + infinitive. 24 of these are in triple tradition: 6 are shared with Matthew and 3 are shared with Luke but none are shared by all three.[15] In Luke-Mark double tradition there are no points of contact.

    16.22 // Mark 8.32, 26.22 // Mark 14.19, 26.37 // Mark 14.33, 26.74 // Mark 14.71. These are best explained as coming from Mark since they are not otherwise a Matthean feature, yet show significant overlap with Marcan vocabulary in these contexts. In addition, Matt 26.22 shows a more Grecian syntax and 26.74 has the characteristic Matthean τότε.)

Double tradition Matthew-Mark have three points of contact:

– two places where Matthew does not include Mark's ἄρξασθαι (Mark 6.55, Mark 15.18);
– and one uniquely Matthean 14.30 (Matt 14.30 shows a Grecizing syntax by putting ἄρξασθαι in a subordinate participial form.);
– there are no places in double Matthew-Mark tradition with agreement on ἄρξασθαι.

Double tradition Matthew-Luke have nine points of contact:

– two parallels with Luke, (Matt 11.17 // Luke 7.24, Matt 24.49 // Luke 12.45. Both have high verbal agreement.);
– one unique occurrence Matt 11.20, (Again, one finds Matthew's characteristic τότε.);
– and six points where Matthew does not include Luke's ἄρξασθαι. (Luke 3.8, 3.23, 11.53, 14.18, 14.29, 14.30.)

Unique Matthew tradition has two examples:

– Matt 18.24 has the more Greek genitive absolute construction.
– Matt 20.8 has a participle without an infinitive.

[15] In triple tradition there are 38 potential points of Mark-Luke contact.

– Three parallels with Luke, (Mark 8.11 // Luke 11.29, Mark 11.15 // 19.45 with high agreement, and Mark 12.1 // Luke 20.9.).;
– Fifteen uniquely Marcan occurrences, (Mark 1.45, 4.1, 5.17, 5.20, 6.2, 6.7, 6.34, 10.28, 10.32, 10.41, 10.47, 13.5, 14.65, 14.69, 15.8.);
– Six shared with Matthew against Luke (Mark 2.23, 8.31, 8.32, 14.19, 14.33, 14.71.)

One may conclude that ἄρξασθαι + infinitive is a stylistic feature of Mark. The three shared occurrences with Luke might suggest some literary interdependence but the wide divergencies call for an explanation.[16]

When viewed against Mark, Luke looks every bit as wild and erratic with potential use of sources. It will raise the question as to whether Luke, Mark or both were being erratic.[17]

Luke has 27 examples of ἄρξασθαι + infinitive in his gospel and 6 in Acts. Yet it appears that Luke does *not* like to proliferate ἄρξασθαι in his writings[18]. This may be concluded from several different aspects. (a)

- Fourteen places where Mark does not have ἄρξασθαι in parallel to Luke's, (Luke 4.21, 5.21, 7.38, 7.49, 9.12, 12.1, 13.25, 13.26, 19.37, 21.28, 22.23, 23.2, 23.5, 23.30.)
- In Matthew-Mark double tradition Mark has two occurrences (Mark 6.55, 15.18).

[16] There are five primary, logical possibilities, none of which would have been predicted. (a) Mark and Luke shared a source without many ἄρξασθαι. Both added many examples. [But the evidence of Acts would negate this explanation as far as Luke is concerned.] (b) Mark and Luke shared a source that had many ἄρξασθαι, Mark and Luke both independently rejected most of those and then independently added as many or more than they rejected. [But cf. Acts, again.] (c) Mark and Luke shared a source that had many ἄρξασθαι, Luke accepted most of them but Mark rejected most of them, only to add as many more elsewhere in Mark. [Strange but possible.] (d) Mark used Luke as a source, rejecting most of the ἄρξασθαι examples but adding as many elsewhere. [Equally plausible linguistically with (c).] (e) Luke used Mark as a source, rejecting most of the examples but adding even more on his own. [But this does not explain Acts.]

[17] In triple tradition there are 38 points of contact between Mark and Luke for ἄρξασθαι.

- Three parallels with Mark, (Luke 11.29 // Mark 8.11, Luke 19.45 // Mark 11.15 with high agreement, and Luke 20.9 // Mark 12.1.);
- Fourteen places where Luke has ἄρξασθαι and Mark and Matthew do not, (Luke 4.21, 5.21, 7.38, 7.49, 9.12, 12.1, 13.25, 13.26, 19.37, 21.28, 22.23, 23.2, [23.5 not with following infinitive], 23.30.);
- and the twenty-one places in Mark (see above) that Luke does not share.

In double tradition with Matthew there are nine points of contact:

- Two parallel texts with high verbal identity (Luk 7.24 // Matt 11.17, Luke 12.45 // Matt 24.49);
- Six points where Luke has ἄρξασθαι and Matthew does not, (Luke 3.8, [3.23], 11.53, 14.28, 14.29, 14.30);
- One point where Matthew has ἄρξασθαι and Luke does not, (Matt 11.20, with τότε).
- In uniquely Lucan pericopae there are six occurrences: (Luke 7.15, 14.9, 15.14, 15.24, [24.27], [24.47]).

[18] Luke 23:5, 24:27 [non-Western text] and 24:47 are Greek usage and not the idiom ἄρξασθαι + infinitive. Most of the rest are likely source-isms. Thus, Luke is consistent

Most importantly, a comparison with Acts shows a drastic drop-off in frequency. (b) In comparison with a hypothesis of Mark as a source, Luke would have to reject ἄρξασθαι in 20 out of the 23 times that they are parallel, yet in two out of three parallels with Matthew/Q the same Luke would accept ἄρξασθαι. That apparent inconsistency in his gospel is an argument against Luke's generally rejecting ἄρξασθαι in Marcan material. The Matthean evidence is consistent with an argument that Luke would have accepted ἄρξασθαι if it were in his source. (c) An examination of many of the Lucan examples shows Semitisms that are consistent with a suggestion that Luke is accepting ἄρξασθαι from a source.[19]

From all of the above we learn some significant points that help us to control and understand synoptic texts. In the gospel of Luke ἄρξασθαι is not a stylistic feature of Luke and is therefore probably coming from a source. It is a source-ism rather than a Lucan-ism, and not from Mark, of course. In Mark, ἄρξασθαι is probably a Marcan stylistic feature and apparently testifies to an elusive style of what may be termed Judaic Greek.

The results are significant for understanding the style and redactive techniques of the gospel writers. We can now give a probable answer to the important question, "Luke or Mark, who changed ἄρξασθαι?" Lin-

---

with ἄρξασθαι in his gospel, but inconsistent when compared to his preferred style as seen in 2nd Acts with only 3 examples of ἄρξασθαι+infinitive (18:26, 24:2, 27:35).

[19] (point 1) Of Luke's 27 examples of ἄρξασθαι, 11 join with the conjunction καί , while only 5 join with δέ, 12 others being asyndeton or 'other' syntax. This ratio of 11 καί to 5 δέ is higher than the typical 1.6 to 1 for the gospel or 0.5 to 1 for Acts 16–28 [The general ratio for Luke at 1.6 καί to 1 δέ is from Turner (1963: 332). This excluded Luke chapters 1–2. Turner (1976: 58) gives 1.2 καί to 1 δέ for Luke-Mark passages and 0.5 to 1 for the "we" sections of Acts, 0.6 to 1 for a sample of 2nd Acts. With all of these, the ratio 11/5 or 2.2 καί to 1 δέ is considerably higher than Luke's norm and consistent with viewing ἄρξασθαι as a source-ism.]. However, in Acts ἄρξασθαι fits Lucan patterns, 1 with τέ, 2 with δέ, 2 with καί and 1 asyndeton.

(point 2) The ἄρξασθαι at Lk 4.21 is in a very Hebraic context. There is a potential example of *gezera shava* in the scripture quotation two verses earlier [Steven Notley, private communication and forthcoming, comparing Is 58.5 and 61.2 uniquely in the Hebrew text and not in our LXX], the phrase at 4.17 'book-of-the prophet' [Steven Notley, private communication and forthcoming.], plus the idioms "in your ears", "from his mouth" 4:21–22 and the adversative dative for ‎ב- "against" in 4:22.

(point 3) More remarkably, in all of the ἄρξασθαι+infinitive examples the word order is relatively good Hebrew/Semitic. There are relatively few positionings of nominal phrases in front of the verb 'begin' or in front of its infinitive and none of them show the Greek options of putting the infinitive before the main verb or splitting noun phrases. (Cf. the opposite in Josephus' above.)

guistic evidence points to Mark as the probable rewriter who deleted most of the ἄρξασθαι in his sources only to reinsert them rather abundantly in his work. It is not clear linguistically whether Mark was changing Luke or a shared source with Luke. In Matthew, ἄρξασθαι is usually from sources and only rarely a reflection of either normal or Judaic Greek, like when in conjunction with his τότε. Luke is very tolerant of ἄρξασθαι and he appears to frequently preserve his source(s).[20]

Matthew, Mark and Luke need to be contrasted in their acceptance of ἄρξασθαι from sources. Luke's high incidence of ἄρξασθαι in his gospel means that he was relatively tolerant of this feature and has frequently preserved it. Matthew was probably less tolerant than Luke and has apparently rejected over half of the occurrences that he encountered in his sources. Mark was the least accepting with his sources but idiosyncratically reused the device frequently.

CN 5. *Excursus on "ἐγένετο + time phrase + finite verb:" Hebraic, non-Lucan (and not even once in Acts 16–28)*

Luke 20.1 has a very distinctive stylistic feature, καὶ ἐγένετο "and it happened … (+ finite verb)" that has continually drawn discussion. Dalman suggested that any discussion about possible Hebrew sources behind our gospels would want to start with the question of καὶ ἐγένετο.[21] However, Dalman himself rejected any connection between Luke's καὶ ἐγένετο and potential sources on the grounds that καὶ ἐγένετο turns up in the last part of Acts.[22]

---

[20] Please note, this is one of many threads that point to Luke's not using Mark as his source since he doesn't preserve Mark's ἄρξασθαι. See Critical Note 38 where Luke does not preserve Mark's εὐθύς. "immediately". (See Luke 14.18 where Luke has 'begin' with a potential idiom 'immediately' ἀπὸ μιᾶς [now attested at 4Q462.8 מאחד].)

Naturally, if "one knew for a fact that Luke was rewriting Mark", then one or two threads would be insufficient evidence and more improbable explanations might be entertained. (For example, Hunkin suggested that Acts was a different genre, "history", from the more lively "biography" of the Gospel, even though both are narratives with similar subject matter and similar themes for the same audience. Hunkin's argument appears highly artificial from a linguistic point of view. There is no evidence that the two writings to Theophilos were ever intended to be different genre and there is no evidence that such alleged genre distinctions would produce different grammars and lexica.) But there are more threads.

[21] G. Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu* (2d. ed.; Leipzig, 1930): "Wer Beweise für ein hebräisches Urevangelium sammeln wollte, hätte zuerst dies καὶ ἐγένετο nennen müssen."

[22] "Selbst der 'Wir'-Bericht … ist nicht frei davon, s. Apg. 21,1. 5; 27,44; 28,8.17.

First, we want to express our agreement with the methodology that Dalman demonstrated. He was comparing Lucan expressions with Acts, and especially "2 Acts", to determine whether something was Lucan or from a potential source. However, Dalman's conclusion was fundamentally flawed, as will become clear below. In addition, his rejection of a connection between καὶ ἐγένετο and Lucan sources is echoed in so many publications on Luke and on the gospels that the question as to how it happened will also need discussion.

There are three distinct structures with καὶ ἐγένετο or ἐγένετο δέ in the gospels and Acts that where first discussed by Plummer.[23] They have been neatly assembled in a table by Howard.[24]

(a) καὶ ἐγένετο (ἐγένετο δέ) (+intervening time phrase)+finite verb. Such a phrase is used in the LXX for a Hebrew structure of ויהי+(time phrase)+finite verb, though it also is used for a Hebrew structure ויהי+(time phrase)+ו-+finite verb (like structure 'b', below).[25]

(b) καὶ ἐγένετο (ἐγένετο δέ) (+intervening time phrase)+καὶ+finite verb. Thackeray has shown that this structure is a more slavish translation of the parallel Hebrew structure and should be considered even more Hebraic than (a), though both are strongly Hebraic. (H.St.J. Thackeray, *Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek.* 1909:50–52.)[26]

… Solche Beobachtungen verbieten die Annahme eines hebräishen Originals, aus welchem die Redensart geflossen wäre." (Ibid., 26)

[23] A. Plummer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 45.

[24] J.H. Moulton and W.F. Howard, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, 426–427. This table is accurate and shows the various kinds of temporal adjuncts as well. For example, in the second type of structure (b), Acts 5:7 is listed with a question mark. The doubt is because the verb has an explicit subject διάστημα 'interval'. Fitzmyer included this and added Acts 9:19, but Acts 9:19 is not the impersonal construction. 'Paul' is the subject of ἐγένετο. That is why, for example, Luke 1:5 and another 35 examples of ἐγένετο are not listed by Howard for the gospel, or another 37 examples of ἐγένετο in Acts. Howard's table is reliable.

[25] The structure (a) occurs twice in Mark (1.9, 4.4), five times in Matthew (7.28, 11.1, 13.53, 19.1, 26.1), *twenty-two* times in Luke (1.8, 1.23, 1.41, 1.59, 2.1, 2.6, 2.15, 2.46, 7.11, 9.18, 9.28 9.33, 9.37, 11.1, 11.14, 11.27, 17.14, 19.29, 20.1, 24.30, 24.51) and *never* in Acts. [Codex Bezae has an example at Acts 4.5]

[26] Mark never has this structure (b).

Matthew has one example (9.10).

Luke has *eleven* examples (5.1, 5.12, 5.17, 8.1, 8.22, 9.51, 14.1, 17.11, 19.15, 24.4, 24.15.)

(c) καὶ ἐγένετο (ἐγένετο δέ) (+/- intervening time phrase) + infinitive as the main verb phrase. This structure never occurs in the LXX, (Elliot Mahoney, *Semitic Interference in Marcan Syntax*, Scholar's Press, 1981:84.) so it can hardly be called a Septuagintalism in the gospels and Acts. It cannot be equated with structures (a) and (b) above. Structure (c) fits Greek style and mimics the classic construction συνέβη + infinitive. Luke himself has συνέβη + infinitive at Acts 21.35. The structure (c) καὶ ἐγένετο (ἐγένετο δέ) + infinitive as main verb may be considered a "non-Semitic" structure.[27]

Each one of these structures a, b, c, is remarkable in their own right. Structure (a) strongly patterns as non-Lucan, since *it never occurs in Acts*. Likewise, structure (b) shows the same non-Lucan pattern, even if Acts 5.7 were included. It never occurs in 2nd Acts. Note well: *Neither structures (a) nor (b) ever occur in 2nd Acts*. Finally, structure (c), the non-Semitic structure, patterns as Lucan and occurs many times in Acts, especially 2 Acts.[28]

The consistent distinction between structures (a) and (b) versus (c), completely undermines the frequently heard thesis that Luke was systematically trying to imitate the style of the LXX with this device. On the one hand, Luke was not so systematic. He allowed (c) several times in his supposedly Septuagintally-styled gospel. Now if a Semitist of Dalman's stature did not bother with distinguishing (a+b) from (c), then

---

Acts 1:1–15:35 may have one example (5:7?). (Howard correctly listed Acts 5:7 with a question mark since there is an explicit subject. Codex Bezae may be added at 2:1.)

Acts 15:36–28:31 does not have one example!

[27] Mark has this structure twice (2:15, 2:23)

Matthew never has structure (c).

Luke has the structure 6 times (3:21, 6:1, 6:6, 6:12, 16:22)

Acts has 16 examples, 7 in 1Acts (4:5, 9:3, 9:32, 9:37, 9:43, 11:26, 14:1),

and 9 in 2Acts (16:6, 21:1, 21:5, 22:6, 22:17, 27:44, 28:8, 28:17).

[28] N. Turner, *Grammar of New Testament Greek, IV: Style*, Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1976:47, "The construction with the infinitive occurs, very rarely in non-Biblical authors, but the preponderance of the strictly Hebraic construction in Luke-Acts indicates that even when Luke sometimes uses the infinitive construction he is still writing Biblcail Greek influenced by the LXX (II Acts 19:1; We 16:6, 21:1,5; 27:44; 28:8)." Turner missed the point. If Luke was writing with a biblical Greek influence, he only used the third structure, never the first two. Notice how Turner's "the preponderance of the strictly Hebraic construction in Luke-Acts" neatly slides over the facts that the structure only occurs in the gospel of Luke. If Turner believed his statement (1976:55): "There is no doubt that some of the … Semitisms must be attributed to the use of sources," then he missed a golden opportunity. Cf. also, M. Johannessohn, "Das biblische kai egeneto und seine Geschichte," Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung 53 (1925): 161–212.

who would expect Luke or his audience to be so perceptive? In addition, if Luke were the one producing all of the structures (a+b+c) in his Gospel then he was probably unconscious of material distinction between them. However, this flexibility of (a+b+c) is turned off like a faucet when Luke crosses into Acts. Structure (c) continues, seemingly taking over (a+b) so that structures (a+b) disappear. There is even an excellent place to observe this incongruity. At Acts 22.2 Luke makes a point of stating that the Hebrew language had an effect on the crowd. However, in the two places in the speech where Luke uses an ἐγένετο structure (22.6, 22.17), we find structure (c) "ἐγένετο + infinitive main verb"! This restriction in Acts to only structure (c) needs a more reliable and more probable hypothesis than "sophisticated stylization". Methodologically, we can recognize that (c) was Luke's own style, probably biblicized from the classical "συνέβη + infinitive", and therefore shows up in both Acts and Luke. The simple corollary, in line with the absolute stopping of flexibility in 2nd Acts, is that structures (a) and (b) are not Luke's style but are from a source.

These three structures, taken together, lead to the following conclusions as necessary working hypotheses for Luke-Acts criticism.

1. Luke's own preferred style is ἐγένετο + time phrase + an infinitive as the main verb (structure c, above). This Greek structure may be echoing the LXX from a distance, for example in Acts 22.6 and 22.17, but it is distinctly Greek and not a Hebraism. Structure (c) is an excellent indicator of Luke's own editorial work and is useful in analyzing six places in Luke's gospel.

2. Luke was willing to accept [καὶ/δέ] ἐγένετο with a finite verb (structures a and b, above). [καὶ/δέ] ἐγένετο with a finite verb in the gospel of Luke is an excellent indicator of sources and should be considered "Hebraic"[29]. This is useful in 33 places in Luke's gospel.

3. Luke did not like [καὶ/δέ] ἐγένετο with a finite verb well enough to incorporate it into his own written style. There is no evidence that he ever used these structures on his own initiative.

We need to address the question of why so many twentieth-century commentators could look at this same data and conclude that all or

---

[29] E.C. Maloney, *Semitic Interference in Marcan Syntax* (Atlanta, Scholan's Press, 1981), 84–85, argues that the structure is not Hebraic but Aramaic for the first century. This is done by citing one Aramaic example from the 5th century BC, by rejecting two Qum-

most of the καὶ ἐγένετο structures in Luke were coming from Luke himself and were not an indication of possible sources going back to Hebrew.

One surprising item should be mentioned from the beginning. Dalman correctly recognized that literary usage in Acts should be used for evaluating Luke's style in the gospel. Unfortunately, Dalman missed the fact that *none* of his examples from Acts were documenting the highly Hebraic structures (a) and (b), but were only listing the structure (c), the non-Semitic, more acceptably Greek structure.

At the end of the 19ᵗʰ century, Alfred Plummer was able to make a revealing, though illogical statement: "Frequent Hebraisms indicate that a great deal of Luke's material was originally in Aramaic." (Plummer, xxvi) Logically, Hebrew should have pointed to Hebrew. However, Plummer was the one to analyze the three distinct structures of καὶ ἐγένετο and to correctly recognize that their combined weight was against Lucan authorship for them all. In his note on καὶ ἐγένετο he wrote, "But (a) is not found at all in the Acts, and (b) occurs there only once … All which is quite what we might have expected. In the Acts there is much less room for Hebrew influences than there is in the Gospel." (Plummer,45. See also, pages xlix–l.)

During the following generation, loose sentiment ("Hebraisms means Aramaic sources") was being challenged with a different conclusion, more logical within its own worldview, but missing the main point. "Generally speaking, the presence of numerous Hebraisms will suggest the influence of the LXX, whereas numerous Aramaisms or idioms common to Hebrew and Aramaic will point to a background of Aramaic." (Howard, 480.) Two assumptions were rapidly gaining a concensus within New Testament scholarship that gave a strong predisposition to this view.

On the one hand, Dalman's Aramaic studies were being widely accepted in New Testament studies so "everyone knew" that neither the first-century church nor Jesus nor his followers would have pro-

---

ran Hebrew examples of the parallel future construction "and it will be … that" (there are at least eight others 1Q22f1.10, 4Q162c2.2, 4Q163f4–6c2.8, 4Q169f3–4c3.2, 11QT56.20, 58.11, 61.14, 62.6; plus ויהי in 4Q252c1.12 [rewriting the flood], 11QT 62.14 [in future context]), by ignoring the Hebrew of Daniel, and by ignoring the common sense of Dalman (1930:25) who cited books like 1Maccabees and Judith as evidence that the structure was still alive in literary Hebrew. For example, 1Maccabees has structure (a) 3 times (5.30 [6:8, 9:23 א]) and structure (b) five times (1.1, 5.1, 7.2, 10.64, 10.88).

duced material in Hebrew.[30] At the same time the Oxford circle of synoptic studies was making a strong case for Marcan priority in synoptic theory. It turns out that *none* of Luke's 33 Hebraic examples of ἐγένετο (a) and (b) are parallel with Mark. Apparently, synoptic theory was not prepared to consider that Luke might have had a Hebrew-based source(s) that extended, in pieces or in whole, from Luke 1 to Luke 24. Luke simply had to be the one making the changes. With such a worldview, it was almost inevitable that Luke's Hebraisms became "evidence" of imitating the LXX and creatively rewriting Mark. This line of thought was explicit in Sparks.[31]

Of course, none of these attitudes change the basic data that was already laid out clearly by Plummer and later Howard. The data unambiguously pointed in a different direction, but a direction few were willing to go[32]. Fortunately for New Testament scholarship, the Qumran discoveries and Bar Kochba letters have dramatically opened up a new world for the first century. As should have been visible from Mishnaic Hebrew, apocryphal and pseudepigraphical literature, Hebrew was being used in a multilingual society and Hebrew must be considered as one of the real possibilities for early Christian traditions.

With a different worldview it becomes possible and necessary to re-evaluate Luke's Hebraisms. In a restricted sense, Luke does "echo" the LXX with structure (c) "καὶ ἐγένετο + infinite main verb". Ironically, it is not a serious effort to Septuagintalize, since the structure doesn't even occur in the LXX. As for καὶ ἐγένετο + time phrase + a finite verb (structures a and b), they most probably point to a Hebraic source(s) wherever they occur in Luke's gospel.

---

[30] A negative view of Mishnaic Hebrew was prevailing at the time. A thesis that Mishnaic Hebrew was an artificial language of the Rabbis had been developed by Avraham Geiger, the founder of Reformed Judaism. Avraham Geiger, *Lehr- und Lesebuch zur Sprache der Mischnah* (Breslau, 1945). Segal published a long refutation of Geiger's thesis in 1908, but this was not widely discussed in Christian scholarship. M.H. Segal, "Mishnaic Hebrew and its Relation to Biblical Hebrew and to Aramaic," *JQR* (1908):647–737. See also, M.H. Segal, *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*, (Oxford: Oxford University, 1927), 1–21. It is perhaps symptomatic that Geiger is mentioned, but Segal is not mentioned in Dalman's summary of the language question in *Die Worte Jesu* (1930:1–13.)

[31] Sparks, "The Semitisms of St Luke's Gospel," 129–138.

[32] One might read a bit of surprise between the lines of Howard's comment, "These constructions are thus distinctively Lucan, with a marked contrast between the Third Gospel and Acts, which becomes still more striking when we observe that in the latter Luke not only use (c) almost entirely to the exclusion of (a) and (b), but also avoids the more Hebraic form of the time clause [a sharp decrease in the use of ἐν τῷ with the infinitive, Lk 19/Acts 2–RB/BK]." (Howard, 427)

CN 6. *A person ἄνθρωπος: Man/Householder–Owner*

Many point out that only in Thomas is there a *good* owner.[33] As an aside, χρηστός "good" is a reconstruction in Thomas that might alternatively be read as: χρή(στη)ς", "creditor/usurer."[34] However, χρήστης is otherwise unattested in Coptic and the reading "good" should be accepted for the Coptic text.[35] Beyond that, there is no principled way to decide between the synoptics and Thomas, except on whether a "good owner" sounds like a beginning to a parable. While the background to Luke 18.18 is ambiguous ("No one is good but God"), as a parable beginning "a good owner" sounds foreign to the parable tradition of both Jesus and the rabbis.

Matthew's οἰκοδεσπότης ὅστις has both a complex Greek noun and a more complex Greek syntax. It is likely a secondary rewriting of the simple "man". The more Semitic idiom ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος בעל הכרם (viz. ὁ κύριος τοῦ οἴκου בעל הבית) occurs in Lk 20:13 and 15, and Mk 12:9.[36] The parabolic picture of the human is reminiscent of the rabbinic picture of God in parables as a "king of flesh and blood."

De Moor follows Matthew Black in stating, "the absolute of ἄνθρωπος without τις must be a Semitism." However, it is not clear what kind of Semitism this word in Mark might be. Is it Marcan Greek or a source? There is evidence of this idiom being formed by Jewish Greek writers and in light of the overall sentence structure one might suspect

---

[33] Thomas 45:1–2 "He said, There was a g(oo)d man who owned a vineyard."

[34] J. Hartenstein, and U.-K. Plisch "Greek Retranslation of Thomas" (1996) In *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum, 10th edition*, ed. Kurt Aland; (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft), 519–546 here at 536. Λέγει, ἄνθρωπος χρη(στὸ)ς ἀμπελῶνα εἶχεν. ἐξέδετο αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς, ἵνα ἐργάσωνται … Compare Guillaumont et al., *The Gospel According to Thomas: Coptic Text Established and Translated* (Leiden: Brill, 1976), 38. After noticing this lacuna in the text, we came upon others who have recently pointed this out, namely Jean-Marie Sevrin, "Un groupement de trois paraboles contre les richesses dans L'Evangile selon Thomas: EvTh 63, 64, 65.," in *Les paraboles évangéliques: Perspective nouvelles*, ed. Jean Delorme (Paris: du Cerf, 1989), 425–439; and Stephen J. Patterson, *The Gospel of Thomas and Jesus* (Sonoma, Calif.: Polebridge, 1993).

[35] Förster, Hans, *Wörterbuch der Griechischen wörter in den Koptischen dokumentarischen Texten*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002. Only χρηστός 'good' is listed on p. 862.

[36] Snodgrass refers to van Iersel (1961) who argued that this word (in the synoptics 7/1/4) is a Matthean parabolic word and may reflect a Hebraic counterpart (Snodgrass, 1983: 46n8); yet as has been noted above, the ὁ κύριος τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος in Lk 20:13 and 15, and Mk 12:9 are more direct counterparts to the Hebrew בעל הבית. Contra Montefiore, Flusser argued that οἰκοδεσπότης has no Hebrew equivalent (1981: 197–198).

that this is a Judaic Greek Marcanism.[37] Even more important than the word ἄνθρωπος is the overall word order.[38] Mark's word order of Object-Subject-Verb is rather un-Semitic. Such an order is very acceptable Greek. It occurs, among other places, in Aesop's fables[39]. Hebrew and Judean Aramaic prefer only one clause-level constituent before the verb. In cases of two fronted elements the second one, not the first one, is focal.[40] Luke's Greek matches the more restriction of one fronted element and has the more expected Semitic order Subject-Verb-Object.

---

[37] Johannes C. de Moor, "The Targumic Background of Mark 12:1–12: The Parable of the Wicked Tenants." *JSJ* 29:1 (1998): 63–80 at 66. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, 106–107, 249–251.

Mk and Lk's ἄνθρωπος is not an expected Greek indefinite style, which prefer a simple τις construction (cf. Luke 13:6). [ἄνθρωπός τις in Luke: NA27 includes τις in brackets since א, B, L R Ψ f^1, vg, D, it, and C do not have it.] I.e. good Greek would likely prefer τις alone over ἄνθρωπος alone (Mk 12:1) and allows, but would not need, both ἄνθρωπος and τις together (Lk 20:9). ἄνθρωπος τις is a rather rare combination in the LXX [Gen 38:1, Job 1:1, Daniel-Bel 2. The opposite order τις ἄνθρωπος does not occur.] and in the NT except for Luke (9 examples, all in parables, and Acts 9:33; i.e., Lk 10:30, 12:16, 14:2, 14:16, 15:11, 16:1, 16:19, 19:12, 20:9, Acts 9:33. The opposite order τις ἄνθρωπος occurs in Mt 18:12, (Lk 15:4), Jn 5:5, Acts 25:16, 1 Tim 5:24 and Jude 1:4.)

Ἄνθρωπός τις might suggest איש אחד. However, in cases like 1 Sam 1:1 איש אחד, the LXX ἄνθρωπος has apparently made some stylization towards Greek by dropping anything corresponding to אחד. A similar thing happens at Jud 13:2 where איש אחד becomes only ἀνήρ. This might suggest that Mark's ἄνθρωπος is a Jewish Greek feature, capable of self-generation by Mark. The opposite phenomenon occurs at Gen 38:1 and Job 1:1, where simple איש becomes ἄνθρωπός τις. This latter style is regular Greek, though not the most common. Both of these appear to be overlapping cases of a structure that is possible in Greek but whose frequency may line up with Semitic influence. A nice Greek example of ἄνθρωπός τις comes from an Aesop fable: Ἄνθρωπός τις ξύλινον θεὸν ἔχων (Subject-Object-Verb) "a certain human was having a wooden god". (Chambry, *Aesop*, #61, page 30.)

[38] Caesarean texts in Mark follow Luke, Bzyantine and Western texts use Object-Verb-Subject (more acceptable in Semitic and more common in Greek than OSV). The Alexandrian family should be accepted as explaining the others.

[39] For example, Ἵππον τὸν ἑαυτοῦ στρατιώτης, ἕως μὲν καιρὸς τοῦ πολέμου ἦν, ἐκρίθιζε, Object-Subject-Verb: "a soldier had a personal horse that he would feed barley during a time of war". (Chambry, #142, page 64.)

[40] With two pre-verbal constituents of which the second is a Subject, Hebrew would expect the first one to be a Topicalization (as here in Mark 12.1) and the second one to be Focal (specially marked salient information) [cf. Ps 51.3–5]. The only way to get an apparent second, fronted item in Hebrew that is less-salient and less-focal than the first fronted item is in a nominal clause. מקל שקד אני רואה 'an almond stick I am seeing' (Jer 1.11). But in a nominal clause a subject in front of a participle is not fronted. Nominal clauses normally have a default order of Subject-Participle, so that only מקל שקד is actually a fronted item in the example quoted. See, R. Buth, "Word Order in the Verbless Clause: A Generative-Functional Approach," in *The Verbless Clause in Biblical Hebrew, Linguistic Approaches* (ed. C. Miller; Winnona Lake: Eisenbraun's, 1999: 79–108).

The vocabulary and syntax of the introduction suggest that Luke may be following a source and that source is more fitting with a potential Hebrew background than Mark, Matthew or Thomas.[41]

CN 7. *Planted ἐφύτευσεν*

Thomas is closer to Isaiah in having a statement about "possessing a vineyard" rather than "planting a vineyard". Contrary to most, G. Quispel argued that Thomas 45:1 presupposes a Hebrew text of Isaiah 5:1 (היה ל) rather than the LXX.[42] Such is slim evidence, yet Quispel rightly attempts to connect Thomas's version of the VTS with Isaiah 5. Without this connection to Isaiah, the VTS is separated from its background, its launching point. "Possessing a vineyard" would have commanded respect as part of an earlier *vorlage* if other Semitic details were not missing in the rest of Thomas' version. Consequently, we assume that syntoptic ἐφύτευσεν נטע 'planted' was initially employed, as being slightly dissimilar to Isaiah.

CN 8. *The vineyard motif*

Only one vineyard parable occurs in the Old Testament.[43] When Jesus told them a parable of the vineyard, many of the people, scribes and high priests would have recognized the exegetical basis for Jesus' parable: Isaiah 5:1–7.[44] The VTS is simply a midrashic contextualization—an applied retelling—of the Isaiah 5 parable itself. This is true for all

---

[41] The addition of τις, if in Luke's original, could be a Lucanism overlaid on the source. Cf. Lk 10:30, 12:16, 14:2, 14:16, 15:11, 16:1, 16:19, 19:12, 20:9. However, τις ἄνθρωπος in Acts 25:16 and Luke 15:4 shows a different order, so Ἄνθρωπός τις may have been in Luke's Hebraized Greek source. The data is too scanty for a decision on this point.

[42] G. Quispel, *Makarius, das Thomasevanelium und das Lied von der Perle.* (Leiden: Brill, 1967) cited by Snodgrass (1983: 48 n 15).

[43] John Willis concluded that Isa 5:1–7 must be classified as a parable in "The Genre of Isaiah 5:1–7" *JBL* 96 (1977): 337–362. Gale Yee corroborated Willis and proposed that the parable constituted a specific type: a judicial parable, "Within the overall framework of a song the parablolic element operates covertly to bring about the hearers' own judgment against themselves" (Gale A. Yee, "The Form-Critical Study of Isaiah 5:1–7 as a Song and a Juridical Parable," *CBQ* 43 [1981]: 30–40). Willis's classification was substantiated by Gerald Sheppard, "More on Isaiah 5:1–7 as a Juridical Parable," *CBQ* 44 (1982): 45–47.

[44] Cf. Fitzmyer, "the 'vineyard' is still enough of a symbol for Israel in the OT that the allusion at the beginning of the Lucan form of the parable cannot be missed (see

of the synoptic gospels, including Luke's simple "a man planted a vine-yard". For some who did not know the scriptures as well (especially in the Greek speaking ekklesia) the word "vineyard" would not have thrust the readers back to Isaiah 5. More allusions to Isaiah 5 would certainly have helped and Matthew and Mark both expand the terms referring to Isaiah's parable (hedge, wine vat, tower).

In Isaiah 5 the vineyard is equated as the people of Israel with an emphasis against the Judeans (Is 5:3) which may have directed the VTS in a similar direction: the Temple authorities in Jerusalem. Most have taken the vineyard to be Israel,[45] although others suggest the world (Pseudo-Philo 28:4)[46] or the temple (Isaiah Targum). Culbertson has the vineyard symbolizing the "*Bet Israel*, the covenanted people itself" where the tenants are gentiles and the owner is the Jews.[47] Relevance theory in linguistics, or Occam's razor in general, points against Culbertson's over-elaborate exegesis. If the vineyard signifies Israel—the simple reading (*p'shat*) of Isaiah's text—then the parable is not anti-Jewish as the vineyard is not accused of inadequacy in any way, only the tenants' *actions*, or lack of action is reproached.[48] Both Israel and the Temple are plausible readings of the symbolic understanding of the vineyard.[49] In fact, the exegetical tradition that linked the tower with the temple proper could harmonize both views. The vineyard could be Israel on the one hand, while the tower and winepress point to the temple. (More on this below.)

Ps 80:9–14 [8–13E]; Isa 27:2; Jer 2:21; Hos 10:1; Ezek 19:10–14, as well as Isa 5:2–7)" (Fitzmyer, 1281). We agree on the connection to Israel and would include a reference to Isaiah 5.

[45] E.g., Isaiah 5, Tanhuma 54:3, "the vineyard of the Lord is the house of Israel," etc.

[46] "But I will recall that time that was before the creation of the world, the time when man did not exist and there was no wickedness in it, when I said that the world would be created and those who would come into it would praise me. And I would plant a great vineyard, and from it I would choose a plant; and I would care for it and call it by my name, and it would be mine forever. When I did all the things that I said, nevertheless my plant that was called by my name did not recognize me as its planter, but it destroyed its own fruit and id not yield up its fruit to me." (*OTP*, 1:341) *Pseudo-Philo* was probably written in Hebrew and in Palestine (*ibid.*, 298–299).

[47] P.L. Culbertson, *A Word Fitly Spoken: Context, Transmission, and Adoption of the Parables of Jesus*, (*SUNY Series in Religious Studies*. Albany, NY: SUNY, 1995), 221–229.

[48] See de Moor in footnote 48.

[49] Brooke, following Mark, correlated the vineyard as Jerusalem, as Israel in minia-ture, the tower as the sanctuary, and the winepress as the altar and its drainage system "which can take on various eschatological significances" (1995: 285).

The absence of the Marcan and Matthean longer description of the vineyard in Luke should be seen as part of a phenomenon of scriptural citation in Luke. Evans tries to argue that the short reading in Luke means that the Isaiah reference is almost gone.[50] On the contrary, Luke's succinct rendering of Jesus' allusion was probably all that was needed to drive home his message when it was initially told. Its shortness is a sign of originality while still referring to Isaiah.[51]

Luke tends to preserve shorter scriptural references in comparison to Mark. Out of the eleven or twelve explicit quotations of the OT in triple tradition, Luke is the shortest 6 or 7 times, Matthew is the shortest 3 times, and Mark is never the shortest.[52]

---

[50] "Because Isa 5:1–2 was only alluded to [in Mark], and not quoted, its presence in the developing Greek tradition faded from the parable to the point of disappearance. This is seen in Luke's version of the parable, which retains scarcely a trace of the passage …" (Evans: 1995, 404–405).

[51] Shmuel Safrai, "Oral Tora" in *The Literature of the Sages* (CRINT; ed. S. Safrai and P. Tomson; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987). K.E. Bailey, "Informal Controlled Oral Tradition and the Synoptic Gospels.," *Themelios* 20, no. 2 (1995): 4–11; idem "Middle Eastern Oral Tradition and the Synoptic Gospels," *Expository Times* 106, no. 12 (1995): 363–367; and H. Koester, "Written Gospels or Oral Tradition," *JBL* 113, no. 2 (1994): 293–297.

[52] notation:

> // = +parallels;
> TT = Triple tradition;
> A# = Aland's Synopis pericope number according to 14th ed (1995).
> * = notes that Luke is shortest

1. Lk 20:37 // TT (A#281, Dt 25.5ff), essentially the same length in all three synoptics; 2. Lk 18.20 // TT (A#254, Ex 20:12–16, Lv 19 and Dt 5:16–20), * Lk is shortest; Mt with Lv 19.18 and Mk with Lv 19.13 are longer; 3. Lk 10:27 // TT (A#182, Dt 6:5, Lev 19:18), Mt is shortest, Mk and Lk are the same, though the Mk has a lengthy biblicizing soliloquy (12:32–33); 4. Lk 8:10 // TT (A#123, Is 6:9f), * Lk is shortest, Mt adds one clause, but later repeats with the longest version; Mk is longest with the shared quotation; 5. Lk 23:24 // TT (A#344, Ps 22:19), * Lk is shortest, against Mt and Mk; 6. Lk 13:19 // TT (A#209, Ps 104:12) (allusion rather than exact quote), * Lk is shortest (9 words), Mt (11 words) and Mk (ten words); 7. Lk 20:42–42 // TT (A#283, Ps 110:1), same length in all 3; 8. Lk 20:17 // TT (A#278, Ps 118:22–23), The vineyard parable, * Lk is shortest, Mt and Mt equally longer than Lk with v. 23; 9. Lk 3:4–6 // TT (A#13, Is 40:3), Mt is the shortest, Mk is the same but adds Mal 3.1, Luke is the longest; 10. Lk 19:46 // TT (A#273, Is 56:7/Jer 7:11), Mt is shortest, Lk is one word longer, non-LXX, Mk is longest with πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν; 11. Lk 21:27 // TT (A#292, Dan 7:13), * Lk is shortest, Mk is like Luke plus extra allusion, Mt is longest with additional "of heaven" plus Mark's allusion plus extra allusion; 12. Lk 22:69 // TT (A#332, Dan 7:13+Ps 110:1), * Lk is shortest, Mk and Mt have "coming with/on the clouds of heaven"; 13. Lk 7:22 // Mt 11:5 (DD) (A#106, Is 26:19), Lk and Mt are equal;

14. Lk 7:27 // Mt 11.10 (DD) (A#107, Mal 3.1), Lk and Mt are equal; 15. Lk 4.4 // Mt4.4 (TT?) (A #20, Dt 8.3), * Lk shortest; 16. Lk 4.10 // Mt 4.6 (TT?) (A#20, Ps 91.11),

Mark and Matthew's expansion show some Septuagintal Greek de-
tails. The string of independent clauses with finite past verbs in Mark
12.1–2 (seven) and Matthew 21:33–34 (six) is overly simplistic Greek
because it does not take advantage of the Greek capability to syntac-
tically demote some of the events with participles.

Mk's ὑπολήνιον in 12:1 'little collection vat' differs from the Septu-
agint προλήνιον 'little vat in front of wine-press' yet both are complex
Greek nouns which distinguish it from the simple ληνόν 'winepress'. Mt
21:33 seems to follow the Hebrew יקב 'vat, winepress' more closely than
Mark by replacing the LXX and Marcan word with the more common
Septuagintal equivalent to יקב: ληνόν 'winepress'.[53]

Of special notice is the Septuagintal phrase περιέθηκεν φραγμόν "he
put a hedge/fence around it" in both Mark and Matthew. This does
not translate the Hebrew ויעזקהו "and he prepared the ground". While
neither Matthew nor Mark are copying the LXX word for word, both
reflect the LXX rather than the MT.[54] Additionally, Matthew preserves
the Greek word order of Isaiah 5 LXX better than Mark (Gundry,
Matthew, 425). For example, Mt 21:33 φραγμὸν αὐτῷ περιέθηκεν ("a
hedge around it he placed," with two elements before the verb) is good
Greek order and not Hebrew order.

Let us sum up the complexities of this longer vineyard detail in
Matthew and Mark. We have Luke preserving a much shorter scrip-
tural citation—suggesting an earlier redaction. In the midst of Mt and
Mk's lengthier scriptural citation, we have Mt using a more precise
Greek equivalent for a Hebrew word in Isaiah 5, suggesting contact or
knowledge outside of Mark, while Mt's word order is less Semitic than
Mk, suggesting Mt as secondary to Mk. Both Mt and Mk reflect the
LXX version of Isaiah 5.

Mt is shortest; 17. Lk 4.8 // Mt 4.10 (TT?) (A#20 Dt. 6.13), equal; 18. Mt 27:46 // Mk
15:34(TT?) (A#347, Ps 22.1), Mt and Mk are equal.

[53] יקב in the MT is translated by ἀπολήνιον (1x), ληνόν (9x), οἶνος (1x), προλήνιον
(1x), and ὑπολήνιον (4x). E.C. Dos Santos. *An Expanded Hebrew Index for the Hatch-Redpath
Concordance to the Septuagint*. (Jerusalem: Dugith), 84.

[54] J. Kloppenborg Verbin, "Egyptian Viticultural Practices and the Citation of Isa
5:1–7 in Mark 12:1–9," *NT* 44 (2002): 134–159. Kloppenborg makes a strong case that
the source to Mark's parable did not contain a long quotation of Isaiah. We accept
Luke's short reference as original and read Luke's "a man planted a vineyard" as a
sufficient reference to Isaiah 5 for Jesus' original audience.

CN 9. *Letting out the vineyard to tenant farmers*

Καὶ ἐξέδετο αὐτὸν γεωργοῖς καὶ ἀπεδήμησεν "and [he] went on a jour-ney (away from one's city-state)" is in triple tradition and may be included in everyone's reading of the VTS. Craig Evans has restored a tenant farmer understanding to γεωργοῖς.[55] As many have pointed out, the journey does not necessarily entail travel to a gentile country, but likely has a picture of an absentee landlord off in a city like Jerusalem.

CN 10. *Long time χρόνους ἱκανούς*

Only Luke has an addition of χρόνους ἱκανούς 'sufficient times'. This is a helpful phrase because it is a non-Semitic idiom. It is not duplicated in the LXX where a Hebrew original either exists or is suspected.[56] After noting that ἱκανός occurs 9 times in Luke and 18 times in Acts (10xx in 2 Acts), we find that ἱκανός should be recognized as a Lucan redaction,[57] even though this turn of phrase occurs in rabbinic para-bles.[58] Luke is the probable initiator of the addition. Both Mark and Matthew reflect an earlier stage of wording. This may be attributed to Mark's sharing Luke's source though an isolated detail does not carry much weight.

---

[55] On γεωργός see Evans (1996), "Jesus' Parable of the Tenant Farmers in Light of Lease Agreements in Antiquity," *JSP* 14: 65–83 at 67–73. After exploring the Zenon's role in the Near East and his numerous relevant papyri, Evans concludes that "Jesus' followers, many of whom were probably Galilean peasants, would have recognized that the tenants of the parable were not the field workers but the lessees who will manage and profit from the vineyard." Evans (1995), "God's Vineyard and It Caretakers," in *Jesus and His Contemporaries* (AGAJU 25; Leiden: Brill), 381–406 at 390. Cf. also J. Row-landson, *Landowners and Tenants in Roman Egypt* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), especially pages 266–279 which while not interacting with the VTS provide independent support for such views as Evans, 1995 and 1996.

[56] Ἐτῶν ἱκανῶν occurs at 2 Maccabees 1.20, a book with a distinct Greek pedigree. Lk 8:27, 20:9, and 23:8 have this coupling (χρόνος ἱκανός) without synoptic parallels. Acts 8:11, 14:3, and 27:9 also combine both words and another temporal phrase with ἱκανός (ἡμέραι ἱκαναί) occurs at 9.23, 9.43, 18.18 and 27.7.

[57] J.C. Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae* (2d. ed.; 1909), reprinted, Baker, 1968:27 included ἱκανός as a Lucanism. Collison, *Linguistic Usages*, 370, listed this as a 'likely' Lucanism, the weakest of his three rankings "certain", "probable", and "likely". Our 2nd Acts test would enable us to upgrade that rating.

[58] See the appendix in D. Stern, *Parables in Midrash: Narrative and Exegesis in Rabbinic Literature* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1991).

CN 11. *'Some of the fruit' versus '[all of] the fruit'*

Both Thomas and Mt refer to fruit (Mt: fruit*s*) collectively, while Mark and Luke only refer to "some of the fruit".[59] The subtle distinction in Mark and Luke appears to be a better reading both historically and linguistically. As outlined in the introduction, there was a probable historical background of corruption in the use of tithes by the high-priestly families. This little phrase, "some of the fruit" would fit that situation. Thus, Thomas and Matthew have probably simplified the fruit reference, perhaps as time or interest took the parable farther from its historical setting. For Matthew, the fruit would be a metaphor for good works, in parallel with his addition in 21:43 "doing the fruit of the kingdom". In Mark and Luke the refusal to give part of the fruit is a picture of the high-priests' refusal to pay and share tithes justly.

Linguistically, the phrase in Mark and Luke is irregular Greek and possibly more "Semitic", which increases the probability that it is coming from earlier tradition. Both Lk 20.10 ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ, and Mk 12.2 ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν use a bare ἀπό without an article or indefinite pronoun before ἀπό (meaning "some of the fruit"). This bare ἀπό is possible Greek but is not a preferred style in either Classical or Hellenistic Greek[60]. Greek did not need the preposition ἀπό (e.g., τινας τῶν καρπῶν), but in any case preferred something in front of ἀπὸ. Cf. Acts 27.44 ἐπί τινων τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ πλοίου "on some [pieces] which were from the boat".

A further, important distinction can be made between "fruits" and "fruit". Lk 20.10 uses the singular καρποῦ while Mark uses the plural καρπῶν. In the OT the Hebrew word for fruit is always singular (פרי 118 xx) while the LXX frequently translates with a plural καρποί, καρπούς (about 33 xx, cf. Nu 13.20 λήψεσθε ἀπὸ τῶν καρπῶν τῆς γῆς.). Thus, Greek has a tendency or preference for the plural. Would Luke have looked at Mark's good Greek plural and replaced it with a singular? If so, why? The singular in Luke would appear to reflect an earlier tradition, especially in light of similar surrounding examples.

---

[59] Cf. Mt 3:8, "Bear fruit that befits repentance" // Lk 3:8 has "fruits"; Is 27:9, 2 Kg 19:29; Is 37:30; Is 65:21, Hos 10:1, Zech 8:12, Cant 8:11; and *Gen Rab Noah* 38:9 on Gen 11:6 (Soncino 1.308).

[60] Maloney, *Semitic Interference in Marcan Syntax* 136–137, lists some colloquial Greek examples from papyri. However, Turner is less accepting of the Greek respectability, "This is a Bibl. Greek construction, not unknown but rare in class. Greek, really orig-

CN 12. *"ἵνα + future"*

In Lk 20.10 δώσουσιν, "they will give" (a future indicative tense[61]) follows ἵνα. This combination is often considered ungrammatical in Greek because ἵνα requires a subjunctive.[62] Other NT examples may include Luke 14.10, 1 Cor 9.15, Gal 2.4, Eph 6.3, 1 Pet 3.1, Rev 3.9, 6.4, 8.3, 9.20, 13.12. Textual questions may add or take away from this list. For example, Acts 5.15 has a few miniscule manuscripts and B (Codex Vaticanus) with ἐπισιάσει for ἐπισιάσῃ. Nestle-Aland[27] have considered B a mistake here and we concur. Similarly, Acts 21.24 is fundamentally a spelling problem since both the subjunctive and future were pronounced identically already in the first century.[63] One may read with A, B[2], C, and Byz ξυρήσωνται (subjunctive), rather than NA[27] ξυρήσονται (future ind.) p74, ℵ, B*.[64] The future is an example of an early spelling error entering a good text tradition.[65] Finding unambiguous examples outside the NT of "ἵνα + future indicative" is difficult. Among 453 ἵνα clauses in the LXX, we could only find Daniel-Susanna 28 with an unambiguous future. BDAG list a papyri example and two inscriptions. In Josephus,

---

inating in LXX, and is parallel to similar constructions in Heb., Syriac and Arabic." (Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek, vol. III, Syntax*, (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1963), 209.

[61] The Western, Caesarean and Byzantine texts correct Luke's future to a subjunctive δῶσιν, which was always distinct in sound. The Western text is especially puzzling because it has this correction here in Luke and then the whole uncorrected text at Mark 12.2.

[62] See Turner, *Syntax*, 100 for a good survey of the phenomenon in the NT. There are always textual variants changing a future into a subjunctive.

[63] In the first century EI = I, AI = E, Ω = O and OI = Y, but H was still distinct from I. See G. Horrocks, *Greek, A History of the Language and Its Speakers* (London: Longmans, 1997), 107–109; and Yoannes Buth, *Living Koine Greek for Everyone, vol. 1* with 3 CDs (Jerusalem: Biblical Language Center, 2002), 177–179.

[64] The full evidence is best viewed in R.J. Swanson, ed., *New Testament Greek Manuscripts, Variant Readings Arranged in Horizontal Lines against Codex Vaticanus: The Acts of the Apostles* (Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 378. Many of the manuscripts that have ἵνα with the subjunctive still preserve a following καί + a future 'will know' (B[c], C, A, D*, 69, 1739) which we accept as the best reading.

[65] In an oral context, both spellings of ξυρήσωνται may be considered the subjunctive. Cf. the opposite phenomenon at Romans 5.1 where ℵ, A, B, C, D all have a "subjunctive" spelling ἔχωμεν for what is most probably an indicative ἔχομεν. Itacistic spelling, the misspelling of a word because of the same sound, is something found in all our manuscripts, of all periods, and cannot be ruled out for autographs and initial stages of circulation. Notice the following itacistic readings for Acts 21.24: ξυρίσονται 33, 88, 1891; ξυρίσωνται … γνῶσι H, Ψ, 330, 618, 1245, 1854; ξυρίσονται … γνῶσι 440, 927, 1243, 1505; ξυρίσοντε … γνῶσι 2147, and ξυρήσονται … γνῶσι 614, 2412.

Jewish War, there are no examples in published texts like *Loeb*.[66] (Other possible examples are in a second clause after a καί 'and', cf. Lev.10:6 and Jer 43:3 LXX). These are more acceptable Greek as possibly distinguishing two levels of purpose and result. This may reflect Luke's intention at Acts 21.24 καὶ γνώσονται following a subjunctive. (Likewise, Shepherd of Hermas, *Mandate* 6.2.10.)

In the parallel to Luke 20.10, Mark 12.2 correctly has a subjunctive λάβῃ. The probability of literary direction between Mark and Luke is easy to recognize. It is difficult to believe that a good Hellenistic writer would change Mark into Luke. Mark is secondary here and not the source of Luke. The question, though, is whether the future indicative is a rare Greek colloquialism or a Semitism. A Hebrew or Aramaic text would not distinguish a subjunctive from a future, and might contribute to a translator producing ἵνα with a future. If so, then this would be an example of a non-Septuagintal Semitism, something that Luke could not have learned from the LXX. Whether a colloquialism or a Semitism, the future form in Luke is most likely coming from a source other than Mark. The multiple features of the ἀπό idiom, the singular καρποῦ, and the ἵνα+future structure, reinforce such a reading. In the light of several Hebraisms in this verse and in this parable, a non-Septuagintal Hebraism is the most probable explanation. Again, Luke is preserving the earliest form of a pre-synoptic source.

CN 13. *Clauses Out of Time Sequence:* δείραντες

In Mark 12:3 the clauses, 'took', 'beat' and 'sent away' are in their real-time order. But in Luke 20:10 the clause order ἐξαπέστειλαν … δείραντες[67] reverses the real time sequence. This is permitted in Greek because of options with participles. It is distinctly non-Semitic. Also, the adverb 'empty' is separated from the verb+object that it belongs with. This too is a uniquely Greek feature, non-Semitic. This Greek-styled sentence directly follows on a sentence that is Semitic-styled

---

[66] Josephus, *Jewish War*: ἵνα—with subjunctive 54 times, ἵνα—with optative 9 times, ἵνα—with future—zero, though one of the optatives did have a subordinated εἰ+fut.

ἵνα εἰ τὸ πρῶτον ἀσθενήσει[1] φάρμακον, τούτῳ … ὁπλίσαιτο "so that if the first poison will be weak, … he might arm himself …" [[1] ἀσθενήσειε (='would be weak' [optative]—RB/BK) Dindorf]. (J.W., 1.601 [Loeb] = BJ I,xxxi,1)

[67] Byzantine, Caesarean and Western witnesses strongly follow the real-time order in Luke. The Alexandrine texts should be followed as explaining the change. They are more difficult but not too difficult.

and produces a strange kind of schizophrenia when analyzing Luke's style. The simplest hypothesis is that this is caused by sources that are only partially and lightly edited. This is another feature of Luke's style that argues against the hypothesis that he artificially imitated the Septuagint. The word order options just mentioned would have been too easy to avoid and are too disruptive for any Septuagintalizing style to be communicative.

It is possible that this particular change of word order is tied to a clause that was in Luke's source that he deleted. For example, both Mark and Matthew have a parallel addition λαβόντες 'having taken [the servant]'. This pleonastic verb has been reasonably suggested as a Semitism.[68] It may have stood in the source that Luke saw, which he deleted while moving and demoting the "beating" into a non-sequential participle.

The same verb λαβόντες and a similar phenomenon occurs at Luke 20:15, Mark 12:8, Mt 21:39. Mark has λαβόντες in this verse as well as 12:3. Luke is missing λαβόντες, or has dropped it. Matthew has a minor agreement with Luke in the order "throwing out and killing" and Matthew's λαβόντες may be testifying to the wording of the shared source and not just a borrowing from Mark. It appears that an earlier Semitic account of VTS had λαβόντες with the first servant and with the final son. This would then be an indication that Mark was working off of a shared source with Luke rather than directly off of our Luke.[69] This then adds to the evidence of Lucan editing at the end of 20:10b and would help to explain the non-Semitic order of Luke's δείραντες.

CN 14. *Addition in Thomas: report of the first servant(s): GT 45:8–9*

Only in Thomas do we have the first servant reporting back to the master. Thomas reads: "They seized his servant, beat him (and) almost killed him. The servant went (back) (and) told his master. His master

---

[68] Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, p. 125 (citing Jeremias, *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu*[2], 88), mention that Hebrew לקח, נטל, and Aramaic נסב, all mean "take", they are very frequent in Hebrew and Aramaic, and they could contribute to an increased frequency of use in the gospels. However, λαβόντες is not a strong indication by itself and may easily be entered by a writer in either Greek or Hebrew. Notice Acts 16:3 where Luke himself adds the word in a Greek text. The strongest independent Marcan Semitism in this pericope is the καί+future in 12:7, which may only reflect Marcan style. See the discussion in §30. "The Heir and the Inheritance".

[69] This observation may be strengthened by noting that Mark did not include the Lucan editorial addition χρόνους ἱκανούς 'sufficient times'.

said: 'Perhaps ⟨they⟩ did not recognize ⟨him⟩.'" This item is presumably an addition by Thomas, in line with his emphasis on gnostic-leaning ideas of perception, seeing, recognition.

CN 15. *Hebraism in second sending*

In Luke 20:11 we have an idiom προσέθετο … πέμψαι probably meaning "again he sent". This is a very Semitic structure associated with literary (Biblical) Hebrew. Few try to deny this, especially with Mark using "again" in the parallel verse. However, because Hebrew was considered a dead language by many scholars during the last century and because Marcan priority achieved a dominant position, a frequent option for commentators was to assume that Luke artificially introduced a Septuagintalism.[70] The idiom "added + infinitive" for "to do again" is common in classical Hebrew and regularly, but not always, translated woodenly in the LXX.[71] However, the Septuagintal style theory does not explain the Greek word order. One does not say "he added a different to send servant" [sic] in either Hebrew or English for "he added to send a different servant". It is schizophrenic to insert a blatant Hebraism but to just as blatantly use a non-Hebrew, non-Septuagintal word order. This is part of the riddle that a source theory can handle much more naturally. It is relatively easy to edit a preexisting Greek text, partially adapting items to Greek style but leaving much of the source's style intact. This regularly happens to one degree or another whenever official documents are translated from one language to another. The phrase "added + infinitive" only occurs at Luke 20.11, and 20.12 in the gospel. The same structure at Acts 12.3 does not reflect this Hebrew idiom[72] and the phrase does not occur in 2Acts. The non-Lucan style of

---

[70] E.g., Fitzmeyer, *Luke*, X–XXIV 1284.

[71] There are two examples of MT וַיֹּסֶף שְׁלֹחַ "he added to send" in the LXX:

 – Καὶ προσέθετο Βαλακ ἔτι ἀποστεῖλαι "Balak added to send another messenger" Num 22.15 LXX;
 – καὶ ἐπισχὼν ἔτι ἡμέρας ἑπτὰ ἑτέρας πάλιν ἐξαπέστειλεν τὴν περιστερὰν ἐκ τῆς κιβωτοῦ. "and waiting seven days he *again* sent the dove from the ark" Gen 8.10 LXX.

Please note, neither LXX passage with 'he added to send' used πέμψαι. Both used a word based on the ἀποστέλλω and one even switched to the more idiomatic πάλιν + finite verb. Luke was not copying from either reference.

[72] BDF 435(a) translate Acts 12.3 'he proceeded to …' and suggest the same for Luke 20.

APPENDIX

"added + infinitive" coupled with the non-Hebraic word order lead to a conclusion that this is not an imitation of the LXX. The word order suggests Lucan editing and the Hebrew idiom suggests the Hebraic source that we found in idioms like ἐγένετο and ἄρξασθαι.

CN 16. *The third sending*

Some have argued for a "parabolic threesome" in the servant-sending found in Thomas, with a possible echo in Matthew,[73] on the grounds that the number three is sufficient and climatic, while four (3 servants + the son) is redundant and excessive.[74] But the *meshalim* in Avot 5:10ff have four types of virtues, four types of students, four kinds of giving, four types on attendees, four types of disciples, and four types of animal qualities, reminding one of Jesus' parable of the sower with four kinds of soil. Hence, such a subjective criticism of Luke's 3 + 1 sendings is not convincing but in fact would include the parable within stylistic expectations of parables.

Luke and Thomas both have a simple crescendo of individual incidents. However, Thomas has an inconsistency in reflecting a plural behind the first servant ("them") and having a very insipid second event.[75] In Luke the escalation moves from a beating δείραντες, to a second incident with an additional 'dishonoring' ἀτιμάσαντες, to a third with an additional 'severely wounding' τραυματίσαντες, to the final killing of a son. This fits a parable with simple events and individual characters from this world.

On the other hand, Mark and Matthew appear to have a secondary allegorization. The crescendo of suspense is gone because Mark's third servant is killed and he has a fourth sending of multiple servants, with

---

[73] Luke has three individual servants who are beaten and the son who is killed, Thomas has two servants who are beaten and the son who is killed, Matthew has two envoys of servants who are beaten, killed and stoned, and the son who is killed, Mark has three individual servants, then many others, who are beaten and killed, and the son who is killed.

[74] Cf. Hengel, referring to Dibelius, *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*[2], 1933, with a note to A. Olrik, *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, 51 (1909), 7, "Achtergewicht mit Dreizahl verbunden ist das vornehmste Merkmal der Volksdichtung." (Hengel, *Gleichnis*, 6 n. 27.) Fitzmeyer also argued for Thomas' version based upon this "parabolic threesome" (1280) and cites C.L. Mitton, "Threefoldness in the Teaching of Jesus," ExpTim 75 [1963–1964] 228–230. Yet one could equally argue for a Jewish parabolic foursome as above.

[75] Young (287) argues that Thomas' overall framework should not be trusted for three reasons: 1) Due to the owner being uniquely described as a "good (χρηστός)

both beatings and killings, adding up to five sendings in Mark's version. Matthew's first group has both killings and stonings included. The motivation for both Mk and Mt would appear to be a reference to the long history of prophets in the Hebrew Bible and the martyrdom traditions that became popularized after the times of the Maccabees. Cf. Matthew 23.37 and Luke 13.34 "Jerusalem, who kills the prophets and stones the ones sent to her." We agree with those who suppose that Mark and Matthew reflect a secondary, more allegorical and more developed form of the parable. It should be added that both the second and third sending in Luke have a Hebraism that appears to come from his pre-synoptic source. The four-fold, individual sendings in Luke appear to be the earliest form of the tradition.

CN 17. *"What shall I do?"*

The phrase Τί ποιήσω; "What shall I do?" in Luke 20:13 appears to echo Isaiah 5:4 מה לעשות עוד לכרמי "What else can I do for my vineyard?" Cf. also, "what will he do?" (Luke 20:15). These are very characteristic rhetorical questions in rabbinic stories. Luke's third person question introducing the final resolution co-occurs with another Semitic idiom בעל הכרם "Lord of the vineyard", instead of the more Greek οἰκοδεσπότης. Once again, in the light of the strong Semitisms and non-Lucan style in this pericope, these rhetorical questions should probably not be attributed to Luke but to sources. Compare the following rabbinic example.

> ר׳ אלעזר בן עזריה אומר ... מה אעשה ואבי שבשמים גזר עלי כך? ת״ל ואבדיל
> אתכם מן העמים להיות לי נמצא פורש מן העבירה ומקבל עליו מלכות שמים:

> R. Elazar son of Azaryah was saying, "… What will I do, and my father in heaven has commanded me thus? The teaching says, 'and I will separate you from the nations to be found for Me as someone separated from transgression and receiving on himself the kingdom of heaven.'" (Sifra, Qodashim 10)

In the parable of the VTS, the extreme forbearance of the owner is super-human. Most owners would send one or possibly two servants

---

man"; 2) The melodramatic "they seized his servant and beat him, all but killing him" (Thomas 45:6–7); and 3) the illogical third person plural pronoun for a singular servant (Thomas 45:9): "The master said, 'Perhaps he did not recognize them.'" Young wonders whether Thomas knows Mt, a Matthean tradition or Matthean source since 45:9 has a plural servant reference (like Matthew's envoys).

before bringing force or authorities. The question in Luke 20:13 would appear to be preserving an allusion to Isaiah 5:4. The other synoptic authors apparently thought this was superfluous for their allegorical, multiple sendings, or perhaps they thought that it cast God in an overly feeble and indecisive position.

CN 18. *Beloved ἀγαπητός*

The son as ἀγαπητός "beloved" appears in Mark and Luke, not in Mt or Thomas. "Beloved" is a common Jewish attribution to an only son. It is used midrashically in the LXX as correlating to יחיד.[76] Mark's text explicitly supports a midrashic inference to ἀγαπητός with ἔνα εἶχεν, "one he had" in 12:6. However, because of that, Mark's ἀγαπητός is not required to provide a primary meaning of "only". On the otherhand, in Luke the cultural significance of ἀγαπητός as meaning "only" is required for the heir aspect of the parable to be logical.[77] Did Luke accidently rely on a Hebraic, Jewish sense of ἀγαπητός in rewriting Mark? Or, is this one more item where he has preserved a different tradition from Mark? Literarily, it again looks like Mark has expanded the tradition. Confirmation comes from the Greek split word order, "one he had son" (instead of "he had one son").

Snodgrass argued "… without question, the Matthean version has every indication of being more self-contained and of preserving the earliest form" (1983:61). He based his thesis upon his belief that "no attempt to emphasize [the son—RB/BK] was made by Matthew" (1983:59). Yet Matthew (against Luke and Thomas) preserves the Ps 118:23 text (at 21:42c) which adds a miraculous quality about the son/stone, "it is marvelous in our eyes." Matthew also highlights the son in 21:38 where only Matthew has "the tenants saw the son." It appears that Matthew has dropped Mark's whole sentence about having one son while building toward his expansions later. Finally, the logic of

---

[76] See J.A.L. Lee, *A History of New Testament Lexicography*, Studies in Biblical Greek; (New York: Peter Lang, 2003), 193–211. Lee has argued persuavsively that ἀγαπητός does not mean 'only'. Contra C.H. Turner, "Ο ΥΙΟΣ ΜΟΥ ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ" *JTS* 27 (1926): 113–126; and A. Souter, "ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ" *JTS* 28 (1927): 59f. On the other hand, the connection with 'only' is common midrashically. Greek textual support includes Gn 22:2, 12, 16; Prov 4:3, Jud 11:34; Amos 8:10; and Zech 12:10. Cf. also, Young, 285–286.

[77] ἀγαπητός also appears in the baptism and transfiguration narratives. See Mt 12:18 where Isaiah 42:1 is applied to Jesus.

the parable requires that his son be an only son, not just a son. So, ἀγαπητός can be reasonably tied to its Hebraic implicature of "only", and that turns out to be most original in Luke.

CN 19. *Ayndeton with ἀπέστειλεν*

Some have suggested that the lack of conjunction with ἀπέστειλεν αὐτόν in Mark is a Semitism.[78] By itself, this is ephemeral and may be produced as an idiolect and as Judaic Greek, not to mention both colloquial and standard Greek.[79].

CN 20. *Those tenants*

The phrase ἐκεῖνοι δὲ οἱ γεωργοί "those tenants" in Mark 12:7 has been called a Semitism of frequency.[80] However, Semitisms of frequency are not very reliable at any one occurrence. This particular passage has the added distinction of being opposed to a "minor agreement" between Luke and Matthew "the tenants having seen [the son]" without ἐκεῖνος. On Semitisms of frequency, it may be best to mention that all our synoptic writers can be expected to exhibit their style along with their sources. Consider Raymond Martin's conclusions for this parable: Matthew, Mark and Luke all scored in the grey area between "clearly translated from a Semitic source" and "clearly original Greek".[81] Here, we would attribute "those" to Mark and the minor agreement to the source that we find behind Luke.

---

[78] Marius Young-Heon Lee, *Jesus und die jüdische Autorität, Eine exegetische Untersuchung zu Mk 11,27–12,12* (Echter Verlag, 1986), 80.

[79] Conjunctions need to be discussed together as part of a system for a writer, cf. Randall Buth, "Οὖν, Δέ, Καί, and Asyndeton in John's Gospel," in *Linguistics and New Testament Interpretation, Essays on Discourse Analysis* (ed. D.A. Black; Nashville: Broadman Press, 1992), 144–161. For example, for John, asyndeton has taken over the role of καί and is not an indication of sources. It would be impossible to prove that asyndeton is a feature of a source for Mark without additional data. Cf. Turner's comment on Paul, "Paul's asyndeton is effective in all his letters." (Turner, *Style*, 85.)

[80] Cf. discussions of attributive versus independent examples of ἐκεῖνος in Turner, "The Unique Character of Biblical Greek," VT 5 (1955): 208–213; Turner, *Style*, 24–25; and Marius Y.-H. Lee, *Jesus und die jüdische Autorität*, 80.

[81] Martin, *Syntax Criticism of Johannin Literature, the Catholic Epistles, and the Gospel Passion Accounts* (Edwin Mellen Press, 1989), 48, 133. His methodology with 17 features is a step in the right direction, but would be more helpful with a 'tighter sieve' of 30–40 features. Eight of the 17 features relate to the preposition ἐν 'in'.

CN 21. *The inheritance*

All three synoptics (contra Thomas) have the exact wording for the tenants' report—exclaiming against the heir—like Joseph's brothers in Genesis 37:20a, "let us kill him" (ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτόν).[82] The issue of inheritance is also found in Targum Isaiah 5:1.[83] Brooke highlighted inheritance as a key motif in the exegetical tradition surrounding the vineyard image.

The purpose of killing the heir was "so that the inheritance will be ours" (Lk 20:14). It is not clear on what legal basis the murderers might acquire the vineyard.[84] It is possible that the vineyard already belonged to the son (like the pre-death inheritance gift in Luke 15.12) or that they though that the father had died or was soon to die. But the question about how the tenants might eventually succeed is irrelevant to the parable. The point is that they were willing to murder the son.

The wording differences between the three synoptic writers illustrate the complexity of synoptic relationships. Matthew has καὶ σχῶμεν τὴν κληρονομίαν "and we might have the inheritance". This is a more Greek idiom than the other two synoptic writers, since Hebrew and Aramaic do not use a verb for "having". Mark has καὶ ἡμῶν ἔσται ἡ κληρονομία "and ours will be the inheritance". This has two points that are closer to a Hebraic ולנו תהיה הירושה "and the inheritance will be ours." The Semitic idiom for 'having' is reflected in "will be ours". More importantly, Mark has the simple connective "and" that is so distinctive in Hebrew as a substitute for a purpose clause. Luke also reflects a Greek idiom that is closer to Hebrew for "to have", but Luke uses the more explicit conjunction ἵνα ἡμῶν γένηται ἡ κληρονομία "in order that the inheritance might be ours". An additional confirmation of this Semitism is the simple future tense ἔσται "will be" that accompanies the καί in Mark. A volitional (cohortative) followed by καί + a future

---

[82] Genesis 37:20a "Come now, let us kill him (δεῦτε ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτόν) and throw him into one of the pits …" Mark and Matthew have δεῦτε ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτόν; the better texts of Luke have a shorter ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτόν. The intra-familial nature of the struggle may be developed and echoed in Matthew in the singular form of "nation" in his editorial addition Mt 21:43.

[83] "The prophet said, I will sing now for Israel—which is like a vineyard, the seed of Abraham, my friend—my friend's song for his vineyard: My people, my beloved Israel, I gave them a heritage on a high hill in fertile land," B.D. Chilton, *The Isaiah Targum* (Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1987), 10.

[84] For the legal background, see J.D.M. Derrett, *Law in the New Testament* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1970), 286–312 and Snodgrass, *Parable* 36–38.

may reflect both *vav ha-hippux* future (*veqatal*) and an ambiguous form between future and jussive (*veyiqtol*). E.g., in Genesis 37:20 the cohortatives "let us kill" and "let us throw" is followed by a simple future καὶ ἐροῦμεν "and we will say".[85]

If, as this study is demonstrating, Luke had access to a highly Hebraic form of the parable, then Mark's "Hebraic" conjunction might be evidence that Mark was sharing a similar (the same?) Hebraic Greek source with Luke. It would not be expected that Mark would look at Luke's ἵνα and produce καί. But there is doubt in this instance. Conjunctions are words that tend to be subconsciously controlled by writers and may be changed according to one's style without conscious reflection. Mark has a noted καί style in a similar way that Matthew has a noted τότε style.[86] Perhaps the καί is just Mark. However, we suspect that Mark probably did have access to the Hebraic Greek source(s) that Luke used. While Mark may drop many Hebraisms that are preserved in Luke and may not often add/preserve his own, the καί 'and' + future (after a volitional) in this clause Mk 12:7b, an example of λαβόντες in the next verse, Mk 12:8, and λαβόντες in 12:3, are enough to suggest that Mark was working from Luke's source and sometimes edits it less that Luke did.[87]

CN 22. *To themselves* πρὸς ἑαυτούς

Mark 12:7 πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς εἶπαν "they said to themselves, said to each other" has been considered a Semitism.[88] It is more probably a Greek colloquialism and useful for synoptic discussions. Standard Greek would prefer a phrase with ἀλλήλους like Luke's parallel 20:14 διε-

---

[85] Cf. Howard, "Semitisms …", 458; also Turner, *Syntax*, 86; and Marius Y.-H. Lee, 80.

[86] See Critical Note 38.

[87] See discussion on in section "I. Clauses Out of Time Sequence," above. NB: these are vague Semitisms in Mark that may be duplicated in the LXX. Methodologically, of course, being found in the LXX does not mean that Mark was imitating the LXX. More importantly, though, they are relatively faint Semitisms that Mark may have produced by his own idiolectic Greek style.

[88] Hengel, *Gleichnis*: 8, n. 31, incorrectly or unnecessarily refers to *dativus ethicus*. This context is reciprocal. (Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*, 102–104, does not include Mark 12:7 as an ethical dative, correctly.) For possible examples of ethical datives (idiomatic, pleonastic datives), see Luke 7:30 εἰς ἑαυτούς וַיְמָאֲנוּ לָהֶם "they refused for themselves" and Luke 24:12 וַיֵּלֶךְ לוֹ תָּמֵהַּ "and he went away for himself wondering".

λογίζοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους "they were discussing among themselves". In confirmation of its Greek status, notice that the Marcan citation πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς εἶπαν has a more Greek word order "prepositional phrase + verb". It is not really a Semitism. In the LXX it never translates one of the Hebrew phrases like אִישׁ אֶל רֵעֵהוּ, אִישׁ אֶל אָחִיו 'each other'.[89] Mark has 7 examples of πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς (Mk 1:27, 9:10, 10:26, 11:31, 12:7, 14:4, 16:3). They should be considered a Greek colloquialism and may or may not be reflecting a source.

These idioms πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς and ἀλλήλων/-οις/-ους are helpful for tracing sources in Luke and the synoptics. In 2 Acts the word ἀλλήλων/-οις/-ους occurs 6 times (Acts 15:39, 19:38, 21:6, 26:31, 28:4, 28:25) while πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς never occurs as a reciprocal substitute for ἀλλήλους. We should consider ἀλλήλων/οις/ους to be Lucan and πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς non-Lucan. The phrase πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς also occurs 2 times in the gospel of Luke. At Lk 20:5 it is probably reflecting a shared source with Mark 11:31, and at Lk 22:23 it is probably a marker of a source.

Likewise, ἐν ἑαυτοις (Mt 21:38, probably Matthean and 6 times altogether in his gospel) never occurs in Acts, but does occur 2 times in Luke (3:8, 7:49). These too, (Lk 3:8, 7:49) are probably non-Lucan. In is rare in the LXX but occurs at Joshua 24:33, 1 Mac 1:62, Psalm 66:7 [LXX 65:7], Wisdom 2:1 and 5:3, Isaiah 5:21, Dan 4:37, 6:5, Susanna 28, and twice in the introduction to Ben Sira 0:20, 0:25. Here in the VTS ἐν ἑαυτοις appears to be Matthean, though the parallels in Luke (ἀλλήλους) and Mark (πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς) may equally be their own hands. Stylistically on this point, nothing is decisive and apriori considerations will prevail. At Mt 21:25 ἐν ἑαυτοις is probably Matthean, as against reflecting a source behind πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς in Luke and Mark. Also, Mt 9:3 is probably Matthean against Mark's more Semitic "in their heart". Mt 16:7 and 8 are uniquely Matthean and may be hypothesized to be from Matthew's hand, while Matthew 3:9 is shared with Luke 3:8 and probably comes from their shared source. Luke 7:49 is probably the same non-Lucan, non-Matthean source.

---

[89] The LXX prefers phrases with (ἕκαστος, ἄνθρωπος, ἕτερος, ἀνήρ) and (τῷ πλησίον, πρὸς τὸν ἀδελφόν, ἑτέρῳ).

CN 23. *Place of killing*

Casting out a person before killing them is typical (1Ki 21:13, Lk 4:29, Ac 7:58)[90], although exceptions exist (Jn 8:59 and Ac 14:19).[91] David Daube among others has noted that Mark implied that the body of the son was unburied, an extreme disgrace.[92]

There is a minor agreement between Matthew and Luke that has elicited conflicting perspectives. Mt 21.39 and Lk 20.15 present the son as being thrown out of the vineyard and then killed. Mark on the other hand has the killing take place in the vineyard, since the body is thrown out after the killing. This is a very curious detail.

In 1898 Plummer pointed out the inheritance theme and the inappropriateness of a historicizing explanation in Luke. "This perhaps was intended to represent their turning him out of his inheritance. It may be doubted whether it refers to Jesus 'suffering without the gate.' Outside the vineyard would be outside Israel rather than outside Jerusalem." (Plummer, 460–461.)

R. Gundry makes several relevant observations on this issue.

> To make the point that the tenant farmers pollute the vineyard, according to J.D.M. Derrett (in *JTS* ns 25 [1974] 431), Mark insists on the remarkable and improbable killing of the son inside it. But the text stresses throwing him outside, not killing him inside. K. Snodgrass (Parable 60–61) thinks that originally, as in Matthew and Luke, before killing the son the tenant farmers threw him outside the vineyard to keep its produce ritually clean and saleable, and that to introduce a desecration of the corpse Mark may have reversed the order and brought the killing inside the vineyard. But in Matthew and Luke the throwing out is related

---

[90] 1 Kings 21:13, "The two scoundrels came in and sat opposite him; and the scoundrels brought a charge against Naboth, in the presence of the people, saying, 'Naboth cursed God and the king.'" So they took him outside the city, and stoned him to death.' Lk 4:29, "They got up, drove him out of the town, and led him to the brow of the hill on which their town was built, so that they might hurl him off the cliff." Acts 7:58, "Then they dragged him out of the city and began to stone him; and the witnesses laid their coats at the feet of a young man named Saul."

[91] Jn 8:59, "So they picked up stones to throw at him, but Jesus hid himself and went out of the temple." Acts 14:19, "But Jews came there from Antioch and Iconium and won over the crowds. Then they stoned Paul and dragged him out of the city, supposing that he was dead."

[92] D. Daube, *The New Testament and Rabbinic Judaism* (London: Athlone Press, 1956), 302. Cadoux believed that it may have been within the interest of the tenants not to have an impure vineyard (A.T. Cadoux, *The Parables of Jesus* (London: James Clark), 40. This may be the very reason why Mark would want to put the killing inside the vineyard.

to inheritance, not to the produce of the vineyard; i.e. the son is ejected from his inheritance. The normality of expulsion before killing may not at all favor the originality of that order. It may rather have influenced Matthew and Luke to change Mark's order because of its abnormality. The progression of leading Jesus away, going out, and coming to Golgotha in Matt 27:31–33 (par. Luke 23:26, 32–33) favors a secondary switching of Mark's order to conform to what happens in the passion story (cf. Heb 13:12–13), but a secondary switching in forgetfulness that the vineyard represents Israel, not Jerusalem.

So Gundry agrees with Plummer that the vineyard doesn't represent Jerusalem, that the focus is on the inheritance and that a historicizing explanation about 'outside the vineyard' doesn't really fit, though he accepts it anyway. What is surprising is that in standard two-document theory *both* Matthew and Luke would independently and *illogically* historicize. There is a better solution for this minor agreement.

Mark has edited the overall structure of the parable when he inserted the fourth group of servants who were beaten and killed. Mark has tied into the same traditions as Matthew. (NB: we are not saying that he got them from Matthew.) The point is that Mark stands with traditions of a prophetic condemnation against the temple authorities. One is reminded of the sanctity of the altar in stories like 1 K 1.52–53, where Solomon pulls Adoniya off of the altar and dismisses him. Later, in 1 Kings 2.25 he orders Adoniya killed.

A more suggestive example for Mark's perspective comes from 2 Chr 24.17–22. The people of Judah turned against the Lord and were worshipping idols and Ashera poles. "And [the Lord] sent prophets against them to bring them back to the Lord and they testified against them but they did not believe. (2 Chr 24:19)" The priest Zecharya challenges the people to follow the Lord, but on the king's orders, a crowd in the temple stones him and kills him. As he dies he says, "May the Lord see and revenge".

Three items are striking in this passage, one is the generic group of prophets sent to lead the people to repent. The second is the priest's death in the temple courtyard. The third is the cry for vengence. These provide an explanation for the way in which Mark may have restructured and used the parable. It is clear that Mark has added a group of servants to an already balanced foursome (3 servants and the son) in the VTS. The gruesome details of killing the son in the vineyard and throwing the body out in shame would be a fitting corrollary to the death of Zecharya in the temple courtyard. This would have relevance

to the high-priestly families who control the temple. Their "vineyard", whether the people they rule or the temple they control would be defiled. And such a defiling would call for God's judgment no less than Zecharya's explicit call.

The effect of Mark's parable of the VTS would be to pollute the temple of the high-priestly families. Would Mark be interested in such a portrayal? Apparently. Mark is the one who mentions the 'abomination of desolation', Mark is the one with an expanded version of driving out the money changers from the temple. More importantly, Mark shows an inclination in other places to rewrite history for the sake of a sectarian/Qumranian eschatology.

Steven Notley has provided a confirming example of such an apocalyptic, "Essene" editing in Mark. In an SBL paper[93] he argued that Mark's order of "bread – wine" was not the historical order. The order of "wine – bread" is behind Luke 22.16–22, it is found in the Didache, and it fits with non-Essene Jewish practice. Luke and the Didache present the more probable historical order of "wine – bread". With Mark on the otherhand, "bread – wine" become the order found in Genesis 14 with Abraham and Melkitsedek. Bread and wine serves as a symbol of a new eschatological world order, of the messianic age. Now if Mark can change the order to "bread and wine" at the last supper for apocalyptic and messianic symbolism, he is certainly capable of doing the same with a parable. Consequently, it is very easy to see Mark write negatively about the temple complex by having the killing of the son take place inside the vineyard.

Matthew and Luke's minor agreement in order probably reflects an earlier stage of the parable. Mark's reordering not only "defiles the vineyard" but fits into a larger worldview for Mark that is parallel with Qumran.

CN 24. *The identity of the son*

The בֵּן "son" is already a metaphor for Israel in the Hebrew Bible, "my son, my firstborn heir, Israel (Exod 4.22)", "and out of Egypt I called my son (Hoshea 11.1)". However, in this parable such a collective

---

[93] R.S. Notley, "The Eschatological Thinking of the Dead Sea Sect and the Order of Blessings in the Christian Eucharist" (paper presented at the Historical Jesus Session of the annual meeting of the SBL, Nashville, 2000) [forthcoming in this volume].

reference to the whole people is impossible. The son is parallel to individual servants (prophets).

The immediate context of the parable in all three synoptic gospels follows a discussion about John the Baptist.[94] There may be an important historical tie here. If the parable was told against the temple authorities and the most recent martyred prophet was John the Baptist, then this parable may allude to a conspiracy between the high priests and Herod in John's death. However, the parable does not need to describe a death already accomplished.

Jesus was expecting a conspiracy where he would be put him to death (Mt 16:21, Mk 8.31, Luke 9:22). Speaking within the hearing of members of the conspiracy would allow such a detail about the death of the last messenger, the son, to fully communicate. In fact, it may have bordered on being a self-fulfilling prophecy. However, because it is a parable, it is able to function without a unique allegorical referent. Some of the people listening to the parable may have wondered about a connection between John's death and Herod. Others may have considered the high priests and John and wondered about where Jesus was going with this. Those in the high priestly circles would have recognized the allusion to their conspiracy against Jesus. Hearing this parable they may have agreed all the more with the need for such a "son" as Jesus to die.

CN 25. *The destruction of the tenants*

A conjectural point in defense of a Semitic source comes from all the synoptics prediction of the "destruction" of the tenants which may parallel the "desolation" בתה of the vineyard in the Masoretic text (hereafter MT) at Isaiah 5:6; the LXX provides no direct equivalent, rather having the idea of forsaking the vineyard.[95] The VTS would be midrashic development independent of the LXX.

---

[94] M. Lowe, "From the Parable of the Vineyard to a Pre-Synoptic Source," *NTS* 28 (1981–1982): 257–263. Lowe offers a fascinating reconstruction of the synoptic tradition in its emphasis on John. Lowe identifies the son in the VTS as John. In the light of John's mention in the previous pericope in all synoptics, this is worthy of more consideration.

[95] LXX: ἀνήσω from ἀνιέναι 'to let go, neglect'. A parallel between the destruction of the tenants in the synoptics and the desolation of the vineyard in the MT is weakened with the uncertainty of בָּתָה in Isaiah 5:6.

In looking for biblical antecedents in the VTS, one can see a resemblance in the story of Naboth and Ahab. In 1 Kings 21, Naboth is killed (parallel to the son) and Jezebeel and King Ahab (the tenants) "inherit" his vineyard. But when Ahab attempts to posses the vineyard, Elijah (John or Jesus in the VTS) confronts this usurper and prophesizes Ahab's death (21:19–24) and likens Ahab future to the treatment of the Amorites, "whom the LORD cast out before the people of Israel" (21:26). Like 1 Kings 21, the VTS does not lay the onus on the vineyard, but on the proprietors of the vineyard. de Moor says it well:

> "The most remarkable difference between Isa. 5 and the parable of the Wicked Tenants is the total absence of any accusation of the vineyard itself in the latter. No bad grapes and no punishment in the form of destruction of the vineyard."[96]

The vineyard remains and the tenants are destroyed and disinherited by giving the vineyard to new tenants. In the Targum to Isaiah, such disinheritance occurs because of the economic oppression (5:7–8) and failure to "not give the tithes" (5:10).

Before leaving this note on the destruction, it is useful to point out a probable Matthean insertion. Matthew is alone in adding the words, λέγουσιν αὐτῷ· κακοὺς κακῶς ἀπολέσει αὐτούς. "They say to him, 'as for the bad people, he will destroy them badly'." The Matthean tradition has two items in front of the verb, a probable Grecism. The extra αὐτούς 'them' is potentially a Semitism. However, as a pronoun it could be an automatic insertion by Matthew himself and not evidence of a source. The Matthean tradition has the tenants pronouncing a strong self-judgment calling the tenants "wicked"—a judgment which seems rather awkward if the same people "perceived that [Jesus] was speaking about them" in 21:45. This looks like an expansion that has not been smoothly fit into the parable. In sum, the language criterion is more consistent with this coming from Matthew than from a source.[97]

CN 26. *A non-Septuagintal Hebraism: Tò γεγραμμένον*

Matthew has "Jesus said to them, 'Have you never read in the *scriptures*?'" and Mark has "Have you not read this *scripture* [γραφήν]." Luke

---

[96] Moor, 1998: 68.

[97] Doubts linger. Could Matthew have been thinking or once heard something like רעים ברעות יאבדם. The pronoun is resumptive and helps to relieve the double fronting before the verb. The Hebrew is strange, but alliterates.

however has "What then is this *that is written*?" Τὸ γεγραμμένον, 'the thing written/scripture,' is a nominalized, perfect participle and a literal translation of the Hebrew perfect participle הַכָּתוּב. Τὸ γεγραμμένον is a more Hebraic technical term for referring to scripture;[98] Mark and Matthew have the Greek noun γραφή and never use this nominalized participle as "scripture."[99] It is hard to understand why Luke, if looking at Mark—as a Marcan prioritist would assume—would change a common Greek Christian term to a common Hebrew idiom? It is worthy to note that since scripture citation is a post-Biblical phenomenon, Luke could not have been "Septuagintalizing."

We need to text this proposal of γεγραμμένον in the rest of Luke-Acts. Luke 21:22 and 22:37 both have γεγραμμένον as an abstact technical term for 'scripture'. They are Hebraisms, non-septuagintal and point to a source. Other examples in Luke-Acts treat γεγραμμένον as a participle "written" and are not this abstract idiom for scripture. For example, Acts 24.14 reads τοῖς ἐν τοῖς προφήταις γεγραμμένοις "things written in the prophets." This is related but is different from the absolute γεγραμμένον as the equivalent of γραφή. The idiom in Luke 20.17 passes the 2nd Acts test.

γεγραμμένον is a non-Septuagintal Hebraism that supports the possibility of another one with ἵνα+future earlier in the parable. It strongly reinforces the thesis of this study and the findings of many of these notes. Luke had access to a Hebraized Greek source. Furthermore, it is another example where Luke is not rewriting Mark but is preserving a source.

CN 27. *The scriptural wordplays from Psalm 118:22*

All four versions of the VTS contain the citation from Psalm 118:22: "The stone that the builders rejected has become the chief cornerstone."[100] The centrality of the prooftext-*nimshal* with the parable-

---

[98] For rabbinic examples of הכתוב as 'the thing written' equaling 'scripture,' see *M. Ta'anit* 3:8 Shimon ben Shetah (early first-century BCE): "If you were not Honi, I would ban you … concerning you the scripture says (עליך הכתוב אומר) (Let your father and your mother be happy and let the one who birthed you rejoice.[Prov 23])." And *M. Yadayim* 4:4, "Rabban Gamaliel (end of the first-century CE), 'The Scripture says (הכתוב אומר), "An Ammonite or Moabite will not come into the congregation of the Lord."'" Cf. Lk 18:31, 24:44. Cf. also Acts 13:29, 24:14 for similar, though different, uses.

[99] γεγραμμένον is preserved in Luke at 21:22, 22:37 and not in the parallels.

[100] Some argue that the phrase "Jesus said" in Thomas logion 66 (Ps 118) makes it unconnected with logion 65 (the vineyard parable). For example, P.L. Culbertson, *A*

proper is due to both to the wordplay between בֵּן "son" and אֶבֶן "stone" as well as the connection with a motif of building with stones. This wordplay is persuasive. Incidentally, it is *only* able to be made in Hebrew.[101] Snodgrass has written extensively concerning the בֵּן/אֶבֶן wordplay citing numerous examples,[102] and brings forth the most convincing with Josephus' account of the Jewish War. When the Romans were besieging Jerusalem and tossing stones at the Jews, the Jews would shout out a warning when a stone was coming:

> Therefore watchmen would sit on towers and would give warnings ahead of time, so that whenever an engine would be released and the stone would be sailing, they would cry out in their ancestral tongue, "The son is coming."[103] Then those targeted stood aside and were lying down ahead of time, and the result of such watching would be that the stone would pass by and fall in the rear without doing anything.[104]

Word Fitly Spoken: Context, Transmission, and Adoption of the Parables of Jesus (SUNY Series in Religious Studies. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1995), 222 n5, "The same two verses are included in the Gospel of Thomas #65 as part of the parable, but the nimshalim attached to the Matthean version are a separate pericope in Thomas, subsequent but not attached to the Wicked Tenants." The important fact is the Psalm 118:22 quotation follows *directly* after the story involving the tenants and the son. A bigger question is whether Thomas is an independent testimony. If Thomas is dependent on the synoptics directly, or directly, e.g., through the diatessaron, then he is simply an echo of the tradition that we already have in the synoptics.

[101] Culbertson (1995, 226) upholds the Aramaic as having a double entendre, but both entendres are weak: the connecting word between the mashal-proper and the nimshal is son and stone (*ben* and *even*) which is lost in the Aramaic *talya* 'boy'; it is not surprising then that Culbertson finds this Ps 118:22 *nimshal* misplaced. It is an example of trying to force data into Aramaic unnecessarily. Hebrew is fine for the first century.

[102] Snodgrass, *The Parable of the Wicked Tenants* (WUNT, vol. 27; Leiden: Brill, 1983), 113–119.

[103] ὁ υἱὸς ἔρχεται = הַבֵּן בָּא. The underlying Hebrew was intended to be "the stone is coming" הָאֶבֶן בָּאָה. This wordplay does not work in Aramaic where the word for son is בְּרָה/בַּר, the common word for stone is כֵּיפָה/כֵּיף, and the word for 'coming' is אָתֵי. Josephus claimed to know the law so well that chief priests and elders asked him about wordings and interpretations when he was still 14 (Vita 9 [2].) That authoritative resource was in written Hebrew and in what would come to be written down in Mishnaic Hebrew, his ancestral tongue.

[104] Josephus, *WAR*, 5.272. [The translation is ours. Thackeray translated the phrase in question, "Sonny's coming," which might hide the simplicity of the language itself.] Josephus has captured a uniquely Hebrew wordplay, interesting called 'their ancestral/national πατρίῳ tongue'. This testimony should be joined to Acts 1.19 ('their dialect' refers to Aramaic) to witness to the *complexity of the tri-lingual language situation in that century*.

The wordplay בֵּן/אֶבֶן is a feature that is behind all of the VTS accounts. It should be noted that it is a non-Septuagintal Hebraism shared by all.[105]

The phrase κεφαλὴν γωνίας, "cornerstone," lit. "head of the corner," is a phrase drawing from the Hebrew ראש פנה.[106] Although the quotation is clearly pulled from Psalm 118:22 (word for word with the LXX) it refers to an appointment of honor, regardless of whether the original idiom referred to an anchoring stone on a corner or a capstone of an arch. (See *lexica*.) This gives a poetic victory to the rejected/dead stone/son and is intended as an enigmatic climax to parable.

Psalm 118:22 was used in later Jewish literature to illustrate David's pedigree as well as messianic expectation. Both the Midrash haGadol and a pesher in the DSS explicate David's chosen status to rise in power: "'the builders' [in Ps 118:22] are Samuel and Jesse, [and the words] 'has become the head of the corner' refers to [David], the greatest of all kings."[107] Just four verses later the following appears: "Blessed be he who enters in the name of the Lord!" (Ps 118:26), an

---

[105] The relationship between the Hebrew text and the targum needs to be pointed out because of frequent assumptions in New Testament circles that the targum was the basis of popular exegesis in the Second Temple, or, on the other hand, that the late date of the targum renders it suspect. Cf. de Moor, "It cannot be doubted anymore that Jesus and his Jewish followers often made use of exegetical traditions which are also found in the Targums, despite their late final redaction … the parable makes use of targumic exegesis which may have been current in the first century or even earlier." (De Moor, 66.)

Firstly, the midrashic development in this Psalm is an inner-Hebrew development. בן/אבן is a Hebrew wordplay not an Aramaic one. Secondly, the Aramaic targum tradition to Psalms apparently preserves an earlier Hebrew exegetical tradition here by specifically translating 'stone' as טַלְיָא 'child, servant'. Thus, the late date of the targum is somewhat irrelevant. It is secondary testimony to something from an earlier period in Hebrew. The targum tradition is valuable as a cultural storehouse but we are not suggesting that targumic, Aramaic traditions were the basis of biblical exegesis in the Second Temple period. Virtually all of our Qumran exegesis and our tannaitic rabbinic exegesis were based on the Hebrew biblical text and most of it was first recorded in Hebrew. See Buth, "Aramaic Targumim: Qumran," where the Qumran finds line up with a view that an Aramaic Bible was not being used in the land of Israel in the first century.

[106] Compare with Is 28:16 and 1 QS 8:7—פנת יקר. For examples of פִּנָּה as a chief or leader, see Jud. 20:2, 1 Sam 14:38, Is 19:13.

[107] *Midrash Hagadol* on Deut 1:17 (Fish, 32) and Young, 293–294 n37 and n40 who refers to the Pseudo-Davidic Psalm from the Dead Sea Scrolls, a psalm which exalts David over his more handsome brothers: "And he made [David] leader of his people and ruler over the sons of his covenant." (J.A. Sanders, ed., *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran* 11 [DJD IV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965], 48–56). See Young 294 n40 for three other pertinent examples and citations.

exclamation common in pilgrimage festivals and used in messianic claims.[108] "The rejected corner-stone which the builders rejected you have elevated to head over all kings." (פינה ממואסה אשר מאסו בונים העלת לראש לעל כל המלכים).[109]

Other verses in the Hebrew canon are suggestive of stones being equated with people, rejection, atonement, and honor.[110] In the Second Temple period, the image of the stone was used for a wide range of meanings, especially messiahship, destruction, and judgment.[111] The synoptics have Jesus personifying "stones" elsewhere besides in the VTS. Luke 19:40 reports Jesus' reply to some of the Pharisees, "I tell you, if these were silent, the stones would shout out." Luke 3:8 has, "Bear fruits worthy of repentance. Do not begin to say to yourselves, 'We have Abraham as our ancestor'; for I tell you, God is able from these stones to raise up children to Abraham."[112] Jesus seemed to use this same verse in other contexts—Mark 8:31, Luke 9:22 and 17:25.

There is an extended word play with "builders" הַבּוֹנִים and "stone" אבן already underlying the Psalms quotation. The builders הַבּוֹנִים would have a metaphorical connection with the temple leaders. 'Builders' were seen as religious authorities in rabbinical textual traditions, in the DSS, and in the NT.[113] This motif of building with stones also connects

[108] Cf. Yoram Tsafrir, Jewish Pilgrimage in the Roman and Byzantine periods. *Jahrbuch fur Antike und Christentum: Erganzungsband* (20:1,1995): 369–376; Shmuel Safrai, *Pilgrimage at the Time of the Second Temple (in Hebrew)*. Tel Aviv: Am Haseffer Publishers, 1965; and *ibid.*, "Pilgrimage at the Time of Jesus." *Jerusalem Perspective* 2, no. 10 (1989): 3–4, 12.

[109] David Flusser and S. Safrai, in שירי דוד החיצוניים, עיונים במקרא[112] (ed. B. Uffenheimer; Tel Aviv, 1970), 83–105.

[110] Cf. Zechariah 3:9, "on the stone which I have set before Joshua, upon a single *stone* with seven facets, I will engrave its inscription, says the LORD of hosts, and I will remove the guilt of this land in a single day." Zechariah 10:4 "Out of them shall come the *cornerstone*, out of them the tent peg, out of them the battle bow, out of them every commander." Isaiah 28:16 "therefore thus says the Lord GOD, See, I am laying in Zion a foundation *stone*, a tested *stone*, a precious *cornerstone*, a sure foundation: "One who trusts will not panic."

[111] Cf. K. Derry, "One Stone on Another: Towards an Understanding of Symbolism in *The Epistle of Barnabas*," *JECS* 4, no. 4 (1996): 515–528, and L. Gaston, *No Stone on Another* (Leiden: Brill, 1970). Also, J.D.M. Derrett, "Stones Crying Out (Luke 19:40)," *Exp Times* 113 (2002), 187–188.

[112] The second portion of this verse is a "minor" agreement with Matthew 3:9.

[113] The Yahad polemicizes against them: "[God hates the] builders of the wall" (CD 8:12, 18). In Acts 4:11 the builders are identified as "rulers of the people and πρεσβύτεροι" (4:8). *B. Shabbat* 114a, "R. Yahana said: 'These are scholars, who are engaged all their days in the upbuilding of the world.'" See also 1 Cor 3:10, Philo *Som* 2.2 §8.; *b. Ber.* 64a, *y. Yoma* 3:5 and LXX Is 3:3, CD 4:19, and 8:12.

the *mashal*-proper and the *nimshal*-citation. Mark and Matthew preserve a longer version of Isaiah 5:1–2 which exlicitly mentions "building a tower." Both Ps 118 and Isa 5:1–2 speak of stones (אבן and לסקל respectively) and both speak of building with לִבְנוֹת. Brooke has buttressed this connection by noting 4Q500's use of בנוי באבנים "built with stones", suggesting a possible "a much more involved word-play at work … in its opening and closing quotations, a wordplay based on אבן, בנה, and possibly בן." (Brooke, 1995: 288.) A wordplay between builders, stone, son and sons also occurs in Yalkut Machiri on Psalm 118:28[114]

This sophisticated *mashal*-telling compels us to applaud Brooke's conclusion, "The whole pericope, consisting of story, logion and prooftext, has an integrity which puts the burden of proof that it contains secondary accretions firmly on those who are looking for an originally' simple story with a single point."[115]

CN 28. *An added scripture "It is miraculous in our eyes." (Ps 118:23)*

The redaction process seems to have taken the liberty to extend the quotation of Ps 118:22 into verse 23. "The Lord has done this[116], it is miraculous (θαυμαστή נפלאות) in our eyes."[117] The shorter version in Luke appears to be original. Well-built parables use words sparingly and we judge this to be a secondary expansion in Mark and Matthew. Recognizing an editorial expansion leads to an interesting question and speculation. By itself, Psalm 118:22 has the stone reaccepted and given highest honor but the stone's vindication and application to the parable is a mystery, especially when equated with the dead son. Why would Mark and Matthew add a reference to something miraculous? Just to add an extra verse? This may be their way to hint to a miracle, to

---

[114] Young, 293 n37. For other instances of the wordplay see *b. Pesachim* 119a paralled by *Yalkut Shimeoni* 2 remez 873, the Targum to Psalm 118:22 cited by Billerbeck, 1:867, and Exodus Rabbah 37:1.

[115] Brooke, 1995: 289.

[116] "This" probably refers to the action. The feminine form comes from the LXX as a calque on the Hebrew. In Greek one would expect a neuter for such a context, with a result that the verse would read as a description of the κεφαλή 'headstone.' In either case, the point is that this is miraculous.

[117] θαυμαστή according to BDAG: "wonderful, marvelous, remarkable … in our lit. not of human personalities, but of God … and of things which are often related to God." The translation "miraculous" is intended to bring out the divine implication without implying that it is a technical term like δυνάμεις 'miracles' and σημεῖα 'miraculous signs'.

the resurrection. This addition of Psalm 118:23 would be fitting as a retelling of the parable for the church but would not be necessary for confronting the temple authorities and exposing their corruption and murder. Luke's shorter version is a tighter fit historically.

CN 29. *Falling on the stone*

Luke and probably Matthew (after two verses[118]) follow this *nimshal*-prooftext with an enigmatic phrase: "Every one who falls on that stone will be broken to pieces; but when it fall on any one it will crush him." The combination of these metaphors: stone, brokenness, and sanctuary suggests an allusion to Isaiah 8:14–15, "He will become a sanctuary, a stone one strikes against; for both houses of Israel he will become a rock one stumbles over—a trap and a snare for the inhabitants of Jerusalem."

In an incisive comment on this saying, Young clarified, "one is either broken to pieces *sunthalo* or crushed into powder *likmao*. Which is preferable? One thing is clear—the stone remains."[119] The power of the stone here parallels the stone which destroys Nebuchadnezzar's statue in Daniel 2:34–35 and 44–45[120] and may well reflect the Isaiah 8:14–15 passage.[121] Billerbeck notes a similar bi-directional saying from Esther

---

[118] Two verses later at Mt 21:44, the Western textual family does not include the parallel to Luke 20:18. In favor of inclusion, the verse has excellent external support and one does not expect a Lucan verse to be put into Matthew. The word καί and τοῦτον in Matthew are more Hebraic than Luke's text, which suggest that the verse is coming from the shared source with Luke rather than as an interpolation from Luke. But the verse raises synoptic questions. It requires Matthew to have access to a shared narrative source with Luke and breaks up the flow of Matthew's pericope. One could as easily say that the unique Matthean addition of Mt 21:43 breaks up the flow. We think that the other minor agreements already suggest such a shared narrative source so it is probable that this verse is original in Matthew. Cf. Gundry, *Matthew, A Commentary on His Literary and Theological Art* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdman, 1982), 430–431.

[119] Young notes that "Mark may have deleted the saying about the crushing and being crushed because of its puzzling nature" (Young, 294). We would add Thomas in his comment.

[120] Daniel 2:44–45, "And in the days of those kings the God of heaven will set up a kingdom which shall never be destroyed, nor shall its sovereignty be left to another people (ἔθνος/עַם). It shall break in pieces all these kingdoms and bring them to an end, and it shall stand for ever."

[121] Isaiah 8:14–15 "And he will become a sanctuary, and a stone of offense, and a rock of stumbling to both houses of Israel, a trap and a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem. And many shall stumble thereon; they shall fall and be broken; they shall be snared and taken."

Rabbah 7:10, "If a stone falls on a pot, woe to the pot! If a pot falls on a stone, woe to the pot! In either case woe to the pot!"[122] Young brings another saying from Tanchuma, "the amora Resh Lakish interpreted the stone of Daniel that destroys the statue, as portraying the King Messiah's triumph over the kingdoms."[123] Daniel 2:34, Acts 4:11, 1 Peter 2:4, 7 and Barnabas 6:4 share the common stone motif with the same implications—the triumph of the stone.

CN 30. *Taking Away the Kingdom of God*

"The kingdom of God from will be taken away from you" is only to be found in Matthew's version of the VTS. Here we may have an allusion to Daniel 2:44[124] as Mt 21:44 // Lk 20:18 (see below) significantly alludes to Dan 2:45. On the question of the kingdom of God being taken away, Brad Young expresses a common reading:

> "For [Matthew (or the final reviser of the gospel)] the vineyard represented the kingdom of God which was to be uprooted from the Jewish people and transferred to a new nation (ἔθνος) which would replace Israel."[125]

---

[122] Billerbeck, 1:877. In this passage of Esther Rabbah both Psalm 118:22 *and* Daniel 2:45 are cited (!). The full text reads, "R. Simeon b. Jose b Lakunia said: In this world Israel are likened to rocks, as it says, *For from the top of the rocks I see him* (Num 23:9); *Look unto the rock whence you were hewn* (Is 51:5). They were compared to stones, as it says *From thence the shepherd of the stone of Israel* (Gen 49:24); *The stone which the builders rejected* (Ps 118:22). But the other nations are likened to potsherds, as it says, *And he shall break it as a potter's vessel is broken* (Is 30:14). If a stone falls on a pot, woe to the pot! If a pot falls on a stone, woe to the pot! In either case woe to the pot! So whoever ventures to attack them receives his deserts on their account. And so it says in the dream of Nebuchadnezzar, *You saw a stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, and that it broke in pieces the iron, the brass, and the clay* (Dan 2:45)."

[123] Young, 295; *Tanchuma*, Buber's edition, Terumah, 6.

[124] R. Swaeles, "L'Arriere-fond scripturaire de Matt XXI.43 et son lien avec Matt XXI.44," *NTS* 6 (1959–1960): 310–313 cited in Snodgrass 1983: 68n100. See also, Gundry, *Matthew,* 431, "Daniel predicts that the kingdom will *not* be passed on to another people, or nation; Matthew writes that it *will* be transferred." [italics Gundry's]

[125] Brad H. Young, *Jesus and His Jewish Parables: Rediscovering the Roots of Jesus' Teaching* (New York: Paulist, 1989), 291. Young subscribes to Flusser's thesis of a Gentile anti-Jewish final redactor of Matthew whereas we follow Saldarini in positing a Galilean anti-Judean compiler/editor. See respectively, Flusser, "Two Anti-Jewish Montages" and "Matthew's 'Verus Israel,'" in *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988), 552–560 especially 558–560 which deal explicitly with the nature of Matthew's Gentile redaction and 561–574. Contra Flusser, see Anthony J. Saldarini, *Matthews' Christian-Jewish Community* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1994). See critical note 31 below.

While the connection for Matthew between the kingdom of God and the vineyard is clear enough in the text of Matthew, this creates some incongruities. For one, the tenants, a small group, are put on a level with a nation. The vineyard tenants appear to be the temple authorities and "the Pharisees" in Matthew (21:45), but the new "tenant farmers" (Mt 21:41) are enigmatically named as "a nation" (ἔθνος) producing the fruit of the kingdom (Mt 21:43). Secondly, these new tenants, the nation, are described as producing fruit, which is what a vineyard does. So the people of the nation are both the recipients of the vineyard and they are the vineyard. Thirdly, the vineyard loses its connection with the whole people of Israel and symbolizes an abstract relationship, "the kingdom of God," a possession of part of the people. Matthew appears to have complicated a simpler literary context and to have reapplied the parable to a new social context. In Mark and Luke the tenants are more naturally limited to the temple authorities, the chiefpriests, scribes and elders. To complete this note we need to discuss 'nation' in the next note.

CN 31. *The identity of the people*

What kind of "people" was Matthew referring to in this addition to the tradition? In church history this has frequently been applied to the gentiles, yet it is curious that Matthew uses a singular noun here. An explanation of Matthew's meaning may come from religious texts of the period where עם "people" can refer to an inner-Jewish group[126]. Matthew's "nation" is probably an intra-Jewish polemic, where Matthew views the spiritual leadership of the nation as being transferred from the temple authorities and Pharisees to the Jesus movement that Matthew belongs to.

In order to compare some of the Jewish texts of the period we must inquire into the Hebrew equivalent of ἔθνει "to a nation". From the MT to the LXX, עם translates as ἔθνος 137 times, with λαός 1600 times; ἔθνος appears for גוי 460 times, and λαός appears 10 times for גוי. While the LXX was translated by many hands in the third-century B.C.E.

---

[126] Matthew is noted to have more of a Jewish audience in mind that the other synoptic gospels. Matthew is the one who mentions concern about the Sabbath (24:20), Matthew is the one with an extended record of Jesus' teaching points of the Law (chapter 5), and Matthew is the one who records the injunction to work out the community *halacha* as "binding and loosing" (16:19, 18:18).

and following, it is a rough indication of translation transference. The chance that עם lies behind our ἔθνει is certainly possible. One may reasonably search for examples of עם used religiously/spiritually rather than ethnically.

In 4QMMT C27 there appears, "a few works of the Law that we considered good for you and your עם." This explicitly uses עם for a different Jewish group and implicitly sets off the Qumran Yahad as "our עם".

In the War Scroll we find (1QM 3:13), "On the large banner which goes at the head of all the nation (עם) they shall write: 'God's nation' (עם אל)".[127] Here we have the Qumran Yahad or some Jewish minority called "the people of God". It appears that Matthew is saying something quite similar as an intra-Jewish polemic. The high-priestly families and Pharisees (= sanhedrin?) had control of the vineyard and God's rule, but this was passing on to Matthew's Jewish-messianic people, a different עם.

Both of the examples above fit with a Jewish sectarian use of people/nation (עַם) behind the ἔθνει of Mt. 21:43. If this verse had been interpolated by an anti-Jewish, gentilizing redactor after the destruction of the Temple, he could have been more explicit in using the plural ἔθνεσι, since the Christians were not from one nation. As the verse stands, it is exactly the kind of terminology that other Jewish sectarians have used. The polemical, singular ἔθνει suggests itself as spoken by an "insider"—an intra-Jewish polemic.[128]

CN 32. *'They tried' ἐζήτησαν as an unsuccessful aorist*

Ἐζήτουν "they were trying" (Mk and Mt) is an imperfect verb, hinting at the unsuccessful attempt of the leaders. The verb makes proper use of Greek to signal this failed attempt. The same imperfective phenomenon occurs consistently in other cases of parallels with Luke and Matthew and Mark.[129] On the otherhand, Luke 20:19 preserves an aorist form ἐζήτησαν "they tried", which correlates closer to the simple past tense (probably וַיְבַקְשׁוּ) of Hebrew storytelling. Imperfectivity is

---

[127] See also Daniel 2:44, having LXX ἔθνος/עַם., while Theodotion has λαός.
[128] Cf. Saldarini, J. *Matthews' Christian-Jewish Community.*
[129] Cf. Mark 11:18 // Luke 19:47 (both imperfect), Mark 14:1 // Luke 22:2 (both imperfect), Mark 14:11 // Luke 22:6, Mt 26:16 (all imperfect), and Mark 14:55 // Matthew 26:59 (both imperfect). All examples parallel with Mark here are in the

cumbersome to express in Hebrew storytelling (e.g., ויהיו מבקשים) and Hebrew tends to put most events into a simple past, into an aoristic aspect (ויבקשו).

As a contrast, the one aorist indicative ζητῆσαι in 2 Acts is for a 'completed' attempt, a positive attempt (Acts 16.10 "he attempted to go into Macedonia.") (Cf. 2 Tim 1.17 for another positive aorist attempt.) The mis-applied aorist in Luke 20:19 looks like a Semitism, a literary Hebraism[130], in Luke. Did Luke look at the correct Greek use of ἐζήτουν in either Matthew or Mark, and then change this to a less-appropriate Greek form? Not likely. Elsewhere in the gospel Luke uses ἐζήτουν in tight Greek style. Lk 20:19 ἐζήτησαν is an inconsistent detail in Luke's style that is most likely coming from the Hebraic Greek source. It is too small and insignificant to be considered as Septuagintalizing. Did Luke even know he did it? Why did he never do it elsewhere? It looks more like an item that slipped through by not registering high enough on a threshhold of consciously needing to be changed, so it was not intended to be noticed by his audience or viewed as "LXX." It only gets noticed when someone applies a careful linguistic methodology. This is another little clue that Luke is preserving and reflecting a Hebraic Greek source behind the vineyard parable. He was not working off of Mark's text.

CN 33. *'To throw hands on someone, arrest' ἐπιβαλεῖν τὰς χεῖρας*

Following on the Hebraism ἐζήτησαν as an unfulfilled aorist (i.e. 'attempted and failed'), we find a curious switch to a Greek idiom in Luke. "To throw hands on someone" ἐπιβαλεῖν τὰς χεῖρας is Greek.[131] It

---

imperfect. More instances of Luke's imperfect "was trying" can be found at 5:18, 6:19, 9:9, 11:16, 19:3; Acts 13:11, and 17:5. For an OT example of the imperfect "was trying" see Ex 2:15 καὶ ἐζήτει ἀνελεῖν 'was trying to kill [unsuccessfully]' based on the "aoristic" Hebrew וַיְבַקֵּשׁ לַהֲרֹג אֶת־מֹשֶׁה 'and he sought to kill Moses.'

[130] Aramaic is perfectly capable of producing the same structure. However, literary Hebrew with the *vav ha-hippukh style* (= *waw consecutive*) has a higher propensity to cause this kind of thing. The literary Hebrew style was fixed long before bilingualism with Greek started to sensitize colloquial and written Hebrew to more frequently marking continuative/imperfective aspectual nuances in the past. Naturally, it was possible to talk about a failed attempt in Greek in the aorist. It was just less frequent, because of the aspectual option of the imperfect verb. See an appropriate example in the LXX Dt 13.11, where the failed attempt is itself a crime, a complete event, and therefore described in the aorist.

[131] Contra Nolland, 953: "He makes use of the Septuagintal idiom 'to lay hands upon'." This idiom is a false friend and not coming from the Septuagint.

is never in the LXX for "arrest, seize violently," and only an apparent parallel to the Hebrew לִשְׁלֹחַ יָד ב – "to send a hand against, to harm, to kill." The Greek phrase means "to seize" and is found 10 times in the New Testament, always in a context of arresting or agressively taking control of someone.[132] In contrast to the Greek phrase, the Hebrew phrase לִשְׁלֹחַ יָד בְּאִישׁ means 'to harm a person, to kill,' e.g., Gn 37: 22, 1 Sm 26:23, Es 2.21[133]. The Hebrew "send a hand against" does not mean 'to arrest'. While the Hebraism ἐζήτησαν points to a pre-synoptic source of Luke, it is difficult to guess what Greek infinitive was in the source that Luke saw. The most likely idioms in a Hebrew source would have been לֶאֱחֹז אֶת 'to seize' and לִתְפֹּשׂ אֶת 'to seize, catch.' In the LXX אָחַז "agressively seize" typically produced κρατῆσαι and ἐπιλάβεσθαι, while תָּפַשׂ typically produced συλλαβεῖν.

Luke uses eight different phrases for arresting and seizing someone agressively: διαχειρίσασθαι 'to put a hand through, to kill,' (Acts 5:30 and non-LXX); ἐπιλάβεσθαι 'to grab, take, arrest' (Lu 23:26, Acts 16:19, 21:33); ἐπιβαλεῖν τὰς χεῖρας 'to put hands on, arrest' (Lu 20:19, 21:12. Ac 4:3, 5:18, 12:1, 21:27, non-LXX in this sense); ἐκτεῖναι τὰς χεῖρας 'to extend the hand; seize violently' (Lu 22:53, non-LXX in this sense); κατεσχεῖν 'to hold back, detain' (Lu 4:42); κρατῆσαι 'to arrest, hold' (Ac 24:6); συλλαβεῖν 'to apprehend; [also: become pregnant, conceive]' (Lk 22:54, Ac 1:16); συλλάβεσθαι 'to arrest, seize' (Ac 26:21).[134] At least four of these are attested in 2nd Acts though the small numbers do not allow us to exclude any of these from being true Lucan style. On the other hand we can point out that συλλαβεῖν (19xx in LXX in the sense of 'seize agressively') and κρατῆσαι (4xx in LXX in the sense of 'seize agressively') are common in the Septuagint, while ἐπιβαλεῖν τὰς χεῖρας and ἐκτεῖναι τὰς χεῖρας are never in the Septuagint in the context of "arrest, violently seize a person".

---

[132] Mt 26:50, Mk 14:46, Lk 20:19, 21:12, Jn 7:30, 7:44, Ac 4:3, 5:18, 12:1, 21:27.

[133] Esther 2:21 in Hebrew has a close linguistic parallel of "trying" (mentioned above in CN 32) and "sending a hand against" in the same sentence: וַיְבַקְשׁוּ לִשְׁלֹחַ יָד בַּמֶּלֶךְ אֲחַשְׁוֵרֹשׁ "and they tried to send a hand against King Artaxerxes." This was translated in the LXX clearly and with a more nuanced Greek verb tense than Luke: καὶ ἐζήτουν ἀποκτεῖναι Ἀρταξέρην "and *they were trying to kill*."

[134] Biblical Hebrew idioms include אחז את, אחז ב-, אסר את, לכד את, לקח את, עצר את, תפש את.

What can we learn in the other direction? Mark and Matthew have everything flattened into κρατῆσαι 'to agressively seize, arrest'. Mark has a total of 7 occurrences of κρατῆσαι 'to agressively seize, arrest'. One of those seven is uniquely Marcan (Mk 3.21), while in the other six examples Mark's κρατῆσαι is paralleled with Matthew's κρατῆσαι: Mk 6:17 // Mt 14:3; Mk 12:12 // Mt 21:46; Mk 14:1 // Mt 26:4; Mk 14:44 // Mt 26:14; Mk 14:46 // Mt 26:50; Mk 14:49 // Mt 26:55. Matthew has two unparalleled examples of κρατῆσαι at Mt 18:18 and 22:6. Mark and Matthew only have ἐπιβαλεῖν τὰς χεῖρας once (Mk 14:46 // Mt 26:50) and even there they share κρατῆσαι as the next word. Consequently, when it comes to asking what was in the pre-synoptic source we are left in the dark. On the one hand, Mark and Matthew seem to put everything into κρατῆσαι, so that we may only be seeing their style or preference. On the other hand, Luke is so flexible that any difference from Mark/Matthew may only be Luke's style rather than the pre-synoptic source. As the rabbis would say, תֵּיקוּ "it stands unresolved."

A good example of this application is the arrest at Luke 22:54. Luke has συλλαβεῖν. That may be his choice. Mark 14:53 is parallel but without a resumptive word for the arrest. That may be his choice. Matthew 26:57 is parallel to Luke but with κρατῆσαι. Of course, that may be his own choice. The minor agreement between Matthew and Luke in having a word for "arrest" points to something in the pre-synoptic source, either συλλαβεῖν or κρατῆσαι, but we don't know which one it was. תיקו.

CN 34. *'In the same hour' ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ*

Only Luke has the unusual ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, "in the hour itself," another Semitism. Black, (*AAGA3*, 108–111) has a long discussion, which would be more useful if it had included the Hebrew background as well. Aramaic בה שעתא occurs four times in Daniel and otherwise only as a quotation in later rabbinic texts and in the archaizing Antiochus Scroll. The later Aramaic form is בההיא שעתא "in that hour" in Targum Neofiti and the Talmud (15xx in bTalmud). In Hebrew the pronoun idiom באותה שעה "in it (the) hour" occurs frequently, for example, in tannaitic midrashim (53xx) and 4 times in Mishnah. The Greek equivalent with ἐν occurs in Luke 7:21, 10:21, 12:12, 13:31 and 20:19. Ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ may be from a source and it only occurs once in the LXX, at Dan 5:5, which would make it almost a non-Septuagintalism. The

phrase αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ, without ἐν, occurs in Luke 2:38, 24:33 and Acts 16:18 and Acts 22:13. The phrase without ἐν is in Daniel Theodotion at 3:6 (with LXX), 3:15, 4:30. This phrase without ἐν was apparently adopted by Luke for his own writing, as the Acts examples show. Because Luke 20:19 includes the preposition ἐν, the phrase ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ may be another indication of a Semitic source in the VTS. However, the small numbers available for Luke leave this item as only tentatively supporting a source over Luke's own style. The profile of Mishnaic Hebrew points to Hebrew as the pedigree of the structure.

CN 35. *Crowds*

An item of interest behind the closing verse: Luke has "and they feared the people (λαόν)" whereas Mark (ὄχλον) and Matthew (ὄχλους) "feared the multitude(s)." The plural form אוכלוסין "people, crowd" is always plural in Mishnaic Hebrew. As can be seen from the form, it is a Greek loanword in Mishnaic Hebrew that has idiomatically attached a Hebrew ending. Matthew's form may reflect Jewish Greek or a pre-synoptic source. The overall structure of this verse points to Mark and Luke as the better representatives of the pre-synoptic source. See CN 36.

CN 36. *And they feared … for against them he said this parable*

The pericope closes with more Hebraisms. Both Mark and Luke agree in the conjunction "and" with "fear": καὶ ἐζήτησαν … καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν "and they tried … and they feared the people." The strangeness in the conjunction is that the fear is a contrastive reason why the leaders did not follow through and arrest Jesus on the spot. Such a highly contrastive and causal link signaled by only "and" is highly Hebraic. Mark and Luke are probably jointly testifying to their pre-synoptic source.

A clearer Greek conjunctive syntax can be seen at Mark 6:20 ὁ γὰρ Ἡρῴδης ἐφοβεῖτο τὸν Ἰωάννην "for Herod was fearing John," Mark 11:18 καὶ ἐζήτουν πῶς αὐτὸν ἀπολέσωσιν ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ αὐτόν "they were looking for a way that they might destroy him for they were fearing him," Mark 16:8. ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ "for they were fearing," and Luke 22:2 καὶ ἐζήτουν … ἐφοβοῦντο γὰρ τὸν λαόν "and they were looking … for they were fearing the people." (Note all the imperfective aspects in Greek, too.) Matthew 21:46 does not share this Hebraism with Mark

and Luke because he subordinated "were looking, trying" to "fearing" by using a participle and thus not needing a conjunction at all.

Having pointed out a shared Hebraic background to this verse we need to point out a minor difference between Mark and Luke. Mark has two elements before the verb: ὅτι πρὸς αὐτοὺς τὴν παραβολὴν εἶπεν "that against them, the parable, he said." The word order is clearly Mark's editing. It is good Greek, fronting "against them" for focus and backgrounding the topicalized object-verb "parable he said." Luke has a more original ὅτι πρὸς αὐτοὺς εἶπεν τὴν παραβολὴν ταύτην "that against them he said this parable." The fronting of the phrase "against them" is both good Greek and good Hebrew: כי עליהם אמר את המשל הזה. The most important point of the sentence has been put in front of the verb, a structure called focus in much linguistic literature and to be distinguished from fronted topicalization structures.[135] Additional support of the Hebraic background to this verse comes in the word order παραβολὴν ταύτην "parable this המשל הזה" and the collocation "to say a parable" See critical notes 1 and 2.

CN 37. *Luke's Καί/Δέ Style*

Because of finding several Semitisms and Hebraisms uniquely in Luke and concentrated in Luke, we need to focus on a parallel, enigmatic feature in Luke, his conjunctions, especially καί, δέ, and οὖν. They, too, will testify to Luke's inconsistencies between using sources and his own style.

Καί "and" is the conjunction that is associated with Greek translation of Hebrew texts. It was chosen in the Septuagint because both Greek καί and Hebrew ו "and" can be used to join two nouns together. For example, "male and female he created them" is זָכָר וּנְקֵבָה in Hebrew and becomes ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ in Greek. Once a primary association is formed between Greek καί and Hebrew ו, then it was an easy matter for the LXX to multiply καί at the beginning of sentences. Hebrew narrative style is ubiquitous with ו- "and". The problem is that such a style is unnatural Greek.

In normal Greek styles δέ "and" adds a feature in Greek texts. Δέ joins sentences together like a conjunction "and," but it also adds a notion of a change in topic, a change in paragraph, a change in back-

---

[135] On differences between Topic and Focus, see Simon Dik, *Studies in Functional Grammar*, (New York: Academic Press, 1980), 16.

grounding or a change in story development. In typical Greek writing almost every complex sentence will have a δέ, either at the beginning or in one of the main clauses. This shows up very prominently in statistics[136].

The statistics of καί/δέ show a good Hellenistic writer in the second part of Acts. This fits standard conceptions of Luke, the author of Acts. The statistics are also quite suggestive in showing that 1 Acts leans toward a more Semitic style and that the Gospel of Luke in its various parts leans even more toward a Semitic style. At times, Luke has stretches of high frequency of καί. For example, Luke 19:39 to 20:2 have 15 sentence-level καί to 3 δέ.

Now for the surprise. In our vineyard parable, Luke shows *Greek* stylistic sensitivity with καί/δέ. This is *not* the way to imitate the Septuagint. Luke 20:9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18 all have δέ. By way of contrast, Mark only has three δέ: 12:5 (not parallel to Luke), 12:7, 12:10 (not parallel to Luke). Mark has his noticeably non-Greek, καί style, typically Marcan.[137]

In addition to the Greek δέ, Luke also has examples of οὖν "therefore" (20:15, 17) that are not in Matthew or Mark. The impression from these conjunctions is that Luke is *not* trying to mimic the Septuagint. Rather, he is unobtrusively smoothing out his sources. The

---

[136] The καί / δέ statistics are from Turner, *Style*, 58.

Josephus, *Antiquities* (sample) has	0.3 sentence-level καί for 1 δέ.
Acts (*we* sections)	0.5
Epictetus	0.6
II Acts (sample)	0.6
Paul (1 Cor)	0.6
Papyri	0.9
I Acts	1.0
4 Maccabees	1.0
Luke (Marcan sections)	1.2
Luke ("L")	1.4
Matthew	1.5
Luke ("Q")	1.9
LXX Exodus 1–24	2.1
Mark	5.0
Luke (infancy stories)	5.0

[137] We prefer to think of this as an idiolect for Mark rather than a Jewish Greek dialect. The various gospels and other Jewish writings of the period do not reflect anything like a standard Jewish Greek dialect. However, in addition to Mark's idiolect, his multiple examples of καί probably reflect a shared source with Luke. In many cases it is impossible to decide whether a καί is from a source or from Mark's personal style.

schizophrenic appearance seems to be the result of using Hebraic Greek sources and letting much of the vocabulary remain. The conjunctions are an automatic, grammatical layer added by Luke that move in the direction of Greek sensitivities, but still stop significantly short of Luke's own style in 2 Acts or natural Hellenistic Greek. Thus, Luke added many Greek conjunctions here are there but the overall statistics make it clear that many originally Semitic καί have slipped through the rewriting process. Two phenomena are intertwined here. The abnormal statistics for Luke testify to his using a Semiticized source and the additions of δέ and οὖν testify that he was trying to smooth out the style in the direction of normal Greek, not in the direction of the LXX.

CN 38. *Profiles of conjunctions: τέ, εὐθύς, and the narrative conjunction τότε*

There are other features related to stylistic questions that have not shown up in such a short pericope as the VTS. Three items have been isolated from the styles of Luke, Mark and Matthew as examples. The lack of these three items in the VTS is important within our general discussion.

Luke's use of τέ 'and' in Acts reflects his own Greek style. Τέ is a word that does not reflect a Hebrew word or function but is a part of the Greek system of conjunctions.[138] Luke's uses τέ approximately 140 times in Acts, over half of them in Acts 16–28. Luke only uses τέ 9 times in the gospel, a severe restriction. Τέ did not enter the VTS but its absence is not surprising with so few anywhere in the gospel. Τέ is a Lucan feature whose statistical lack in the gospel points to sources being used. The corrollary is that where τέ does occur we need to consider Lucan redaction. This can support the claim that Luke was not imitating the LXX. In Acts 22, the speech that Luke says was given in Hebrew has three examples of τέ (22:4, 22:7, 22:8). Acts 22:4 joins two nouns, while 22:7 and 22:8 introduce main clauses. Luke is clearly not imitating the LXX even in Acts 22 where such imitation would have been rhetorically effective. Luke is writing with his normal Greek style in Paul's Hebrew speech.

---

[138] The infrequency of τέ in the LXX can be demonstrated: Genesis 19 xx, Exodus 26 xx, Leviticus 10 xx, Numbers 4xx, Deuteronomy 8 xx for a total of 67. For comparison, in the pentateuch there are 11,721 καὶ at word, phrase and and clause levels and 1,555 δέ at clause levels.

314   APPENDIX

Καὶ εὐθύς occurs 41 times in Mark. It has been long recognized as a
Marcanism. Its background and the reason why Mark adopted it are
murky. It may come from מִיָּד "immediately" in Mishnaic Hebrew and
Later Aramaic, but it is certainly part of Mark's style in Greek. More
importantly, εὐθύς is useful for synoptic comparisons.

Luke has παραχρῆμα 'immediately' 10 xx in the Gospel, 6 in Acts
(2xx 2nd Acts), and εὐθέως 'immediately' 6 times in the Gospel and
9xx in Acts (5xx 2nd Acts). In addition, Luke is not anti-εὐθύς. He has
an example of εὐθύς in Luke 6.49 and Acts 10.16. So Luke has many
'immediately's, of many kinds, but not usually where Mark has them.
Only two of the 17 'immediately's in Luke are parallel to Mark's εὐ-
θύς[139]. Luke uses "immediately" and apparently would have accepted
εὐθύς, but he does not seem to know the Marcanism in his sources.

On the other hand, Mt shares εὐθύς 7 times with Mk. These are
the only occurrences of εὐθύς in Mt! He has another 7 examples of
εὐθέως parallel to Mark's εὐθύς, among 11 examples of εὐθέως in Mt.
Matthew prefers εὐθέως and has replaced some of Mark's examples
of εὐθύς with εὐθέως, but has accepted seven examples of εὐθύς from
Mark. Εὐθύς is a Marcanism and it shows up in Matthew but not in
Luke. As for Luke and Mark, they do not object to the item involved,
εὐθύς, but they go in different directions with "immediately."[140] These
observations lead to a conclusion that εὐθύς was not in the pre-synoptic
source shared with Luke, that Matthew used Mark, and that Luke did
not use Mark. This is a weighty stylistic item against Marcan priority. It
could be balanced by showing a Marcanism that turns up in Luke. For
example, something like ἄρξασθαι+infinitive is Marcan and might be
tried out, but it cannot balance εὐθύς because there were not significant
parallels in Luke in the way that we find Marcan εὐθύς in Matthew.
(Cf. CN 4.) The lack of Marcan stylistic features turning up in Luke is
a difficult problem for Marcan priority.[141]

---

[139] Lk 8.44 παραχρῆμα //Mk 5.29; and Lk 5.13 // Mk 1.29 // Mt 8.3 εὐθέως [minor
Mt-Lk agreement]. [or 2 of 23 "'immediately' if including αἰφνίδιος, ἐξαίφνης and
words with ταχ- 'speedily'"].

[140] On εὐθύς, see R.L. Lindsey, *Hebrew Translation of the Gospel of Mark* (2d. ed.;
Jerusalem: Dugith Publishers, Baptist House, 1972), 58–61.

[141] Other items like ἔρχεται (hist.pres.), εὐαγγέλιον, κηρῦξαι, ἔλεγεν, λέγει, πάλιν,
παριστάνειν(intran.), συζητεῖν, only reinforce this problem, but they are beyond the
scope of this article. As an example how this works: πάλιν occurs in Acts 10:15,
11:10, 17:32, 18:21, 27:28 and Luke 6:43, 13:20, 23:20. Luke knows and uses the word.

In similar fashion we need to consider the importance of "narrative conjunction τότε" 'then'. During the Persian and Greek periods Aramaic narrative underwent a stylistic development that separated Aramaic from Hebrew. Literary Hebrew maintained a stylistic device for sequencing stories called *vav ha-hippuch* (*waw consecutive*) that preserved its traditional word order patterns. Aramaic, on the other hand adopted a much looser word order style that apparently triggered the development of additional conjunctions for marking sequentiality. The conjunction that took over and became regular in Jewish narrative texts of the period is אֱדַיִן "then" and its byform בֵּאדַיִן "so then." These show up in Greek translation as τότε. It is a relatively easy task to look at Greek copies of Daniel, Ezra and 1 Esdras and spot the sections that are translations from Aramaic. The Qumran Aramaic narratives all show this feature as well. In spite of not having very many examples of 1st century Jewish Aramaic narrative we can estimate how thoroughly ingrained this feature had become by noticing Matthew's 68 examples of narrative conjunction τότε, out of 90 examples of τότε in his gospel[142]

Note well: Mark *never* uses τότε as a narrative conjunction, though he has six examples of τότε. A datum regularly missed by gospel researchers is that the conjunctions in Mark's narrative Semitic style are uniquely Hebraic and not Aramaic.[143] This holds true for the

However, Luke never accepts one of Mark's 27 examples, though Matthew shares 5of his 16 examples with Mark. For notes on the more impressive λέγειν, see Lindsey, *Hebrew Translation of the Gospel of Mark*, 28–30.

[142] For more detailed discussion cf. Randall Buth, "אדין/τότε An Anatomy of a Semitism in Jewish Greek," *Maarav* 5–6 (1990): 33–48. Mt 2:7, 16, 17, 3:5, 13, 15, 4:1, 5, 10, 11, 17, 8:26, 9:6, 14, 29, 37, 11:20, 12:13, 22, 38, 13:36, 15:1, 12, 28, 16:12, 20, 21, 24, 17:13, 17?, 19, 18:21, 19:13, 27, 20:20, 21:1, 22:15, 21, 23:1, 26:3, 14, 16, 31, 36, 38, 45, 50, 52, 56, 65, 67, 74, 27:3, 9, 13, 16, 26, 27, 38, 58, 28:10; plus some examples within stories in speech 12:44, 45, 13:26, 18:32, 22:8, 13, 25:7.

[143] This phenomenon of narrative τότε providing a clear demarcation in Greek between Hebrew sources and Aramaic sources was never addressed by major publications on Semitisms in the gospels and the New Testament. Recently, M. Casey (*Aramaic Sources of Mark's Gospel*, [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998]) misses this completely in his discussions and reconstructions. His reconstructions look like Aramaic translation from Hebrew. A similar complaint can be lodged against Maloney, *Semitic Interference in Marcan Syntax*. Perhaps if earlier studies had noticed, some of the Aramaic studies of the 20th century would have been rewritten or expanded to include Hebrew. Matthew's Greek style was already strong enough to suggest that the targum traditions, without narrative τότε, were not standard Aramaic narrative but were later Aramaic and translationese from Hebrew. However, the Qumran Aramaic texts have certainly added to our ability to recognize that Middle Aramaic narrative is *not* what lies behind Mark and Luke. To be sure, τότε was listed as an Aramaism in Matthew, without neces-

VTS as well as the whole gospel. In the Dead Sea corpora extended Aramaic narratives all have באדין/אדין. Furthermore, Matthew's Greek "narrative τότε" style is only explainable on the basis of such an אדין style being normal Aramaic narrative in the first century. As argued in Buth 1990, we think that Matthew's τότε is coming from himself and not from a source.[144]

This study has found several features in the VTS that point toward Hebrew. The lack of narrative τότε is another. Statistically, the lack of narrative τότε in the relatively short VTS does not prove anything. However, its *absolute lack in all of Mark* and its equally significant absence in Luke[145] demonstrate clearly and unambiguously that the Semitized Greek source shared by Mark and Luke go back to Hebrew not Aramaic. In addition, narrative τότε is a Mattheanism that never surfaces in parallels in Mark or Luke. Since general occurrences of τότε are found in both Mark and Luke, the lack of narrative τότε conjunction suggests that neither Mark nor Luke were ever using Matthew. This becomes a datum against the (Mt)Lk) Griesbach and Farrer theories.

---

sarily distinguishing narrative τότε. It was the corrolary that was overlooked: narrative τότε was missing in the Semitizing syntax in Mark and Luke. No narrative τότε = no Aramaic source, therfore a Semitic source = Hebrew.

[144] Authors are capable of producing surprising styles. For example, in sub-Saharan Africa one speaker was observed over many occasions whose mother-tongue was a Nilo-saharan language, whose primary intellectual language was English, and who also spoke Arabic as a "second" language, who would idiosyncratically insert *fa* 'so' (Arabic conjunction) into his English speeches. (personal observation-RB)

[145] Luke 14:21, 21:10, 24:45 are an acceptable frequency for Hebrew or Greek in a 24 chapter work. For example, Hebrew Genesis has 4 examples of אז, Infrequent, apparent parallels of an syndetic adverb τότε appear in works like the literary Josephus or the more colloquial Martyrdom of Polycarp. See Buth 1990: 43–44. Luke's style in Acts 16–28 confirms that the lack of τότε in the gospel was neither an accident nor a result of rejecting Matthew's style. Acts 17:4, 27:21, 28:1 are non-initial adverbs, 21:13 is textually suspect. Against Luke's gospel, Acts 21:26, 33, 23:3, 25:12, 26:1 27:32 reflect an asyndetic adverb mildly reminiscent of Matthew's style. This might be an influence from a possible Syrian background for Luke or more probably an adaptation from some Jewish Greek styles. The 11 potential examples of narrative τότε in 1 Acts (1:12, 4:8, 5:26, 6:11, 7:4, 8:17, 10:46, 48, 13:3, 12, 15:22) may mean that Luke had access to an Aramaized Greek source for the first part of Acts. This would match the evidence from ἐγένετο + finite verb. The Hebraic structure does not appear in Acts, suggesting Aramaic for a primary Semitized source to 1Acts. Thus, these two major features are reversed and complementary between the gospel and Acts. The gospel has the Hebraic ἐγένετο structure and lacks the Aramaic narrative τότε. Acts lacks the Hebraic ἐγένετο but has the Aramaic τότε. In any case, the 2nd Acts evidence with narrative τότε makes Luke's gospel style all the more impressive. The missing narrative τότε in the gospel cannot be accidental for Luke and it points to Hebrew and contradicts an Aramaic-based source theory for the gospel.

We are not claiming that narrative τότε can be fully evaluated in isolation from other Semitisms, but that once it is mixed in, for example, together with the discussions in this article on the VTS, then gospel researchers must open up a new perspective that includes Hebrew written sources in the foundations of the gospel traditions.